EXHIBIT D

Original MND

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
ROOM 395, CITY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

LEAD CITY AGENCY: City of Los Angeles		**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** 13
PROJECT TITLE: Virgil Avenue Parking Structure Project	**ENVIRONMENTAL CASE:**	**CASE NO:** ENV-2015-310-MND

PROJECT LOCATION: 4470-4494 De Longpre Avenue, Los Angeles, California.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The Proposed Project would involve the demolition of two 1-story Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center (HPMC) maintenance buildings; an adjacent 1-story, single-family home; and surface parking lots; and construction of a new parking structure that would include 654 parking spaces for HPMC patients, visitors, and employees. The parking structure will vary in height from 42 to 56 feet aboveground and would be constructed on a 1.02-acre (44,500-square-foot) site located within the Vermont/Western SNAP, Subarea C, and C4-1D, [T][Q]C2-1, and R4-1D Zones located at North Virgil Avenue, Los Angeles, California (Project Site).

The Project Applicant requests a Project Permit Compliance Review Approval, pursuant to the provisions of LAMC Section 11.5.7.C, to allow the Proposed Project located within the geographic boundaries of the Vermont/Western SNAP to proceed.

The Project Applicant requests a Project Permit Adjustment, pursuant to the provisions of LAMC Section 11.5.7.E, to allow the Proposed Project to reduce pedestrian path minimum horizontal clearance from 10 feet to 5 feet, and minimum vertical clearance from 12 feet to an approximate range of 8–9 feet.

The Project Applicant would also request approvals and permits from the Department of Building and Safety (and other municipal agencies) for Project construction activities including, but not limited to the following: demolition, excavation, shoring, grading, foundation, haul routes, and building improvements for each site.

NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT IF OTHER THAN CITY AGENCY
CHA Reproductive Managing Group & CHS Property Holdings, LP
C/O John Lee
1300 Vermont Ave., Los Angeles, California 90027

FINDING: The Department of City Planning of the City of Los Angeles has proposed that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be adopted for this project. The mitigation measures outlined on the attached pages will reduce any potentially significant adverse effects to a level of significance.

SEE ATTACHED SHEET(S) FOR ANY MITIGATION MEASURES IMPOSED

Any written comments received during the public review period are attached together with the response of the Lead City Agency. The project decision maker may adopt the mitigated negative declaration, amend it, or require preparation of an EIR. Any changes made should be supported by substantial evidence in the record and appropriate findings made.

THE INITIAL STUDY PREPARED FOR THIS PROJECT IS ATTACHED

NAME OF PERSON PREPARING FORM	**TITLE**	**TELEPHONE NUMBER**
Blake Lamb	City Planner	213 978 1167
ADDRESS 200 N Spring St. CA CA 90039	**SIGNATURE (Official)**	**DATE** 6/15/15

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
ROOM 395, CITY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
INITIAL STUDY and CHECKLIST (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15063)

LEAD CITY AGENCY: City of Los Angeles	**COUNCIL DISTRICT:**	**DATE:**
RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES: Department of City Planning		
ENVIRONMENTAL CASE: ENV-2015-310 -MND	**RELATED CASES:** DIR-2015-309-SPPA-SPP	
PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.	☐ DOES have significant changes from previous actions. ☐ DOES NOT have significant changes from previous actions.	

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The Proposed Project would involve the demolition of two 1-story Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center (HPMC) maintenance buildings; an adjacent 1-story, single-family home; and surface parking lots; and construction of a new parking structure that would include 654 parking spaces for HPMC patients, visitors, and employees. The parking structure will vary in height from 42-56 feet above ground and would be constructed on a 1.02-acre (44,500-square-foot) site located within Vermont/Western SNAP, Subarea C, and C4-1D, [T][Q]C2-1, and R4-1D Zones located at North Virgil Avenue, Los Angeles, California (Project Site).

The Project Applicant requests a Project Permit Compliance Review Approval, pursuant to the provisions of LAMC Section 11.5.7.C, to allow the Proposed Project located within the geographic boundaries of the Vermont/Western SNAP to proceed.

The Project Applicant requests a Project Permit Adjustment, pursuant to the provisions of LAMC Section 11.5.7.E, to allow the Proposed Project to reduce pedestrian path minimum horizontal clearance from 10 feet to 5 feet, and minimum vertical clearance from 12 feet to an approximate range of 8–9 feet.

The Project Applicant would also request approvals and permits from the Department of Building and Safety (and other municipal agencies) for Project construction activities including, but not limited to the following: demolition, excavation, shoring, grading, foundation, haul routes, and building improvements for each site.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (Continued) : See above and supporting exhibits and tables in the attached Initial Study prepared by Meridian Consultants, dated June 2015.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: The Project Site is located within Subarea C of the SNAP and within the boundaries of the Hollywood Community Plan. The Project Site includes approximately 44,500 square feet of lot area (1.02 acres) and is currently occupied by two 1-story HPMC maintenance buildings; an adjacent 1-story, single-family home; and surface parking lots.

Further details and photographs of the existing Project Site and surrounding area are provided in the Initial Study (IS) prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.

PROJECT LOCATION:			
COMMUNITY PLAN AREA: Hollywood Community Plan **STATUS:** ☐ Preliminary ☒ Does Conform to Plan ☐ Proposed ☐ Does NOT Conform to Plan ☒ ADOPTED in 2001		**AREA PLANNING COMMISSION:** Central	**CERTIFIED NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL:** Los Feliz Neighborhood Council
EXISTING ZONING: C4-1D, [T][Q]C2-1, R4-1D	**MAX DENSITY ZONING:** 6:1	**LA River Adjacent:** No	
GENERAL PLAN LAND USE: Neighborhood Office Commercial	**MAX. DENSITY PLAN:** 6:1	**PROPOSED PROJECT DENSITY:** Does Not Apply	

Determination (To be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions on the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature	Title	Phone

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. "Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of a mitigation measure has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analysis," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analysis must be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

    a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

    b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

    c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources: A sources list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whichever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:

    a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

    b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ **AESTHETICS**	☐ **GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**	☐ **POPULATION AND HOUSING**
☐ **AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES**	☐ **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**	☐ **PUBLIC SERVICES**
☐ **AIR QUALITY**	☐ **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**	☐ **RECREATION**
☐ **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**	☐ **LAND USE AND PLANNING**	☐ **TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC**
☐ **CULTURAL RESOURCES**	☐ **MINERAL RESOURCES**	☐ **UTILITIES**
☐ **GEOLOGY AND SOILS**	☐ **NOISE**	☐ **MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST (To be completed by the Lead City Agency)
Background

PROPONENT NAME: CHA Reproductive Managing Group & CHS Property Holdings, LP, C/O John Lee

PHONE NUMBER: 213-487-3211

APPLICANT ADDRESS: 1300 Vermont Ave, Los Angeles, California 90027

AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST: City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning **DATE SUBMITTED:**

PROPOSAL NAME (If Applicable): Virgil Avenue Parking Structure Project

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
PLEASE NOTE THAT EACH AND EVERY RESPONSE IN THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES INITIAL STUDY AND CHECKLIST IS SUMMARIZED FROM AND BASED UPON THE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS CONTAINED IN ATTACHEMENT B, EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST DETERMINATIONS. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE RESPONSE IN ATTACHMENT B FOR A DETAILED DISCUSSION OF CHECKLIST DETERMINATIONS.					
4.1. AESTHETICS					
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature within a city-designated scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐
4.2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES					
a.	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 1220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d.	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e.	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4.3 AIR QUALITY					
a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the SCAQMD or congestion management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the air basin is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐
4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by The California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in the city or regional plans, policies, regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c.	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES					
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Section 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Section 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
4.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS					
Would the project:					
a.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i.	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the state geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to division of mines and geology special publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii.	Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii.	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv.	Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
v.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
vi.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potential result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☐	☐	☒	☐
vii.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in table 18-1-b of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐
viii.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS					
Would the project:					
a.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b.	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐
4.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS					
Would the project:					
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for the people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY					
Would the project:					
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned land uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or offsite?	☐	☐	☐	☒

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
e.	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g.	Place housing within a 100-year flood plain as mapped on federal flood hazard boundary or flood insurance rate map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h.	Place within a 100-year flood plain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, inquiry or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☒	☐
j.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING					
Would the project:					
a.	Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b.	Conflict with applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c.	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4.11 MINERAL RESOURCES					
Would the project:					
a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4.12 NOISE					
Would the project:					
a.	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise in level in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b.	Exposure of people to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c.	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☒	☐	☐

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d.	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING					
Would the project:					
a.	Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b.	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c.	Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☒	☐
4.14 PUBLIC SERVICES					
a.	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i.	Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii.	Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii.	Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iv.	Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
v.	Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
4.15 RECREATION					
a.	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b.	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4.16 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC					
Would the project:					
a.	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b.	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c.	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d.	Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☒	☐	☐
f.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4.17 UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS					
Would the project:					
a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable regional water quality control board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b.	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
c.	Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resource, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐
h.	Require new (off-site) energy supply facilities and distribution infrastructure, or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
4.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE					
a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b.	Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects).	☐	☐	☒	☐
c.	Does the project have environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

DISCUSSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (ATTACH ADDITIONAL SHEETS IF NECESSARY)

The Environmental Impact Assessment includes the use of official City of Los Angeles and other government source reference materials related to various environmental impact categories (e.g., Hydrology, Air Quality, Biology, Cultural Resources, etc.). The State of California, Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology—Seismic Hazard Maps and reports are used to identify potential future significant seismic events, including probable magnitudes, liquefaction, and landslide hazards. Based on Applicant information provided in the Master Land Use Application and Environmental Assessment Form, impact evaluations were based on stated facts contained therein, including but not limited to reference materials indicated above, field investigation of the Project Site, and other reliable reference materials known at the time.

Project-specific impacts were evaluated based on all relevant facts indicated in the Environmental Assessment Form and expressed through the Applicant's project description and supportive materials. Both the Initial Study Checklist and Checklist Explanations, in conjunction with the *City of Los Angeles's Adopted Thresholds Guide* and *CEQA Guidelines*, were used to reach reasonable conclusions on environmental impacts as mandated under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The Project as identified in the project description may cause potentially significant impacts on the environment without mitigation. Therefore, this environmental analysis concludes that a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be issued to avoid and mitigate all potential adverse impacts on the environment by the imposition of mitigation measures and/or conditions contained and expressed in this document; the environmental case file known as **ENV-2015-310-MND** and the associated case(s), **and DIR-2015-309-SPPA-SPP**. Finally, based on the fact that these impacts can be feasibly mitigated to a less than significant level, and based on the findings and thresholds for Mandatory Findings of Significance as described in State *CEQA Guidelines*, section 15065, the overall project impacts(s) on the environment (after mitigation) **will not**:

- Substantially degrade environmental quality
- Substantially reduce fish or wildlife habitat
- Cause a fish or wildlife habitat to drop below self-sustaining levels
- Threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community
- Reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare, threatened, or endangered species

- Eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory
- Achieve short-term goals to the disadvantage of long-term goals
- Result in environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable
- Result in environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

All supporting documents and references are contained in the Environmental Case File referenced previously and may be viewed in the EIR Unit, Room 763, City Hall.

For City information, addresses, and phone numbers, visit the City's website at http://www.lacity.org; "City Planning and Zoning Information Mapping Automated System (ZIMAS)" at http:/zimas.lacity.org/ or EIR Unit, City Hall, 200 N Spring Street, Room 763; "Seismic Hazard Maps" at http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/Engineering/Infrastructure/Topographic Maps/; "Parcel Information" at http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us/index0.1htm; or the City's main website under the heading "Navigate LA."

PREPARED BY:	TITLE:	TELEPHONE NO.:	DATE:

Environmental Analysis Explanation Table

Impact	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
4.1 AESTHETICS		
a. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the Initial Study (IS) prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
b. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
c. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
d. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES		
a. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
b. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
c. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
d. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
e. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.3 AIR QUALITY		
a. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
b. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
c. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
d. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.

Impact	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
e. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
a. Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	**MM-IV-20**
b. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
c. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
d. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
e. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
f. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES		
a. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
b. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required
c. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required
d. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required
4.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS		
a. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
b.. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
c. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required

Impact	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
d. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
e. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required
f. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
g. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
h. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS		
a. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required
b. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		
a. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required
b. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required
c. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
d. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required
e. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
f. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
g. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required

Impact	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
h. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY		
a. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
b. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
c. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
d. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
e. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
f. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
g. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
h. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
i. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
j. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING		
a. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
b. Less than Significant	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required
c. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.

Impact	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
4.11 MINERAL RESOURCES		
a. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
b. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.12 NOISE		
a. Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	**MM XII-30** **MM XII-40**
b. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
c. Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	**MM XII-30** **MM XII-40**
d. Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	**MM XII-30** **MM XII-40**
e. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
f. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING		
a. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
b. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
c. Less than Significant	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.14 PUBLIC SERVICES		
a. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
b. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required
c. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in	No mitigation measures are

Impact	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	required.
d. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required
e. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.15 RECREATION		
a. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required
b. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.16 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC		
a. Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	**MM XVI-30**
b. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
c. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
d. Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	**MM XVI-40**
e. Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	**MM VIII-80**
f. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.17 UTILITIES		
a. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
b. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
c. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
d. Less than Significant	See environmental analysis provided in	No mitigation measures are

Impact	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	required.
e. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
f. Less than Significant	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
g. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
h. No Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
4.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE		
a. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
b. Less than Significant Impact	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	No mitigation measures are required.
c. Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	See environmental analysis provided in the IS prepared by Meridian Consultants dated June 2015.	Applicable mitigation measures stated from Section 4.1 to Section 4.17.

MITIGATION MEASURES

4.1 Aesthetics

No mitigation measures are required.

4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

No mitigation measures are required.

4.3 Air Quality

No mitigation measures are required..

4.4 Biological Resources

MM IV-20 **Habitat Modification (Nesting Native Birds, Non-Hillside or Urban Areas)**

- Proposed Project activities (including disturbances to native and non-native vegetation, structures, and substrates) should take place outside of the breeding season for birds which generally runs from March 1 to August 31 (and as early as February 1 for raptors) to avoid take (including disturbances which would cause abandonment of active nests containing eggs and/or young). Take means to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture or kill (California Fish and Wildlife Code Section 86).

- If Project activities cannot feasibly avoid the breeding season, beginning 30 days prior to the disturbance of suitable nesting habitat, the Applicant shall:

  a. Arrange for weekly bird surveys to detect any protected native birds in the habitat to be removed and any other such habitat within properties adjacent to the Project Site, as access to adjacent areas allows. The surveys shall be conducted by a Qualified Biologist with experience in conducting breeding bird surveys. The surveys shall continue on a weekly basis with the last survey being conducted no more than 3 days prior to the initiation of clearance/construction work.

  b. If a protected native bird is found, the applicant shall delay all clearance/construction disturbance activities within 300 feet of suitable nesting habitat for the observed protected bird species until August 31.

c. Alternatively, the Qualified Biologist could continue the surveys in order to locate any nests. If an active nest is located, clearing and construction (within 300 feet of the nest or as determined by a qualified biological monitor) shall be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged, and when there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. The buffer zone from the nest shall be established in the field with flagging and stakes. Construction personnel shall be instructed on the sensitivity of the area.

d. The Applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures described previously to document compliance with applicable State and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds. Such record shall be submitted and received into the case file for the associated discretionary action permitting the project.

4.5 Cultural Resources

No mitigation measures are required.

4.6 Geology and Soils

No mitigation measures are required.

4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

No mitigation measures are required.

4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

No mitigation measures are required.

4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

No mitigation measures are required.

4.10 Land Use and Planning

No mitigation measures are required.

4.11 Mineral Resources

No mitigation measures are required.

4.12 Noise

MM XII-30 Increased Noise Levels (Parking Wall)

- A 6-foot-high solid decorative masonry wall adjacent to residential use and/or zones shall be constructed if no such wall exists.

MM XII-40 Increased Noise Levels (Parking Structure Ramps)

- Concrete, not metal, shall be used for construction of parking ramps.

The interior ramps shall be textured to prevent tire squeal at turning areas. 4.13 Population and Housing

No mitigation measures are required.

4.14 Public Services

No mitigation measures are required.

4.15 Recreation

No mitigation measures are required.

4.16 Transportation and Traffic

MM XVI-30 Transportation (Haul Route)

- The developer shall install traffic signs in accordance with the LAMC around the site to ensure pedestrian and vehicle safety.

MM XVI-40 Safety Hazards

- The developer shall install appropriate traffic signs around the site to ensure pedestrian and vehicle safety.
- The Applicant shall submit a parking and driveway plan that incorporates design features that reduce accidents, to the Bureau of Engineering and the Department of Transportation for approval.

4.17 Utilities and Service Systems

No mitigation measures are required.

4.18 Mandatory Findings of Significance

Applicable mitigation measures stated from **Section 4.1** to **Section 4.17** would be required.

Final Initial Study

Virgil Avenue Parking Structure Project

ENV-2015-310-MND

4470 DeLongpre Avenue

City of Los Angeles

Prepared by:

City of Los Angeles
Department of City Planning
200 N. Spring Street, Room 721
Los Angeles, CA 90012

With information provided by:

Meridian Consultants LLC
910 Hampshire Road, Suite V
Westlake Village, CA 91361

June 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendices

A Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Background Modeling Data
B Historic Resource Assessment
C Geotechnical Investigation
D Noise Background and Modeling Data
E Traffic Study

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

1.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Virgil Avenue Parking Structure Project

Project Location: 4470-4494 De Longpre Avenue, Los Angeles, California

Project Applicant CHA Reproductive Managing Group & CHS Property Holdings, LP

Lead Agency: City of Los Angeles
Department of City Planning
200 N. Spring Street, Room 721
Los Angeles, CA 90012

PROJECT SUMMARY

The subject of this Initial Study Analysis is the Virgil Avenue Parking Structure Project ("Proposed Project"). The Proposed Project is a parking garage located in the Vermont/Western Transit Oriented District Specific Plan Area ("Station Neighborhood Area Plan" or "SNAP") within the boundaries of the Hollywood Community Plan ("Community Plan") area in Central Los Angeles.

The Proposed Project would involve the demolition of two 1-story Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center (HPMC) maintenance buildings, an adjacent 1-story single-family home, surface parking lot, and the construction of a new parking structure that would include 654 parking spaces for HPMC patients, visitors, and employees. The parking structure will vary in height from 42 feet to 56 feet above ground and would be constructed on a 1.02-acre (44,500 square-foot) site located within Vermont/Western SNAP, Subarea C, and the C4-1D, [T][Q]C2-1, and R4-1D Zones located at Virgil Avenue, Los Angeles, California ("Project Site").

ORGANIZATION OF INITIAL STUDY ANALYSIS

This Initial Study is organized into six sections as follows:

Section 1.0, Introduction, provides introductory information such as the Proposed Project title, the Project Applicant, and the lead agency for the Proposed Project.

Section 2.0, Existing Conditions, describes the existing conditions, surrounding land use, general plan, and existing zoning in the Project Site.

Section 3.0, Project Description, provides a detailed description of the Proposed Project including the environmental setting, project characteristics, project objectives, and environmental clearance requirements.

Section 4.0, Environmental Analysis, includes an analysis for reach resource topic and identifies impacts of implementing the Proposed Project. It also identifies mitigation measures, if applicable.

Section 5.0, References, identifies all printed references and individuals cited in this Initial Study.

Section 6.0, List of Preparers, identifies the individuals who prepared this report and their areas of technical specialty.

The following appendices present data supporting the analysis or contents of this Initial Study.

- Appendix A, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Background and Modeling Data
- Appendix B, Historic Resource Assessment
- Appendix C, Geotechnical Investigation
- Appendix D, Noise Background and Modeling Data
- Appendix E, Traffic Study

This Initial Study is a preliminary analysis prepared by and for the City of Los Angeles as the Lead Agency to determine whether an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Negative Declaration (ND), or Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) must be prepared for a proposed project. A MND is prepared for a project when the Initial Study has identified potentially significant effects on the environment, but (1) revisions in the project plans or proposals made, or agreed to by the applicant before the proposed Negative Declaration and Initial Study are released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur; and (2) there is no substantial evidence in light of the whole record before the public agency that the project, as revised, may have a significant effect on the environment.

Implementation of the Proposed Project could cause some potentially significant impacts on the environment, but as shown in the environmental analysis contained in this Initial Study, all of the Proposed Project's potentially significant impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels through the implementation of mitigation measures. Consequently, the analysis contained herein concludes that a MND shall be prepared for the Proposed Project.

2.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS

PROJECT LOCATION

The Proposed Project is located within Subarea C of the SNAP and within the boundaries of the Hollywood Community Plan. The SNAP is generally bound by Franklin Avenue, the Hollywood Freeway, Hillhurst and Virgil Avenues, Heliotrope Drive, and Sunset Boulevard. The location of the Project Site is shown in **Figure 2.0-1, Project Location Map.**

The Project Site includes approximately 44,500 square feet of lot area (1.02 acres) and is bound by De Longpre Avenue to the north; by Virgil Avenue to the east; by automotive services business and 2-story multifamily residential buildings to the south; and by HPMC and Lyman Place to the west.

The Project Site's Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs), property addresses, and lot areas are summarized in **Table 2.0-1, Project Site Summary.**

Table 2.0-1
Project Site Summary

APN	Address	Lot Area (sq. ft.)
5542012005	1318 N. Lyman Place	1,870
5542012010	4474 W. De Longpre Avenue	7,500
5542012028	4480, 4480 1/2, 4482, 4484, 4490, 4494 West De Longpre Avenue	23,690
5542012029	4470, 4472 W. De Longpre Avenue	5,500
5542012030	1321, 1323 N. Virgil Avenue	5,940
Total Site Area		44,500 sq. ft.[a]

Source: City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, City of Los Angeles Zone Information and Map Access System (ZIMAS), December 2014.
Note:
[a] *Due to rounding and slight measurement differences, the lot area according to ZIMAS does not exactly match the lot area per architectural plans.*
sq. ft. = square feet

REGIONAL AND LOCAL ACCESS

Regional Access

Primary regional access to the Hollywood Community Plan area is provided by the Hollywood Freeway (US 101), which runs in a north–south direction to the west of the Project Site. Primary access to and from the US 101 is via an interchange at Sunset Boulevard. Regional access is also provided by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Red Line. In addition, SR 134 is located to the

north, the I-5 is located to the east, and the Harbor/Pasadena Freeway (I-110/SR 110) is located to the south.

Local Street Access

The major arterials providing regional and subregional access to the Proposed Project include Vermont Avenue and Fountain Avenue. The following is a brief description of the major roadways near the Proposed Project.

Vermont Avenue: Vermont Avenue is a designated Major Highway Class II that travels in the north–south direction. It is located west of the Project Site, and provides four travel lanes.

Fountain Avenue: Fountain Avenue is a designated Secondary Highway that travels in the east–west direction. It is located south of the Project Site and provides two travel lanes.

De Longpre Avenue: De Longpre Avenue is a designated Collector Street that travels in the east-west direction. It is located adjacent to and north of the Project Site and provides two travel lanes.

Virgil Avenue: Virgil Avenue is designated as a Secondary Highway. Virgil Avenue travels in the north–south direction. It is located immediately adjacent to and east of the Project Site and provides four travel lanes.

Lyman Place: Lyman Place is a designated Collector Street that travels in the north–south direction. It is located immediately adjacent to and west of the Project Site and provides two travel lanes.

Sunset Boulevard: Sunset Boulevard is a designated Major Highway Class II that travels in the east-west direction. It is located north of the Project site, and provides four travel lanes.

Figure 2.0-1, Project Location Map

Public Transit

The Project area is currently served by several local and intercity transit operators. The Project Site is approximately 0.25 miles from the Metro Red Line station at Sunset Boulevard and Vermont Avenue. This station serves the Metro Red Line, which runs between North Hollywood and Downtown Los Angeles, connecting with the Metro Orange Line in North Hollywood, the Metro Purple Line at Wilshire Boulevard, the Metro Blue Line and Metro Expo Line in Downtown Los Angeles, and the Metro Gold Line at Union Station.

In addition, the Project Site is served by bus lines operated by Metro and Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT). Metro Rapid Bus Line 780 runs along Hollywood Boulevard, within 0.5 miles of the Project Site; the closest station to the Project Site is located at Hollywood Boulevard and New Hampshire Avenue. Metro Rapid Bus Line 757 runs along N. Western Avenue to Crenshaw Boulevard, with the closest stop to the Project Site located at Sunset Boulevard and N. Western Avenue. A number of MTA bus lines (2, 175, 204, 302, and 754) run along Sunset Boulevard. The closest stop to the Project Site—for MTA line 175—is located at Fountain Avenue and N. Virgil Avenue, less than 300 feet from the Project Site. Finally, the LADOT DASH Hollywood Bus line travels along Sunset Boulevard near the Project Site. The LADOT DASH Los Feliz travels along Vermont Avenue, Sunset Boulevard, and Virgil Avenue near the Project Site.

LAND USE AND ZONING

The Project Site is located within the SNAP, which is located within the Hollywood Community Plan ("Community Plan") area in the City of Los Angeles. The Project Site is also located within several planning policy areas that have been adopted for the purposes of incentivizing development and/or providing specific development standards that are appropriate for the Project area. These planning policy areas include the Los Angeles State Enterprise Zone.

Hollywood Community Plan

The stated intent of the Hollywood Community Plan is to allow Hollywood to continue to be a major center of population, employment, retail services, and entertainment; and to provide housing to satisfy the varying needs and desires of all economic segments of the Community, maximizing the opportunity for individual choice. The Hollywood Community Plan designates the Project Site as a mix of Highway Oriented Commercial and High Density Residential land uses.[1] The Hollywood Community Plan also includes four specific plans, one of which is the Vermont/Western Transit Oriented District Specific Plan, also known as the Vermont/Western Station Neighborhood Area Plan (SNAP).

1 City of Los Angeles, Hollywood Community Plan (1988).

Vermont/Western Station Neighborhood Area Plan

The Project Site is located within the northeastern portion of the *SNAP*. The SNAP was adopted to make the neighborhood livable, economically viable, and pedestrian and transit friendly in an effort to achieve the maximum benefit from the subway stations located within the vicinity. In addition, the *SNAP* includes standards and plans to transform neighborhood streets into shared streets to create safer routes to school and transit, with the ultimate goal of creating a transit-friendly area. The Project Site is located within Subarea C: Community Center. The allowed uses and standards of Subarea C are described below.

Subarea C: Community Center

Subarea C (Community Center) permits multiple dwelling residential uses (includes single-family residences, apartment buildings, and childcare), commercial uses (includes limited commercial uses, as well as retail with limited manufacturing, service stations, and garages), and hospital and medical uses. Additionally, within Subarea C, hospital and medical uses are permitted in all areas. The maximum permitted height for hospital and medical uses is 100 feet.

Additionally, Section E.4 specifies the number of parking spaces required for hospital and medical uses. Hospitals must provide a minimum number of one parking space for each patient bed for which the hospital is licensed, and a maximum of two parking spaces for each patient bed for which the hospital is licensed.[2]

Los Angeles Municipal Code

Consistent with the Hollywood Community Plan, the Project Site is designated as Neighborhood Office Commercial, zoned C4-1D, [T][Q]C2-1, and R4-1D. The C4-1D Commercial zone permits a variety of commercial uses, such as restaurants, florists, catering shops, grocery stores, department stores, theaters, and public parking, in addition to high-density residential uses, churches, schools, and childcare. The [T][Q]C2-1 commercial zone permits a variety of retail uses with limited manufacturing, including parking buildings. [T] stands for tentative zone qualification, and [Q] stands for qualified classification. [Q] includes restrictions on property as a result of a zone change in order to ensure compatibility with surrounding property. The R4-1D zone allows high-density residential uses, churches, schools, museums, and childcare. The LAMC does not place a height restriction for buildings with C4-1, C2-1, and R4-1 zoning designations; however, C4-1D and R4-1D are limited by Development Limitations (D), which indicates that a building or structure may be built to a specific maximum height or floor area ratio (FAR) less than the height or FAR permitted in the Height District classification; buildings may cover only a fixed percentage of the area in a

2 City of Los Angeles, Vermont/Western Transit Oriented District Specific Plan (Station Neighborhood Area Plan), sec. E.4, Project Parking Requirements, Hospital and Medical Uses (2001).

lot; or buildings may be set back in addition to setbacks required by zoning code.[3] The SNAP places a maximum building height restriction of 100 feet for hospital and medical uses. FAR applies to the habitable structures on a lot and to the buildable area of a lot to determine the maximum allowable square footage of all buildings on the lot, but does not include the area within parking structures. Therefore, FAR standards do not apply to the Proposed Project.

State Enterprise Zones

Enterprise zones are specific geographic areas designated to receive various economic incentives for stimulating local investment and employment, in addition to other State-level incentives. Within the Hollywood Community Plan area, the Enterprise Zone generally includes the Hollywood Hills, in addition to the area bound by Franklin Avenue, Hoover Avenue, Melrose Avenue, and La Brea Avenue.[4]

EXISTING CONDITIONS

As shown in **Figure 2.0-2, Aerial Photograph of the Project Site**, and on **Figures 2.0-3, Existing Conditions** and **Figure 2.0-4, Plot Plan - Existing Conditions,** the Project Site currently consists of two 1-story Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center (HPMC) maintenance buildings and a 1-story single-family residence, a surface parking lot which consists of a paved surface parking lot in the western portion, and gravel surface parking in the eastern portion, providing a total of 76 parking spaces. Vehicular access to the existing Project Site is currently provided by De Longpre Avenue and Lyman Place. The Project Site contains 7 trees and landscaped areas.

SURROUNDING LAND USES

The properties surrounding the Project Site include residential buildings, the Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center, a variety of commercial buildings, and surface parking lots. The Hollywood Freeway is also located approximately 1.3 miles west of the Project Site.

North: The Project Site is bounded by De Longpre Avenue. Across De Longpre Avenue is a grocery store. The property is zoned C2-1D (Commercial Zone) and designated at Highway Oriented Commercial.

East: The Project Site is bound by N. Virgil Avenue to the east. Across N. Virgil Avenue is a Bezikians Medical Center, which is a 2-story medical office building. Additionally, a 1-story single-family residence

3 City of Los Angeles Municipal Code, sec. 12.32, Land Use Legislative Actions, Special Zoning Classifications, D Development Limitations.

4 California Department of Housing and Community Development, Map of Los Angeles–Hollywood State Enterprise Zone (2010).

is located adjacent to the medical office building. Properties to the east are zoned C4-1D (Commercial Zone) and designated as Neighborhood Office Commercial.

South: Located south of the Project Site are multifamily residential buildings, an automotive services business, a restaurant, and a single-family home. Properties are zoned R4-1 (Multiple Dwelling Zone) and C4-1D (Commercial Zone) and designated as Neighborhood Office Commercial.

West: Located to the west of the Project Site is Lyman Place, and across is the Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center, with surface parking lots and a parking structure. Properties to the west are zoned C2-CSA1 (Community Commercial).

Figure 2.0-5, Land Use and Zoning Map, depicts the land use and zoning designation of the Project Site and the surrounding area.

Figure 2.0-2, Aerial Photograph of the Project Site

Figure 2.0-3, Existing Conditions

Figure 2.0-4, Plot Plan - Existing Conditions

Figure 2.0-5, Land Use and Zoning Map

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The Proposed Project involves the demolition of a 1-story single-family residence, two HPMC maintenance buildings, surface parking with 76 parking spaces and the construction of a new parking structure that would contain 654 parking spaces for HPMC patients, visitors, and employees. The parking structure would contain approximately 251,840 square feet of floor area. The Proposed Project would be designed to meet the current Development Standards and Design Guidelines set forth by the Vermont/Western SNAP and to fulfill additional parking supply requirements for HPMC.

The 654 parking spaces would be located in 7 parking levels, which consists of 2.5 to 3 subterranean parking levels and 4 above ground levels, with an additional level of parking on the roof deck. The site slopes down from Virgil Avenue along De Longpre Avenue and continuing along to Lyman Place. Four stories of the structure will be visible above ground along Lyman Place, and three and a half levels will visible above ground along the majority of De Longpre and Virgil Avenues. The Proposed Project will feature a lobby at the corner of De Longpre Avenue and Lyman Place. Additionally, the Proposed Project would include two elevators, facing the lobby. The parking structure would contain 2 bicycle racks (32 spaces) at grade at the southeast portion of the Project Site.

In compliance with SNAP Development Standards, the Proposed Project will provide a total of three trash receptacles and three public benches. One of each will be provided within the public right-of-way along Virgil Avenue, Lyman Place and De Longpre Avenue. Additionally, a room for trash and recycling storage (with a separate area for recyclable materials), not visible to the public, would be provided.

The site plan for the Proposed Project is illustrated in **Figure 3.0-1, Site Plan**. floor plans for the Proposed Project are shown in **Figures 3.0-2, Basement B-3 and B-2 Floor Plans; Figure 3.0-3, Basement B-1 and Ground Floor Plans, Figure 3.0-4, Second and Third Floor Plans, and Figure 3.0-5, Fourth Floor and Roof Plans.**

Architectural Design

The building materials used for the structure would consist of high performance glass at the lobby, aluminum wall elements, vertical and horizontal metal panel screening elements, concrete with a sustainable slag mixture (light color), and non-squeal coating on drive surfaces.

The parking structure would vary from approximately 42 feet to 56 feet above ground due to the sloping nature of the site. The architectural design incorporates a number of design features to reduce the visual

mass of the building and create visual interest. The architectural design would feature an open-air, permeable scheme to resemble an actual building rather than a parking garage.

The Lyman Place elevation will contain a glass lobby on the corner of Lyman Place and De Longpre Avenue, providing pedestrian access to and from the parking structure. Horizontal bands would be placed along this elevation to screen views of cars parking in the structure.

The De Longpre Elevation includes a combination of horizontal bands and vertical fins that project up to 7 and 15 inches, respectively, out from the wall to create shadow patterns. Accent lights will uplight this elevation at night to create visual interest and a welcoming pedestrian environment along De Longpre Avenue by providing additional lighting. This accent lighting will also screen views of the interior of the structure from De Longpre at night.

The Virgil Avenue elevation is broken up into three planes with two green walls approximately parallel to the street and horizontal bands and vertical fins on both sides of the larger green wall feature. The south elevation will primarily consist of horizontal bands to screen views into the structure with vertical fins on the lower and upper level near Virgil Avenue. The lower portion of the south elevation will be a solid wall with a height no less than 6'-0' high that will incorporate a mix of vertical scoring and horizontal bands in order to provide a decorative design.

Elevations of the structure are illustrated in **Figure 3.0-6, North and South Elevations** and **Figure 3.0-7, East and West Elevations**.

Landscaping

The landscaping proposed for the Proposed Project is illustrated on **Figure 3.0-8, Landscape Plan**. The Proposed Project would provide approximately 5,679 square feet of landscaping. Nineteen street trees will be placed on Virgil Avenue, De Longpre Avenue, and Lyman Place in compliance with the Vermont/Western SNAP Development Standards and Design Guidelines. As mentioned previously, plantings would be provided along the south side of the parking structure to provide a vertical landscape feature to visually buffer the structure from the existing buildings located south of the site. Landscaping consisting of shrubs, flowers and other plants would be provided around the perimeter of the Project Site and blue glass would be installed on the north elevation behind the landscaping to enhance the aesthetics of the structure on De Longpre Avenue.

Lighting

The Proposed Project is required to include on-site lighting along all vehicular access ways and pedestrian walkways to comply with SNAP Development Standards and Guidelines. All on-site lighting is also required

to be directed away from adjacent properties. On-site lighting will be provided along the Lyman Place and Virgil Avenue driveways for vehicles entering the parking garage. Accent lights will be situated in the landscaping near the base of the structure to uplight the building for pedestrian walkways and provide safety lighting along De Longpre Avenue. All lighting used throughout the structure would consist of energy efficient LED light bulbs. Additionally, the Proposed Project is required to shield all sources of illumination for the Project Site from casting light higher than 15 degrees below the horizontal plane as measured from the light source and shall not cast light directly into any adjacent uses. The light sources in the Proposed Project would be mounted at a maximum height of 14 feet to meet this requirement.

Figure 3.0-1, Site Plan

Figure 3.0-2, Basement B-3 and B-2 Floor Plans

Figure 3.0-3, Basement B-1 and Ground Floor Plans

Figure 3.0-4, Second and Third Floor Plans

Figure 3.0-5, Fourth Floor and Roof Plans

Figure 3.0-6, North and South Elevations

Figure 3.0-7, East and West Elevations

Figure 3.0-8, Landscape Plan

Parking and Access

Vehicular access to the structure would be provided from two driveways, one on Lyman Place and Virgil Avenue. The ingress and egress points on Lyman Place and Virgil Avenue will be two lanes, one lane for ingress and one lane for egress. Virgil Avenue access will primarily serve the lower levels of the garage, while the Lyman Place access will primarily serve the ground and upper levels of the facility, although access to all levels are provided at both entrances. Security gates would be provided at both entrances.

The Virgil Avenue entrance will slope down to provide immediate access to the third level, and the Lyman Place entrance will slope upwards for immediate access to the fourth level. Both access points will provide full access to the roadway system. As indicated above, parking would be provided in a 7 level parking structure, including 2.5 to 3 subterranean parking levels, and four above-ground parking levels. The parking structure will also have handicap and pedestrian access. In addition, handicapped and vanpool parking will be included in the parking structure.

Section 9.E.4(i) of the SNAP requires that hospitals provide a minimum of one parking space for each patient bed for which the hospital is licensed, and a maximum of two parking spaces for each patient bed for which the hospital is licensed.

HPMC currently has a total of 1,059 parking spaces, while the maximum amount of parking spaces allowed for HPMC is 1,591 spaces. Construction of the Proposed Project would result in a loss of 76 spaces, bringing the revised total to 983 spaces. Completion of the new parking structure will contain 654 spaces, resulting in a combined total of 1,637 parking spaces throughout HPMC. Therefore, prior to the Proposed Project being operational, a minimum total of 46 spaces will be removed from the current parking area, located east of Lyman Place in order to not exceed the maximum allowed parking count of 1,591. Therefore, vehicle parking would satisfy the requirements of the Vermont/Western SNAP. Although not required, the Proposed Project would contain 2 bicycle racks (32 spaces) at grade of the southeast portion of the Project Site.

Construction

Construction Schedule/Phasing

For purposes of analyzing impacts associated with air quality, this analysis assumes a Project construction schedule of approximately 14 months. Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would be undertaken in three main steps: (1) demolition and site clearing, (2) grading and soil compaction and (3) building construction. The building construction phase includes the construction of the proposed structure, architectural coatings, and paving the Project Site. A description of the construction phases and timelines are discussed below.

Phase I: Demolition and Site Clearing

There are two existing structures located on the Project Site requiring demolition activities. Site clearing would occur for approximately 1 month and would include the demolition of the existing buildings and scraping of asphalt surfaces from the site. Typical construction equipment includes dump trucks, loaders, auger drills, and backhoes.

Phase II: Grading and Soil Compaction

After the completion of demolition and site clearing, grading and soil compaction activities would occur for approximately 2 months. This phase would involve the shoring and excavation of the site to create the proper base and slope for the building foundations. Typical construction equipment includes excavators, dump trucks, loaders, and graders.

Phase III: Building Construction

The building construction phase consists of below-grade and above-grade building construction and is expected to last for approximately 11 months. Upon completion of the structures, architectural coating, finishing, and paving would occur. It is estimated that paving would occur during the final 2 months of the building construction phase. Typical construction equipment includes cranes, concrete trucks, boom pumps, and air compressors.

Street Closures

Construction activities may necessitate temporary lane closures on De Longpre Avenue adjacent to the Project Site on an intermittent basis for delivery of materials, and other construction activities. However, site deliveries and the staging of all equipment and materials would be organized in the most efficient manner possible on site to mitigate any temporary impacts to the neighborhood and surrounding traffic. Construction equipment would be staged on site for the duration of construction activities. Traffic lane and right-of-way closures, if required, will be properly permitted by the City agencies and will conform to City standards.

Unless stated otherwise, all construction activities will be performed in accordance with all applicable State and federal laws and City codes and policies with respect to building construction and activities. As provided in Section 41.40 of LAMC, the permissible hours of construction within the City are 7:00 AM to 9:00 PM Monday through Friday, and between 8:00 AM and 6:00 PM on any Saturday or national holiday. No construction activities are permitted on Sundays. The Proposed Project would comply with these restrictions.

Haul Routes

All construction and demolition debris would be recycled to the maximum extent feasible. Demolition debris and soil materials from the site that cannot be recycled or diverted would be hauled to the Chiquita Canyon or the Manning Pit landfills, which accept construction and demolition debris and inert waste from areas within the City of Los Angeles. The Chiquita Canyon landfill is approximately 30.5 miles north of the Project Site (approximately 61 miles round-trip). The Manning Pit landfill is approximately 20.6 miles east of the Project Site (approximately 41 miles round-trip). For recycling efforts, the Central Los Angeles Recycling Center and Transfer Station (Browning Ferris Industries), which accepts construction waste for recycling, is located approximately 5 miles southeast from the Project Site (approximately 10 miles round-trip).

For purposes of analyzing the construction-related impacts, it is anticipated that the excavation and soil export would involve 18-wheel bottom-dump trucks with a 14-cubic yard hauling capacity. Approximately 160 daily truck-trips would be required during the peak construction period. All truck staging would occur either on site or at designated off-site locations and radioed into the site to be filled. The local haul route for the Project Site toward the US 101 would utilize Sunset Boulevard and Fountain Avenue. Approximately 40,000 cubic yards of soil would be moved during grading, and approximately 40,000 cubic yards would be exported. The haul route specified above may be modified in compliance with City policies, provided the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) and/or City of Los Angeles Bureau of Street Services approves any such modification.

REQUESTED APPROVALS

The application(s) request approval of the following:

Project Permit Compliance Review Approval: Pursuant to the provisions of LAMC Section 1.5.7.C, to allow the Proposed Project located within the geographic boundaries of the Vermont/Western SNAP to proceed.

Project Permit Adjustment: Pursuant to the provisions of LAMC Section 11.5.7.E, to allow the Proposed Project to reduce pedestrian path minimum horizontal clearance from 10’ to 5’ and minimum vertical clearance from 12’ to an approximate range of 8-9’.

Haul Route Approvals: Approvals for Haul Routes for the Project Site to export approximately 40,000 cubic yards of soil.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

This section of the Initial Study contains an assessment and discussion of impacts associated with the environmental issues and subject areas identified in the Initial Study Checklist Appendix G to the State CEQA Guidelines, (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Sections 15000–15387). The thresholds of significance are based on the Los Angeles (LA) *CEQA Thresholds Guide*.

4.1 AESTHETICS

Impact Analysis

a. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. A scenic vista refers to views of focal points or panoramic views of broader geographic areas that have visual interest. A focal point view would consist of a view of a notable object, building, or setting. Diminishment of a scenic vista would occur if the bulk or design of a building or development contrasts enough with a visually interesting view, so that the quality of the view is permanently affected.

The Project Site is located within the Hollywood area of Los Angeles, approximately 1.25 miles east of US 101, and approximately 1.5 miles west of the I-5. When looking north and south, the view is generally urban in character, and defined by mid-rise commercial and residential buildings. Similar views exist when looking to the east, and west.

The Hollywood Community Plan does not identify any scenic vistas, nor is the Project Site located within or along a designated scenic corridor. As shown in **Figures 2.0-3** and **2.0-4 Existing Conditions**, the Project Site currently consists of two 1-story HPMC maintenance buildings, 1-story single-family residence, and a surface parking lot; which would be demolished. Views near the Project Site are largely constrained by adjacent structures and the area's relatively flat topography. No scenic views are provided from or through the Project Site. The Project Site also contains landscaped areas including several trees. The Proposed Project would add 19 new street trees and landscaping along the border of the Project Site. The Proposed Project would alter the existing views and character of the Project Site and immediately surrounding area in a manner that is similar to existing conditions and that is compatible with the urban form of the Hollywood area. Due to the relatively level topography and extent of development within the immediate area, there are no scenic views or vantage points that afford scenic views.

Therefore, although the proposed project would substantially increase the height and massing of development on the project site, project implementation would not obstruct any views of unique scenic vistas or focal points. Therefore, impacts related to scenic vistas would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. Based on the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant impact would occur if scenic resources would be damaged and/or removed by development of a project. The Project Site is currently utilized by two HPMC maintenance buildings, a 1-story single-family residence, and surface parking lot. The Project Site is not located within or along a designated scenic highway and no scenic views exist from or through the currently developed site. The nearest designated State scenic highway is State Route (SR) 2, which runs from 2.7 miles north of SR 210 at La Cañada to the San Bernardino County line.[5] However, at its nearest point, SR 2 is located approximately 2 miles east of the Project Site. Although there are a variety of ornamental trees and other landscaping within the Project Site, there are no natural scenic resources, such as native California trees or unique geologic features on the Project Site. According to the Historic Resource Assessment (**Appendix B**), the existing on-site 1-story single family residence does not meet the criteria to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or as a City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Landmark based on the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*. Therefore, no scenic resources, including State scenic highways, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic structures, would be impacted by the Proposed Project.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Less than Significant Impact. Based on the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings. Significant impacts to the visual character of a site and its surroundings are generally based on the removal of features with aesthetic value, the introduction of contrasting urban features into a local area, and the degree to which the elements of the proposed project detract from the visual character of an area.

Building Height and Massing

Within the Hollywood area, there are commercial, retail, office, restaurant, parking, and residential land uses of various heights. An 8-story medical center building is located approximately 460 feet west of the

5 California Department of Transportation, "Officially Designated State Scenic Highways" (October 2013), Accessed January 5, 2015, http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy.htm.

Project Site, along with a 6-story medical building located approximately 175 feet northwest of the Project Site. In addition, 2-story multifamily residential buildings and a variety of other office and commercial buildings surround the Project Site. The parking structure would be 4 stories in height (a 7 level parking structure including 2.5 to 3 subterranean levels and 4 above-ground levels), and would therefore be consistent with the height of several buildings within the immediate viewshed of the Project Site. The scale, materials and colors of the parking structure would be designed to resemble similar structures surrounding the Project Site. The Proposed Project would provide a unified and complementary look within the Vermont/Sunset hospital core area; this includes hospitals such as Kaiser Permanente and Children's Hospital Los Angeles. The design of the Project complements the architectural style of the Marion and John E. Anderson Pavilion, located within the Children's Hospital and north of the Project Site.

Subarea C of SNAP imposes a 100-foot building height restriction on hospital and medical use buildings. The Proposed Project would be 56 feet above grade at its highest point. Therefore, the height of the proposed building would be within allowable height limitations for SNAP Subarea C. Although the Proposed Project would be slightly taller than some of the existing structures immediate near the Project Site, the Proposed Project would be shorter than the nearby medical center buildings on Vermont Avenue and would not be incompatible with surrounding uses. The parking structure will be within the allowable height of 100 feet (at 56 feet). At 4 stories, corresponding to approximately 56 feet above grade to the top of the roof at its highest point along De Longpre Avenue as illustrated in **Figure 3.0-4** through **Figure 3.0-7**, the parking structure would not conflict with SNAP Subarea C height restrictions.

The Proposed Project takes into consideration the need to use the architecture of the building to soften its massing and blend with its surroundings utilizing several different but compatible materials. The building materials used for the structure would consist of high performance glass at the lobby, concrete, aluminum wall elements, vertical and horizontal metal panel screening elements, and a green wall.

The architectural design incorporates a number of design features to reduce the visual mass of the building and create visual interest. The western elevation includes a glass lobby on the corner of Lyman Place and De Longpre Avenue and horizontal bands to screen views and headlights of cars parked in the structure.

The Lyman Place elevation will contain a glass lobby on the corner of Lyman Place and De Longpre Avenue, providing pedestrian access to and from the parking structure. Horizontal bands would be placed along this elevation to screen views of cars parking in the structure.

The De Longpre Avenue elevation includes a combination of horizontal bands and vertical fins that will project up to fifteen inches out from the wall to create shadow patterns. Accent lights will uplight this

elevation at night to create visual interest and create a welcoming pedestrian environment along De Longpre Avenue by providing additional lighting. This accent lighting will also screen views of the interior of the structure from De Longpre Avenue at night.

The Virgil Avenue elevation is broken up into three planes with two green walls approximately parallel to the street and horizontal bands and vertical fins on both sides of the larger green wall feature. The south elevation will primarily consist of horizontal bands to screen views into the structure with vertical fins on the lower and upper levels along Virgil Avenue. The lower portion of the south elevation will be a solid wall with a height no less than 6'-0' high that will incorporate a mix of vertical scoring and horizontal bands in order to provide a decorative design.

The Proposed Project's impacts with respect to building height and massing would be less than significant.

Views

The Proposed Project would have 4 above-ground levels and would not become a prominent part of the existing skyline. The Proposed Project will be visible from the adjacent residences located immediately south of the Proposed Project Site. The views of the mountains are currently obscured from the adjacent residences. Although the building is visible from private viewpoints within nearby residential and office buildings within the surrounding area, it should be noted that private views are not protected by any viewshed protection ordinance, and the alteration of private views would not constitute a significant impact. As such, the Proposed Project's impact upon obstruction of scenic public views would be less than significant.

Landscape Plan

The Proposed Project would provide approximately 5,679 square feet of landscaping. Nineteen street trees would be placed on Virgil Avenue, De Longpre Avenue, and Lyman Place in compliance with the Vermont/Western SNAP Development Standards and Design Guidelines. As mentioned previously, plantings would be provided along the south side of the parking structure to provide a vertical landscape feature to visually buffer the structure from the existing multifamily residential buildings located south of the site. Landscaping consisting of shrubs, flowers and other plants would be provided around the perimeter of the Project Site. Blue glass would be installed behind the landscaping on the north elevation to enhance the aesthetics of the structure on De Longpre Avenue. The landscape plan would not result in impacts to the visual character and aesthetics of the neighborhood. Landscaping would be compatible with the surrounding area.

Shade and Shadow

Shade and shadow impacts may result if direct sunlight to the proposed buildings affects adjacent properties. Shading is an important environmental issue because the users or occupants of certain land uses have some reasonable expectations for direct sunlight and warmth from the sun. Per the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, "facilities and operations sensitive to the effects of shading include: routinely useable outdoor spaces associated with residential, recreational, or institutional (e.g., schools, convalescent homes) land uses; commercial uses such as pedestrian oriented outdoor spaces or restaurants with outdoor eating areas; nurseries; and existing solar collectors." These land uses are termed "shadow-sensitive" because sunlight is important to their function. Based on the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a shading impact would normally be considered significant if the Proposed Project's structures cast shadows for more than three hours each day between the hours of 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM during winter months, or for more than four hours each day between the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM during the summer months.

Based on a survey of the buildings within the potential shadow envelope of the Proposed Project, no shade-sensitive land uses were identified within the projected shadow patterns to the immediate north, east, or west. However, shade-sensitive uses were identified immediately south of the Project Site. As shown in **Figure 4.1-1, Winter Solstice Shadows,** the Proposed Project's winter solstice shadows would not shade surrounding structures for more than 3 hours between 9:00 AM to 3:00 PM**.** As shown in **Figure 4.1-2, Summer Solstice Shadows,** the Proposed Project's summer solstice shadows would not shade surrounding structures for more than 4 hours between 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM**.**

North: De Longpre Avenue is located directly north of the Project Site. A grocery store is located to the north of the Project Site. The shadow of the parking structure would extend northeast across De Longpre Avenue for approximately 2 hours (between 8:00 AM and 11:00 AM) during the winter months and would not extend north of De Lonpgre Avenue during the summer months. The Proposed Project would not cast shadows for more than three hours each day between the hours of 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM during the winter months or for more than four hours each day between the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM during the summer months. The Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts on the commercial property.

South: To the south of the Project Site are 1-story single-family residence, two 2-story multifamily residential buildings, an automotive services business, and a restaurant. The shadow of the parking structure would extend south and shade the multifamily residences for approximately 2 hours (between 8:00 AM and 10:00 AM and again between 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM) during the winter months. The multifamily residences would be shaded during the summer months between 4:00 AM and 6:00 PM. The

Proposed Project would not cast shadows for more than three hours each day between the hours of 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM during the winter months or for more than four hours each day between the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM during the summer months. The Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts on these multifamily residential properties.

West: Lyman Place is located directly west of the Project Site. Located to the west of the Project Site across N. Lyman Place is the Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center (HPMC), with surface parking lots and a parking structure. The shadow of the parking structure would extend west across Lyman Place for approximately 2 hours (between 8:00 AM and 10:00 AM) during the winter months and would extend west across Lyman Place for approximately 2 hours (between 8:00 AM and 10:00 AM) during the summer months. The Proposed Project would not cast shadows for more than three hours each day between the hours of 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM during the winter months or for more than four hours each day between the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM during the summer months. The Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts on HPMC properties.

East: N. Virgil Avenue is located directly east of the Project Site. Across N. Virgil Avenue is a 2-story medical office building, along with a 1-story single-family residence located adjacent and south of the medical office building. The shadow of the parking structure would extend east across Virgil Avenue for approximately 2 hours (between 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM) during the winter months and would extend east across Virgil Avenue for approximately 2 hours (between 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM) during the summer months. The Proposed Project would not cast shadows for more than three hours each day between the hours of 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM during the winter months or for more than four hours each day between the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM during the summer months. The Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts on the medical office and residential property.

The Proposed Project would be visually compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, and is consistent with several other medical, office and commercial developments in the Hollywood area.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project introduces new sources of light or glare on or from the Project Site that would be incompatible with the areas surrounding

the Project Site, or that pose a safety hazard to motorists utilizing adjacent streets or freeways. Based on the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of whether the Proposed Project results in a significant nighttime illumination impact shall be made considering the following factors: (a) the change in ambient illumination levels as a result of Proposed Project sources; and (b) the extent to which Proposed Project lighting would spill off the Project Site and affect adjacent light-sensitive areas.

Light

Night lighting for the Proposed Project would be provided to illuminate the parking structure entrance, and largely to provide adequate night visibility for parking patrons and to provide a measure of security. Exterior lighting would be included for pedestrian safety, and it would be situated on the ground to prevent light spillage and light impacts.

The existing maintenance buildings contains nighttime security lighting in addition to lights associated with the surface parking lot on the Project Site. The existing nighttime security lighting associated with the surface parking lot on the Project Site would be removed and replaced with new nighttime security lighting for the new parking structure. The Project Site would include nighttime lighting along the parking structure's frontage on Lyman Place. Lighting would also be placed at the parking structure's vehicle driveways. In addition to the exterior parking structure nighttime security lighting, interior lighting associated with the Proposed Project would provide an additional source of nighttime illumination.

Pursuant to SNAP Development Standards and Guidelines, on-site lighting is required along all vehicular access ways and pedestrian walkways. Parking areas are required to have a minimum of ¾ foot-candle of flood lighting measured at the pavement. All on-site lighting is also required to be directed away from adjacent properties. On-site lighting will be provided along the driveway off of Lyman Place for vehicles entering the parking garage. Accent lights will be situated in the landscaping near the base of the structure to uplight the building for pedestrian walkways and provide safety lighting along De Longpre Avenue.

All lighting used throughout the structure would consist of energy efficient LED light bulbs and have a minimum of ¾ foot-candle of flood lighting measured at the pavement. Additionally, all lighting sources will be shielded from casting light higher than 15 degrees below the horizontal plane as measured from the light source and shall not cast light directly into any adjacent uses.

Glare

Potential reflective surfaces in the Proposed Project vicinity include automobiles traveling along roadways and parked on streets, exterior building windows, and surfaces of brightly painted buildings. Excessive glare not only restricts visibility, but also increases the ambient heat reflectivity in a given area. The glare-resistant building materials used for the Proposed Project would consist of high performance glass at the

lobby, aluminum wall elements, vertical and horizontal metal panel screening elements , concrete with a sustainable slag mixture (light color). Landscaping in the form of street trees would be provided along all street edges of the Proposed Project to buffer and partially screen the building from public view. The design of the Proposed Project would incorporate vertical fins, along the De Longpre elevation, which will also reduce glare. The Proposed Project would install solid panels a minimum of three feet six inches tall at the ramps of the south side of the parking structure to minimize headlight glare. The parking structure would also have barrier walls at each level that will screen car headlights. Additionally, parking bumper barriers would block any additional glare. The Proposed Project would not introduce any new sources of glare that are incompatible with the surrounding areas. The architectural features and design would result in less than significant impacts to glare.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Figure 4.1-1 Winter Solstice Shadows

Figure 4.1-2 Summer Solstice Shadows

4.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Impact Analysis

a. Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

No Impact. The Project Site is located within a developed and heavily urbanized area of the City of Los Angeles. No farmland or agricultural activity exists on or near the Project Site. According to the California Department of Conservation "Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2010" map, the Project Site is not designated as farmland.[6] No portion of the Project Site is designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Local Importance.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. The Project Site is located within the jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles and is subject to the applicable land use and zoning requirements of the LAMC. The Project Site is split between C4-1D, [T][Q]C2-1, and R4-1D zoning designations, and is designated as Neighborhood Office Commercial in the Hollywood Community Plan. The Project Site is not zoned for agricultural production, and there is no farmland at the Project Site. In addition, no Williamson Act Contracts are in effect for the Project Site.[7]

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or

6 California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Important Farmland Map, *Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2010* (January 2011), ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2010/los10.pdf.

7 California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, "The Land Conservation (Williamson) Act" (2013), http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/lca/Pages/Index.aspx.

timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

No Impact. The Project Site is zoned C4-1D [T][Q]C2-1, and R4-1D and is designated as Neighborhood Office Commercial in the Hollywood Community Plan. The Project Site is not zoned as forestland or timberland, and there is no timberland production at the Project Site.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. The Project Site is occupied by two 1-story HPMC maintenance buildings, one 1-story single-family residence, and surface parking. Although there is some landscaping on the Project Site in the form of trees and bushes, no designated forested lands exist on or near the Project Site.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

No Impact. Neither the Project Site, nor nearby properties, are currently utilized for agricultural or forestry uses. The Project Site is not classified in any "Farmland" category designated by the State of California.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.3. AIR QUALITY

Impact Analysis

a. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less than Significant Impact. Based on the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant air quality impact could occur if the Proposed Project is not consistent with the applicable Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) or would in some way represent a substantial hindrance to employing the policies or obtaining the goals of that plan. The most recent AQMP was adopted by the Governing Board of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) on December 7, 2012. The Basin is currently in nonattainment for the following criteria pollutants: ozone (O3), particulate matter (PM10), and fine particulate matter (PM2.5). SCAQMD developed regional emissions thresholds, as shown in **Table 4.3-1**, to determine whether or not a project would contribute to air pollutant violations. If a project exceeds the regional air pollutant thresholds, then it would significantly contribute to air quality violations in the Basin. Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified in the Growth Management Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections because the Growth Management Chapter forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP. As discussed in **Section 4.13, Population and Housing**, the Proposed Project is consistent with the regional growth projections for the Los Angeles Subregion and is consistent with the smart growth policies of the RCP and Compass Vision Report to increase housing density within close proximity to transit stations. The Project Site is located 0.25 miles from the Vermont Avenue/Sunset Boulevard Metro Red Line station and is well served by several Metro bus lines, providing transit opportunities for occupants of the Proposed Project. As discussed in the Project's Traffic Study (see **Appendix E**), the Proposed Project's would result in no additional daily vehicle trips. Thus, the Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2012 AQMP.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less than Significant. Based on the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project may have a significant impact where project-related emissions would exceed federal, State, or regional standards or thresholds, or where project-related emissions would substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. The Proposed Project would not contribute to regional and localized air pollutant emissions

during construction and Project operation within the South Coast Air Basin (Basin). While these emissions may have the potential to exceed SCAQMD emissions thresholds, all projects are mandated to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 which requires all unpaved demolition and construction areas to be wetted at least three times a day during excavation and construction, and temporary dust covers shall be used to reduce dust emissions. The Construction area must be kept sufficiently dampened to reduce and control dust caused by grading, hauling and wind All clearing, earth moving or excavation activities shall be discontinued during period of high winds. All dirt/soils load shall be secured by trimming, watering or other appropriate means to prevent spillage and dust. All dirt/soil materials transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amount of dust. General contractors shall maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions. Trucks having no current hauling activity shall not idle but be turned off. On-site vehicle traffic will be restricted to 10 mph to minimize fugitive dust. Due to these required practices, the project impact will be less than significant.

Construction Emissions

The proposed development on the Project Site includes the construction of a new parking structure. Parking would be located in a 7-level parking garage, including 2.5 to 3 levels of subterranean garage, in addition to four levels of above- ground parking.

For purposes of analyzing impacts associated with air quality, this analysis assumes a construction schedule of approximately fourteen months. This assumption is conservative and yields the maximum daily impacts. Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would be undertaken in three main steps: (1) demolition/site clearing; (2) site preparation and excavation; and (3) above-grade building construction.

These construction activities would create emissions of dusts, fumes, equipment exhaust, and other air contaminants. Construction activities during demolition/site clearing and site preparation/excavation would primarily generate particle pollution. Particles less than 10 micrometers in diameter (PM10) and particles less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter (PM2.5) would be the primary sources of particle pollution. Mobile sources (such as diesel-fueled equipment on site and traveling to and from the Project Site) would primarily generate nitrogen oxide (NOx) emissions. The Project would not involve the application of architectural coatings and would not result in the release of volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions. The amount of emissions generated on a daily basis would vary, depending on the amount and types of construction activities occurring.

The analysis of daily construction emissions was prepared utilizing the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) recommended by the SCAQMD. **Table 4.3-1, Maximum Construction Emissions**, identifies daily emissions that are estimated to occur on peak construction days for each construction phase. Equipment is assumed typical for a parking structure with subterranean and above-ground levels, and would include excavators, dozers, loaders, paving equipment, etc. These calculations assume legal compliance and that code-required dust control measures would be implemented as part of the Proposed Project during each phase of development. Control requirements for SCAQMD Rule 403—Fugitive Dust include but are not limited to applying water in sufficient quantities (at least three times per day) to prevent the generation of visible dust plumes, applying soil binders to uncovered areas, reestablishing ground cover as quickly as possible, utilizing a wheel-washing system to remove bulk material from tires and vehicle undercarriages before vehicles exit the Project Site, and maintaining effective cover over exposed areas.

Table 4.3-1
Maximum Construction Emissions (pounds/day)

Source	VOC	NOx	CO	SOx	PM10	PM2.5
Maximum	8.49	17.29	27.31	0.05	2.94	1.68
SCAQMD threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

*Notes: Refer to Modeling in **Appendix A**. Construction assumptions (equipment, schedule, etc.) are based on information found in **Section 3.0, Project Description.***
Includes implementation of fugitive dust control measures required by SCAQMD under Rule 403.
CO = carbon monoxide; NOx = nitrogen oxides; PM10 = particulate matter less than 10 microns; PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns; VOC = volatile organic compound; SOx = sulfur oxides.

As shown in **Table 4.3-1**, construction-related daily emissions associated with the Proposed Project would not exceed any regional SCAQMD significance threshold for criteria pollutants during the construction phases. Therefore, construction emissions would also not contribute a considerable increase in emissions of the pollutants for which the Basin is currently in nonattainment (O3, PM10, and PM2.5).

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Operational Emissions

Operational emissions generated by both stationary and mobile sources would result from normal day-to-day activities of the Proposed Project. Area source emissions would be generated by the consumption of electricity and landscape maintenance. Mobile emissions would be generated by the motor vehicles traveling to and from the Project Site. The analysis of daily operational emissions associated with the

Proposed Project has been prepared utilizing the CalEEMod recommended by the SCAQMD. The results of these calculations are presented in **Table 4.3-2, Maximum Operational Emissions**.

Table 4.3-2
Maximum Operational Emissions (pounds/day)

Source	VOC	NOx	CO	SOx	PM10	PM 2.5
Maximum	5.29	--*	0.07	--*	--*	--*
SCAQMD threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Threshold exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

*Notes: Refer to Modeling in **Appendix A.** CO = carbon monoxide; NOx = nitrogen oxides; PM10 = particulate matter less than 10 microns; PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns; VOC = volatile organic compound; SOx = sulfur oxides.*
*Construction assumptions (equipment, schedule, etc.) based on information found in **Section 3.0, Project Description.***
**Operational emissions of these compounds are negligible; the Project will not generate any additional vehicle traffic.*

As shown in **Table 4.3-2**, the operational emissions generated by the Proposed Project would not exceed the regional thresholds of significance set by the SCAQMD. Therefore, operational emissions would also not contribute a considerable increase in emissions of the pollutants for which the Basin is currently in nonattainment (O3, PM10, and PM2.5).

Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c. *Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?*

Less than Significant Impact. Based on the *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant impact may occur if the project would add a considerable cumulative contribution to federal or State nonattainment pollutants. As the Basin is currently in State nonattainment for ozone, O3, PM10 and PM2.5, related projects plus the Project could exceed an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality exceedance. With respect to determining the significance of the Proposed Project contribution, the SCAQMD neither recommends quantified analyses of construction and/or operational emissions from multiple development projects nor provides methodologies or thresholds of significance to be used to assess the cumulative emissions generated by multiple concurrent projects. Instead, the SCAQMD recommends that a project's potential contribution to cumulative impacts should be assessed utilizing the same significance criteria as those for project-specific impacts. Furthermore, SCAQMD states that if an

individual development project generates less than significant construction or operational emissions, then the development project would not generate a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment.

As discussed before, the Proposed Project would not generate construction or operational emissions that exceed the SCAQMD's recommended regional thresholds of significance. The Proposed Project would not generate a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions of the pollutants for which the Basin is in nonattainment.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less than Significant Impact. Project construction activities and operations, as described above, may increase air emissions above current levels. In addition, concentrations of pollutants may have the potential to impact nearby sensitive receptors. Sensitive receptors are defined as schools, residential homes, hospitals, resident care facilities, daycare centers or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions who would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The 1-story single-family located immediately adjacent to the southwest of the Project Site would be considered the nearest sensitive receptor. Additionally, the 2-story multifamily residential buildings immediately south of the Project Site would also be considered sensitive receptors. Each of these sensitive receptors is within approximately 25 feet of the Project Site boundary.

The SCAQMD has developed localized significance thresholds (LSTs) that are based on the amount of pounds of emissions per day that can be generated by a project that would cause or contribute to adverse localized air quality impacts. These localized thresholds, which are found in the mass rate look-up tables in the "Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology" document prepared by the SCAQMD,[8] apply to projects that are less than or equal to 5 acres in size and are only applicable to the following criteria pollutants: NOx, CO, PM10, and PM2.5. LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards, and are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each Source Receptor Area (SRA). For PM10, the LSTs were derived based on requirements in SCAQMD

8 South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology* (June 2003; rev. October 21, 2009).

Rule 403—Fugitive Dust. For PM2.5, LSTs were derived based on a general ratio of PM2.5 to PM10 for both fugitive dust and combustion emissions.

LSTs are provided for each of SCAQMD's 38 SRAs at various distances from the source of emissions. The Project Site is located within SRA 1, which covers the Central Los Angeles area. The nearest sensitive receptors that could potentially be subject to localized air quality impacts associated with construction of the Proposed Project are single-family and multifamily residential uses located immediately adjacent, southwest and south, of the Project Site. Given the proximity of these sensitive receptors to the Project Site, the LSTs with receptors located within 50 feet have been used to address the potential localized air quality impacts associated with the construction-related NO_X, CO, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions for each construction phase.

Construction Emissions

Emissions from construction activities have the potential to generate localized emissions that may expose sensitive receptors to harmful pollutant concentrations. However, as shown in **Table 4.3-3, Localized Significance Threshold (LST) Emissions (pounds/day)**, peak daily emissions generated within the Project Site during construction activities for each phase would not exceed the applicable construction LSTs for a 1.02-acre site in SRA 1. The closest distance used to determine the mass-rate emissions from the screening tables is 25 meters (81 feet). The allowable mass-rate emissions were compared to the specified thresholds for a 1-acre site, as the Project Site is only marginally larger than this parcel size. It should be noted that LST methodology and associated mass rates are not designed to evaluate localized impacts from mobile sources traveling along the roadways. Localized air quality impacts from construction activities to the off-site sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

Table 4.3-3
Localized Significance Threshold (LST) Emissions (pounds/day)

Source	NOx	CO	PM10	PM2.5
Construction				
Total mitigated maximum emissions	17.29	27.31	2.94	1.68
LST threshold	74	680	5	3
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Operational				
Area/energy emissions	0.00067	0.07	0.00025	0.00025
LST threshold	74	680	2	1
Threshold Exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Note: CO = carbon monoxide; NO_X = nitrogen oxide; PM10 = particulate matter less than 10 microns; PM2.5 = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns.

With regard to localized emissions from motor vehicle travel, traffic congested roadways and intersections have the potential to generate localized high levels of carbon monoxide (CO). The SCAQMD suggests conducting a CO hotspots analysis for any intersection where a project would worsen the Level of Service (LOS) to any level below C, and for any intersection rated D or worse where the project would increase the volume/capacity (V/C) ratio by 2 percent or more. As indicated in the *Traffic Assessment for the Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center Virgil Avenue Parking Garage Project* (Traffic Study), which may be found in **Appendix E,** implementation of the Project will not generate an increase in traffic volumes. Results of the Traffic Study analyses demonstrate that the Project would not cause an intersection to worsen the LOS below C nor would it increase the V/C ratio by 2 percent or more for an intersection rated D or worse during either the AM or PM peak hour.

Because the Proposed Project would not worsen the LOS of any intersection below C, nor increase the V/C ratio by 2 percent or more for an intersection rated D or worse, the Proposed Project would not have the potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the California 1-hour or 8-hour CO standards of 20 parts per million (ppm) or 9.0 ppm, respectively; or generate an incremental increase equal to or greater than 1.0 ppm for the California 1-hour CO standard, or 0.45 ppm for the 8-hour CO standard at any local intersection. Impacts with respect to localized CO concentrations would be less than significant.

Pollutant emissions are considered to have a significant effect on the environment if they result in concentrations that create a violation of an ambient air quality standard, contribute to an existing air quality violation, or expose sensitive receptors to substantive pollutant concentrations. Should ambient air quality already exceed existing standards, the SCAQMD has established significance criteria for selected compounds to account for the continued degradation of local air quality. Background concentrations are based on the highest observed value for the most recent three-year period.

Table 4.3-4, Central Los Angeles Monitoring Summary (Source-Receptor Area 1), shows the pollutant concentrations collected at the Central Los Angeles Monitoring Station (Source-Receptor Area 1) for the last three years of available data, with the applicable California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) displayed in the last column. **Table 4.3-5, SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds,** outlines the relevant significance thresholds for incremental increases in atmospheric concentrations considered to affect local air quality.

Table 4.3-4
Central Los Angeles Monitoring Summary (Source-Receptor Area 1)

	Year				
Pollutant/Averaging Time	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**Maximum**	**CAAQS**
Particulates (PM10)					
24-Hour	53.0	80.0	57.0	80.0	>50 μg/m3
Particulates (PM2.5)					
24-Hour	49.3	58.7	43.1	58.7	N/A
Particulates (PM10)					
Annual	29.0	30.2	29.5	30.2	>20 μg/m3
Carbon Monoxide (CO)					
1-Hour	2.8	2.2	2.5	2.8	>20.0 ppm
8-Hour	2.4	1.9	2.0	2.4	>9.0 ppm
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2)					
1-Hour	0.1	0.08	0.09	0.1	>0.18 ppm

Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District, US Environmental Protection Agency, and California Air Resources Board.
Note: PM_{10} concentrations are expressed in micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu g/m^3$). All others are expressed in parts per million (ppm).

Table 4.3-5
SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds

Pollutant	Averaging Time	Pollutant Concentration
Particulates (PM_{10}) Particulates ($PM_{2.5}$)	24-Hours	2.5 μg/m3 (operation)
Particulates (PM_{10})	Annual	1.0 μg/m3
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1/8-Hours	SCAQMD is in attainment; impacts are significant if they cause or contribute to an exceedance of the following attainment standards 20 ppm (1-hour) and 9 ppm (8-hour).
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2)	1-Hour	SCAQMD is in attainment; impacts are significant if they cause or contribute to an exceedance of the following attainment standard 0.18 ppm.

Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District.
Note: ppm: parts per million; μg/m³: micrograms per cubic meter.

Emissions of the air pollutants shown above from construction and operation of the Proposed Project will not exceed the applicable LSTs, which are designed to prevent incremental increases in air pollution displayed in **Table 4.3-5**. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with regards to the SCAQMD thresholds.

Diesel exhaust generated by construction equipment contains carcinogenic and noncarinogenic air pollutants. Construction of the Proposed Project will employ equipment with engines adhering to Tier 3 diesel emission standards. Carcinogenic risks from benzene, formaldehyde, 1,3-butadiene, acetaldehyde, acrolein, and diesel particulates do not exceed thresholds, posing no significant risk for nearby sensitive receptors in the adjacent residences. Noncarcinogenic hazards were also predicted to be within acceptable limits. Short duration exposures associated with both toxic and criteria pollutants (including particulate matter) are within acceptable limits. Impacts would be less than significant.

Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC)

As the Proposed Project consists of an enclosed parking structure, the Proposed Project would not include any land uses that would involve the use, storage, or processing of carcinogenic or noncarcinogenic TACs and no toxic airborne emissions would typically result from Project implementation. In addition, construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would be typical of other development projects in the City, and would be subject to the regulations and laws relating to toxic air pollutants at the regional, State, and federal levels that would protect sensitive receptors from substantial concentrations of these emissions. Therefore, impacts associated with the release of TACs would be less than significant.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if objectionable odors are generated that would adversely impact sensitive receptors. Odors are typically associated with industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products, and other strong-smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as in sewage treatment facilities and landfills. Because the Proposed Project involves no elements related to these types of activities, no odors from these types of uses are anticipated. In addition, SCAQMD Rule 402—Nuisance and SCAQMD Best Available Control Technology Guidelines would limit potential objectionable odor impacts during the Proposed Project's long-term operations phase. Therefore, potential operational odor impacts would be less than significant.

During the construction phase, activities associated with the operation of construction equipment, the application of asphalt, and/or the application of architectural coatings and other interior and exterior finishes may produce discernible odors typical of most construction sites. Although these odors could be a source of nuisance to adjacent receptors, they are temporary and intermittent in nature. As construction-related emissions dissipate from the construction area, the odors associated with these emissions would also decrease, dilute, and become unnoticeable.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Impact Analysis

a. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less than Significant with Project Mitigation. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant impact on biological resources if it could result in (a) the loss of individuals, or the reduction of existing habitat of a State- or federal-listed endangered, threatened, rare, protected, candidate, or sensitive species or a Species of Special Concern; (b) the loss of individuals or the reduction of existing habitat of a locally designated species or a reduction in a locally designated natural habitat or plant community; or (c) interference with habitat such that normal species behaviors are disturbed (e.g., from the introduction of noise or light) to a degree that may diminish the chances for long-term survival of a sensitive species.

The Project Site currently consists of two 1-story HPMC maintenance buildings, one 1-story single-family residence, and a surface parking lot along with landscaping in the form of ornamental trees and bushes. The Project Site does not contain any critical habitat or support any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). However, there are 7 trees that border the site along De Longpre Avenue, which may be removed, trimmed, or otherwise disturbed during construction. Two of the seven trees are ficus nitida (laurel) and the remaining five trees are podocarpus gracilior (fern pine). These trees may provide shelter and habitat for nesting birds. Nesting birds are protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Department of Fish and Game Code.[9,10] In the event that construction activities take place during the breeding season, bird surveys would be conducted to detect any protected native birds 30 days prior to such activities.

Nesting birds are protected under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (Title 33, United States Code, Section 703 et seq., see also Title 50, Code of Federal Regulation, Part 10) and Section 3503 of the California Department of Fish and Game Code. Thus, the project applicant shall comply with the mitigation measures to ensure that no significant impacts to nesting birds or sensitive biological species or habitat would occur. Therefore, with mitigation, the impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

---

9 United States Code, Title 33, sec. 703 et seq., see also Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, pt. 10.

10 California Department of Fish and Game Code, sec. 3503.

Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures are proposed.

MM IV-20 **Habitat Modification (Nesting Native Birds, Non-Hillside or Urban Areas)**

- Proposed Project activities (including disturbances to native and non-native vegetation, structures, and substrates) should take place outside of the breeding season for birds which generally runs from March 1 to August 31 (and as early as February 1 for raptors) to avoid take (including disturbances which would cause abandonment of active nests containing eggs and/or young). Take means to hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill, or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture or kill (California Fish and Wildlife Code Section 86).

- If Project activities cannot feasibly avoid the breeding season, beginning 30 days prior to the disturbance of suitable nesting habitat, the Applicant shall:

    a. Arrange for weekly bird surveys to detect any protected native birds in the habitat to be removed and any other such habitat within properties adjacent to the Project Site, as access to adjacent areas allows. The surveys shall be conducted by a Qualified Biologist with experience in conducting breeding bird surveys. The surveys shall continue on a weekly basis with the last survey being conducted no more than 3 days prior to the initiation of clearance/construction work.

    b. If a protected native bird is found, the applicant shall delay all clearance/construction disturbance activities within 300 feet of suitable nesting habitat for the observed protected bird species until August 31.

    c. Alternatively, the Qualified Biologist could continue the surveys in order to locate any nests. If an active nest is located, clearing and construction (within 300 feet of the nest or as determined by a qualified biological monitor) shall be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged, and when there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. The buffer zone from the nest shall be established in the field with flagging and stakes. Construction personnel shall be instructed on the sensitivity of the area.

d. The Applicant shall record the results of the recommended protective measures described previously to document compliance with applicable State and federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds. Such record shall be submitted and received into the case file for the associated discretionary action permitting the project.

b. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. As previously indicated, the Project Site is occupied by two 1-story HPMC maintenance buildings, one 1-story single-family residence, and a surface parking lot along with landscaping in the form of ornamental trees and bushes. No riparian or other sensitive natural community is located on or adjacent to the Project Site. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in any adverse impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No Impact. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant impact on biological resources if it could result in the alteration of an existing wetland habitat. The Project Site is entirely developed and generally covered with impermeable surfaces, and does not contain any wetlands or natural drainage channels. The Project Site does not have the potential to support any riparian or wetland habitat, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

No impacts would occur.

Regulatory Compliance Measure RC-WQ-5 (Alteration of a State or Federal Watercourse): The project shall comply with the applicable sections of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and California's Porter Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Porter Cologne).

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors?

No Impact. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant impact on biological resources if it could result in the interference with wildlife movement/migration corridors that may diminish the chances for long-term survival of a sensitive species. The Project Site is located in an area that has been previously developed in a heavily urbanized area of the City of Los Angeles. Due to the highly urbanized surroundings, there are no wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites in the Proposed Project vicinity.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Less than Significant with Project Mitigation. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would be inconsistent with local regulations pertaining to biological resources. The proposed project would not conflict with any policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Ordinance (No. 177,404). The project site does not contain locally-protected biological resources, such as oak trees, Southern California black walnut, western sycamore, and California bay trees. The proposed project would be required to comply with the provisions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Code (CFGC). Both the MBTA and CFGC protects migratory birds that may use trees on or adjacent to the project site for nesting, and may be disturbed during construction of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance (e.g., oak trees or California walnut woodlands), and no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures required.

f. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project would be inconsistent with mapping or policies in any conservation plans of the types cited. The Project Site is not part of any draft or adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact Analysis

The following section summarizes and incorporates by reference information from the *1318 N. Lyman Place, Los Angeles, California, Historic Resource Assessment* dated January 13, 2015, prepared by Historic Resources Group.[11] The Historic Resource Assessment is included as **Appendix B** to this Initial Study.

a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

No Impact. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project would disturb historic resources that presently exist within the Proposed Project Site. The property at 1318 N. Lyman Place was originally built in 1914. However, the Historic Resource Assessment found that the original dwelling was rebuilt in 1986, and the design of the current residence does not appear to date from 1914. The assessment concluded that the property may have been substantially altered because it no longer represents an architectural style from 1914. Additionally, no significant historical events are attributed to this building. The property is not designated by the City of Los Angeles as a historic-cultural monument. In order for a building to qualify for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, or as a local resource, the building must meet one or more identified criteria of significance. The property must retain sufficient architectural integrity to continue to convey the sense of place and time from which it is historically associated.[12] The property is not listed on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources as it lacks historical integrity and significance.

There is no concentration of historic buildings in the Project area, and no potential for this building to contribute to a historic district for this reason. The building does not rise to the level of historic significance based on association to historic events or patterns of history, historic persons, architecture, design, or craftsmanship to be designated as Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

11 Historic Resources Group, *1318 North Lyman Place, Los Angeles, California, Historic Resource Assessment* (January 13, 2015). See **Appendix B**.

12 Historic Resources Group, *1318 North Lyman Place, Los Angeles, California, Historic Resource Assessment* (January 13, 2015). See **Appendix B**.

b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Less than Significant. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant impact may occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the Proposed Project would disturb archaeological resources that presently exist within the Project Site. The Project Site and immediately surrounding areas do not contain any known archaeological sites or archaeological survey areas. The Proposed Project would include 2.5 to 3 levels of subterranean parking, which would require excavation at up to 30 feet below grade. Thus, the potential exists for the discovery of archaeological materials. Because the presence or absence of such materials cannot be determined until the site is excavated, no further evaluation of this issue is warranted at this time. If archaeological resources are discovered during excavation, grading, or construction activities, work shall cease in the area of the find until a qualified archaeologist has evaluated the find in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Personnel of the proposed Modified Project shall not collect or move any archaeological materials and associated materials. Construction activity may continue unimpeded on other portions of the Project site. The found deposits would be treated in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. ***Mitigation Measures:*** No mitigation measures are required.

c. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less than Significant. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant impact may occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the Proposed Project were to disturb paleontological resources or geologic features that presently exist within the Project Site. The Project Site has been previously graded and is currently developed with two 1-story HPMC maintenance buildings, one 1-story single-family residential home, as well as a parking lot. The Project Site and immediate surrounding areas do not contain any known vertebrate paleontological resources. Although no paleontological resources are known to exist on site, there is a possibility that paleontological resources exist at subsurface levels and may be uncovered during excavation of the proposed basement and foundation levels. California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 would ensure that if resources were found during construction of the Proposed Project, they would be handled according to the proper regulations. As required by the Municipal Code, the Applicant would submit a letter to the case file indicating what, if any, paleontological reports have been submitted, or a statement indicating that no material was discovered, prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less than Significant. A significant impact would occur if previously interred human remains would be disturbed during excavation of the project site. Human remains could be encountered during excavation and grading activities associated with the proposed project. While no formal cemeteries, other places of human internment, or burial grounds or sites are known to occur within the project area, there is always a possibility that human remains can be encountered during construction. If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during construction demolition and/or grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98. If human remains of Native American origin are discovered during project construction, compliance with state laws, which fall within the jurisdiction of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) (Public Resource Code Section 5097), relating to the disposition of Native American burials will be adhered to. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Impact Analysis

The following section summarizes and incorporates by reference information from the *Report of Geotechnical Investigation, Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center, 1300 North Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, California, Dated October 13, 2014* (referred to hereafter as Geotechnical Investigation), prepared by AMEC. The Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center is located approximately 727 feet from the Project Site. The Geotechnical Investigation is included as **Appendix C** to this Initial Study.

a. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

Less than Significant Impact. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant impact may occur if the Project Site is located within a State-designated Alquist-Priolo Zone or other designated fault zone. The Project Site is not located within a currently established Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone for surface fault rupture hazards. The closest active fault near the Project Site with the potential for surface fault rupture is the Hollywood Fault located approximately 0.8 miles to the north-northwest of the Project Site.

The Project Site is located in the Peninsular Ranges geomorphic province near the southern boundary of the Transverse Ranges geomorphic province. The Peninsular Ranges province is characterized by northwest-southeast trending alignments of the mountains, hills and intervening basins, reflecting the influence of northwest trending major faults and folds controlling the general geological structure of the region. The Los Angeles Basin is the northernmost part of the Peninsular Ranges province. The Peninsular Range province is bounded on the east by the San Jacinto fault zone. The Transverse Ranges province is characterized by east-west trending mountain ranges that include the Santa Monica Mountains. The southern boundary of the Transverse Ranges province is comprised of the Santa Monica, Hollywood, Raymond, Sierra Madre, and Cucamonga faults.

As of January 8, 2014, the Hollywood fault zone located within the Hollywood 7.5 minute quadrangle has been included as a preliminary Earthquake Fault Zone in the Earthquake Zones of Investigation by the

California Geological Survey (CGS).[13] The active Hollywood Fault trends east-west along the base of the Santa Monica Mountains. The Hollywood fault zone is located approximately 0.8 miles north of the Project Site. The fault zone is active, based on geomorphic evidence, stratigraphic correlation between exploratory borings, and fault trenching studies. The Hollywood fault zone has not produced any damaging earthquakes during the historical period and has had relatively minor micro-seismic activity.

Fill soils, up to 11 feet thick, were found in borings drilled at a nearby site. Deeper fill may exist between borings. The fill soil generally consists of sand with varying amounts of silt, clay, and gravel.

The fill is underlain by late Pleistocene age alluvial fan deposits, consisting predominantly of massive to crudely stratified sand, silty sand, clayey silt, and clayey sand. The sand is generally medium dense to dense. The silts and clays are generally very stiff to hard. Layers of sediment within the bedrock are highly variable due to localized warping and deformation.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b. Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less than Significant impact. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant impact may occur if a project represents an increased risk to public safety or destruction of property by exposing people, property, or infrastructure to seismically induced ground shaking hazards that are greater than the average risk associated with other locations in Southern California. The Project Site is located within a seismically active region, as is all of Southern California. The intensity of ground shaking depends primarily upon the earthquake magnitude, the distance from the source, and the site-response characteristics. However, according to the Safety Element of the City of Los Angeles, the Project Site is not located within an area identified as having a potential for seismic slope instability. The Project Site is not located within a seismic hazard zone for liquefaction or landsliding.[14]

Seismically induced settlement is often caused when loose- to medium-dense granular soils are compacted during ground shaking. The Geotechnical Investigation indicated that soils are generally medium dense to dense. The silts and clays are generally very stiff to hard. Additionally, siltstone and clayey siltstone of the Puente formation were encountered between 12.5 and 18.5 feet. Based on the densities and the clayey nature of the soils, as well as the underlying siltstone, the Geotechnical

13 California Geological Survey, Earthquake Fault Zones, Hollywood Quadrangle, Preliminary Review Map (January 8, 2014), Accessed December 31, 2014, http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Documents/Hollywood_EZRIM.pdf.

14 City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, *Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan*, p. 49 (November 1996), http://cityplanning.lacity.org/cwd/gnlpln/saftyelt.pdf.

Investigation found that the potential for liquefaction is low. The Project Site is underlain by alluvial fan deposits consisting primarily of massive to crudely stratified sand, silty sand, clayey silt, and clayey sand. Some seismically induced settlement of the proposed structure should be expected as a result of strong ground shaking. However, excessive differential settlements are not expected to occur. The Proposed Project is designed to the provisions of the most current California Building Code (CBC) and is intended to minimize the potential effects of ground shaking. The proposed project would be required to comply with the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) Special Publications 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California (1997), which provides guidance for the evaluation and mitigation of earthquake-related hazards, and with the seismic safety requirements in the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the LAMC. Compliance with such requirements would reduce seismic ground shaking impacts to the maximum extent practicable with current engineering practices. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No Mitigations measures are required.

c. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less than Significant impact. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a significant impact may occur if a project site is located within a liquefaction zone. Liquefaction is the loss of soil strength or stiffness due to buildup of pore-water pressure during severe ground shaking. Liquefaction is associated primarily with loose (low-density), saturated, fine- to medium-grained, cohesionless soils.

According to the Safety Element of the City of Los Angeles, the Project Site is not located within an area identified as having a potential for liquefaction.[15] Additionally, based on the State of California's "Seismic Hazard Zone Maps, Hollywood Quadrangle," the Project Site is not located within a designated liquefaction hazard zone.[16] The proposed project would be required to implement standard construction practices that would ensure that the integrity of the project site and the proposed structures is maintained. Construction will be required by the Department of Building and Safety to comply with the City of Los Angeles Uniform Building Code (UBC) which is designed to assure safe construction and includes building foundation requirements appropriate to site conditions. With the implementation of the Building Code requirements and the Department of Building and Safety's Soils Report Approval Letter

15 City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, *Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan*, p. 49 (November 1996), http://cityplanning.lacity.org/cwd/gnlpln/saftyelt.pdf.

16 California Geological Survey, Earthquake Fault Zones, Hollywood Quadrangle, Preliminary Review Map (January 8, 2014), Accessed December 31, 2014, http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Documents/Hollywood_EZRIM.pdf.

when issued, the potential for landslide lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse would be less-than-significant.

Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d. Landslides?

No Impact. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant geologic hazard impact if it would cause or accelerate geologic hazards that would result in substantial damage to structures or infrastructure, or expose people to substantial risk of injury. A project-related significant adverse effect may occur if the project is located in a hillside area with soil conditions that would suggest a high potential for sliding. Due to the lack of slopes on the site and surrounding areas, the probability of seismically-induced landslides is expected to be minimal. Additionally, based on the State of California's "Seismic Hazard Zone Maps, Hollywood Quadrangle,"[17] the Project Site is not in a designated earthquake-induced landslide hazard zone.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less than Significant Impact. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have significant sedimentation or erosion impacts if it would (a) constitute a geologic hazard to other properties by causing or accelerating instability from erosion; or (b) accelerate natural processes of wind and water erosion and sedimentation, resulting in sediment runoff or deposition that would not be contained or controlled on site.

Although development of the Proposed Project has the potential to result in the erosion of soils during site preparation and construction activities, erosion would be reduced by implementation of stringent erosion controls imposed by the City of Los Angeles through grading and building permit regulations. Minor amounts of erosion and siltation could occur during grading. The potential for soil erosion during the ongoing operation of the Proposed Project is extremely low given the predominantly level topography

17 California Geological Survey, Earthquake Fault Zones, Hollywood Quadrangle, Preliminary Review Map (January 8, 2014), Accessed December 31, 2014, http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Documents/Hollywood_EZRIM.pdf.

of the Project Site, and the fact that the Project Site would be predominantly paved over or built upon, so little soil would be exposed.

In addition, all onsite grading and site preparation would comply with applicable provisions of Chapter IX, Division 70 of the LAMC, and conditions imposed by the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety's Soils Report Approval Letter. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur with respect to erosion or loss of topsoil. Impacts would less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

f. Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if any unstable geological conditions would result in any type of geological failure, including lateral spreading, off-site landslides, liquefaction, or collapse. Development of the proposed project would not have the potential to expose people and structures to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and landslide. Subsidence and ground collapse generally occur in areas with active groundwater withdrawal or petroleum production. The extraction of groundwater or petroleum from sedimentary source rocks can cause the permanent collapse of the pore space previously occupied by the removed fluid. The project site is not identified as being located in an oil field or within an oil drilling area. The proposed project would be required to implement standard construction practices that would ensure that the integrity of the project site and the proposed structures is maintained. Construction will be required by the Department of Building and Safety to comply with the City of Los Angeles Uniform Building Code (UBC) which is designed to assure safe construction and includes building foundation requirements appropriate to site conditions. With the implementation of the Building Code requirements and the Department of Building and Safety's Soils Report Approval Letter when issued, the potential for landslide lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse would be less-than-significant.

The Geotechnical Investigation concluded that some seismically-induced settlement should be expected as a result of strong ground shaking. However, the relatively dense and uniform nature of the underlying alluvial soils would not cause excessive differential settlements. Additionally, construction of the Proposed Project would comply with the CBC to minimize the potential effects of ground shaking. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

g. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Less than Significant Impact. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant geologic hazard impact if it would cause or accelerate geologic hazards that would result in substantial damage to structures or infrastructure, or expose people to substantial risk of injury. For the purpose of this specific issue, a significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project is built on expansive soils without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for buildings, thus posing a hazard to life and property. Expansive soils contain significant amounts of clay particles that swell considerably when wetted and shrink when dried. Foundations constructed on these soils are subject to uplifting forces caused by the swelling. Without proper mitigation measures, heaving and cracking of both building foundations and slabs-on-grade could result.

The on-site geologic materials have medium to very high expansion potential. As discussed previously, fill materials underlying the Project Site consist of alluvial deposits, consisting predominantly of massive to crudely stratified sand. Based on the State of California's "Seismic Hazards Zone Maps, Hollywood Quadrangle," the Project Site is not located in an area subject to liquefaction.[18] This determination is based on groundwater depth records, soil type, and distance to a fault capable of producing a substantial earthquake. The nearest active fault to the Project Site is the Hollywood Fault, at a distance of approximately 0.8 miles. Construction of the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the CBC, which includes building foundation requirements appropriate to site-specific conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures required.

h. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No Impact. A project would cause a significant impact if adequate wastewater disposal is not available. The project site is located in a highly urbanized area, where wastewater infrastructure is currently in place. The proposed project would connect to existing sewer lines that serve the project site and would not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impact would occur. No impacts would occur.

18 California Geological Survey, Earthquake Fault Zones, Hollywood Quadrangle, Preliminary Review Map (January 8, 2014), Accessed December 31, 2014, http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Documents/Hollywood_EZRIM.pdf.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Impact Analysis

a. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. The City of Los Angeles has not adopted specific Citywide significance thresholds for greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts. GHG emissions refer to a group of emissions that have the potential to trap heat in the atmosphere and consequently affect global climate conditions. Although there is disagreement as to the speed of global warming and the extent of the impacts attributable to human activities, most agree that there is a direct link between increased emission of GHGs and rising long-term global temperature.

The principal GHGs are carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), nitrous oxide (N2O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF6), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), and water vapor (H2O). CO2 is the reference gas for climate change because it is the predominant greenhouse gas emitted. To account for the varying warming potential of different GHGs, GHG emissions are often quantified and reported as CO2 equivalents (CO2e).

In September 2006, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, also known as Assembly Bill (AB) 32, into law. AB 32 focuses on reducing GHG emissions in California, and requires the CARB, the State agency charged with regulating Statewide air quality, to adopt rules and regulations that would achieve greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to Statewide levels in 1990 by 2020.

As a central requirement of AB 32, the CARB was assigned the task of developing a Scoping Plan that outlines the State's strategy to achieve the 2020 greenhouse gas emissions limit. The Scoping Plan, which was developed by CARB in coordination with the Cap-and-Trade program, was published in October 2008. The Scoping Plan proposed a comprehensive set of actions designed to reduce overall greenhouse gas emissions in California, improve the environment, reduce the State's dependence on oil, diversify the State's energy sources, save energy, create new jobs, and enhance public health. As required by AB 32, CARB must update its Scoping Plan every five years to ensure that California remains on the path toward a low-carbon future.

CARB updated the Scoping Plan in May 2014 through a Final Supplement to the AB 32 Scoping Plan Functional Equivalent Document (FED or 2014 Scoping Plan). CARB's updated projected "business as usual" (BAU) emissions in the 2014 Scoping Plan are based on current economic forecasts (i.e., as influenced by the economic downturn) and certain GHG reduction measures already in place. The BAU projection for 2020 GHG emissions in California was originally estimated to be 596 metric tons CO2 equivalent (MMTCO2e). The updated calculation of the 2014 Scoping Plan's estimates for projected emissions in 2020 totals 509 MMTCO2e. Considering the updated BAU estimate of 509 MMTCO2e by 2020, CARB estimates that the State would have to reduce GHG emissions by 21.6 percent from BAU without Pavley regulations that reduce GHG emissions in new passenger vehicles and the 33 percent renewable portfolio standard (RPS); or 15.7 percent from the adjusted baseline (i.e., with Pavley regulations and 33 percent RPS) to return to 1990 emission levels (i.e., 427 MMTCO2e) by 2020, instead of the 28.35 percent BAU reduction previously reported under the Scoping Plan.[19]

The Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008, State Bill (SB) 375, supports the State's climate action goals to reduce GHG emissions through coordinated transportation and land use planning with the goal of more sustainable communities.

There are no federal, State, or local adopted thresholds of significance for addressing a parking structure project's GHG emissions. Nonetheless, Section 15064.4 of the *CEQA Guidelines* Amendments serves to assist lead agencies in determining the significance of the impacts of GHGs. Because the City of Los Angeles does not have an adopted quantitative threshold of significance for a parking structure project's generation of greenhouse gas emissions, the following analysis is based on a combination of the requirements outlined in the *CEQA Guidelines*. As required in Section 15604.4 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, this analysis includes an impact determination based on the following: (1) an estimate of the amount of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the Project; (2) a qualitative analysis or performance-based standards; (3) a quantification of the extent to which the Project increases greenhouse gas emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting; and (4) the extent to which the Project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a Statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions.

In addition, as a central component of the CEQA Guidelines, there is substantial evidence to support that compliance with the LA Green Building Code is qualitatively consistent with Statewide goals and policies in place for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, including AB 32 and the corresponding Scoping Plan and 2014 Updated Scoping Plan. Among the many GHG reduction measures outlined later in this section, the LA Green Building Code requires projects to achieve a 20 percent reduction in potable water

19 California Air Resources Board, *Final Supplement to the AB 32 Scoping Plan Functional Equivalent Document (FED)* (May 2014), Attachment D, p. 11.

use and wastewater generation, meet and exceed Title 24 Standards updated by the California Energy Commission in 2013, and meet 50 percent construction waste recycling levels. The Scoping Plan and 2014 Scoping Plan encourages communities to adopt building codes that go beyond the State code. Accordingly, a new development Project that can demonstrate it complies with the LA Green Building Code is considered consistent with Statewide GHG-reduction goals and policies, including AB 32, and does not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to global warming.

To reduce GHG emissions from energy usage, the City's Department of Environmental Protection, EnvironmentLA, proposes the following goals: increase the amount of renewable energy provided by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) to decrease dependence on fossil fuels; present a comprehensive set of green building policies to guide and support private sector development; reduce energy consumed by City facilities and utilize solar heating where applicable; and help citizens to use less energy. Based on the 2012 US Department of Energy Annual Survey, the City's emission reduction programs reduced almost 97,000 tons of greenhouse gas emissions.[20]

Construction

Construction emissions represent an episodic, temporary source of GHG emissions. Emissions are generally associated with the operation of construction equipment and the disposal of construction waste. To be consistent with the guidance from the SCAQMD for calculating criteria pollutants from construction activities, only GHG emissions from on-site construction activities and off-site hauling and construction worker commuting are considered as project-generated. As explained by the California Air Pollution Control Officer's Association (CAPCOA) in its 2008 white paper,[21] the information needed to characterize GHG emissions from manufacture, transport, and end-of-life of construction materials would be speculative at the CEQA analysis level. CEQA does not require an evaluation of speculative impacts.[22] Therefore, the construction analysis does not consider such GHG emissions.

All GHG emissions are reported on an annual basis. Emissions of GHGs were calculated using CalEEMod for each year of construction of the Proposed Project and the results of this analysis are presented in **Table 4.7-1, Proposed Project Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions**. As shown in **Table 4.7-1**, the total GHG emissions from construction activities would be 618.51 MTCO2e.

---

20 City of Los Angeles, EnvironmentLA, "Welcome" (2014), http://environmentla.org/index2.htm.

21 CAPCOA, "CEQA & Climate Change: Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act," 2008, http://www.energy.ca.gov/2008publications/CAPCOA-1000-2008-010/CAPCOA-1000-2008-010.PDF.

22 *CEQA Guidelines,* "Speculation," Section 15145.

Table 4.7-1
Proposed Project Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Year	CO2e Emissions (Metric Tons per Year)[a]
2016	521.12
2017	97.39
Total Construction GHG Emissions[b]	**618.51**

Source: CalEEMod (2015).

a Construction CO2 values were derived using CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2
b N2O emissions account for 0.023 MTCO2e.
*Calculation data and results are provided in **Appendix A** of this Initial Study.*
*Construction assumptions based on information found in **Section 3.0, Project Description.***

Operation

The GHG emissions resulting from operation of the Proposed Project, which primarily involves the usage of electricity to power the elevator shaft and lighting fixtures, were calculated assuming code compliance with the LA Green Building Code. Emissions of operational GHGs are shown in **Table 4.7-2, Proposed Project Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions.**

Table 4.7-2
Proposed Project Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Emissions Source	Project without GHG Reduction Measures (MTCO2e/year)
Construction (amortized)	20.62
Operational (mobile) sources*	0.00
Area sources	0.02
Energy	956.33
Waste	0.00
Water	0.00
Annual Total	**976.95**

Source: CalEEMod (2015).
*Notes: Emissions calculations are provided in **Appendix A, Air Emissions Modeling.** Totals in table may not appear to add exactly due to rounding in the computer model calculations. MTCO2e = metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions.*
The emissions of the Project represent the net difference between the existing greenhouse generated uses that would be removed and the Project greenhouse gas emissions.
** N2O emissions account for 0.023 MTCO2e per year; Project implementation will not result in any additional mobile sources in the area.*

Operation of the Proposed Project will generate approximately 976.95 MTCO2e annually, primarily from the elevator shaft and lighting fixtures. As discussed in **Section 4.16**, the Proposed Project will not result in any additional vehicle traffic, and therefore there will be no new operational mobile source emissions of GHGs produced by implementation of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project is required to comply with the L.A. Green Building Code. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with any

applicable local or State plans for mobile source GHG reductions. The Proposed Project's generation of GHG emissions would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to GHG emissions and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigations measures are required.

b. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less than Significant impact. The goal of AB 32 is to reduce Statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. In 2014, the CARB updated the Scoping Plan, which details strategies to meet that goal. In addition, Executive Order S-3-05 aims to reduce Statewide GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. As previously mentioned, to reduce GHG emissions from energy usage, the City's Department of Environmental Protection, EnvironmentLA, proposes the following goals as drafted in their GreenLA and ClimateLA plans: increase the amount of renewable energy provided by the LADWP to decrease dependence on fossil fuels; present a comprehensive set of green building policies to guide and support private sector development; reduce energy consumed by City facilities and utilize solar heating where applicable; and help citizens to use less energy. 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. As described previously, through required implementation of the CCR Title 24 Part 6; and the LA Green Building Code, the Proposed Project would be consistent with all previously mentioned local and Statewide goals and policies aimed at reducing the generation of GHGs. The Proposed Project's generation of GHG emissions would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution or conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The project is required to comply with state and City regulatory compliance measures which will effectively reduce emissions to a level that would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Impact Analysis

The following section summarizes and incorporates by information from the Department of Toxic Substances and Control's EnviroStor Database, State Water Resources Control Board's Geotracker database, and US EPA's EnviroMapper.

a. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Construction of the proposed project would involve the temporary use of potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. Operation of the project would involve the limited use and storage of common hazardous substances typical of those used in multi-family residential and retail/commercial developments, including lubricants, paints, solvents, custodial products (e.g., cleaning supplies), pesticides and other landscaping supplies, and vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. No industrial uses or activities are proposed that would result in the use or discharge of unregulated hazardous materials and/or substances, or create a public hazard through transport, use, or disposal. As a residential and retail/commercial development, the proposed project would not involve large quantities of hazardous materials that would require routine transport, use, or disposal. With compliance to applicable standards and regulations and adherence to manufacturer's instructions related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident

conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less than Significant Impact. A search of available environmental records was conducted for the site, using Envirostor and Geotracker.[23, 24]

The existing 1-story single-family residence on the Project Site was constructed in 1914 and the HPMC maintenance buildings were constructed in 1972. There are no potentially hazardous historical uses of the Project Site.

Asbestos-Containing Materials

Asbestos is a crumbly material often found in older buildings, typically used as insulation in walls or ceilings. It was formerly popular as an insulating material because it had the desirable characteristic of being fire resistant. However, it can pose a health risk when very small particles become airborne. These dust-like particles can be inhaled, where their microscopically sharp structures can puncture tiny air sacs in the lungs, resulting in long-term health problems. The Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) classifies asbestos waste as potentially hazardous if it is greater than 1 percent and easily crumbled (friable). Based on the age of the existing on-site residence (built prior to 1970), there is a potential for asbestos-containing building materials at the Project Site. According to City of Los Angeles regulations, prior to the issuance of any use of land, grading, or building permit, the applicant shall obtain a sign-off from the Fire Department indicating that all on-site hazardous materials, including contamination of the soil and groundwater, have been suitably remediated, or that the proposed project will not impede proposed or ongoing remediation measures.

Lead-Based Paint

Although lead-based paint has been taken off the market, it is estimated that 80 percent of buildings built prior to 1978 contain lead paint. Based on the age of the existing on-site structures, there is a potential for lead-based paint at the Project Site. According to City of Los Angeles regulations, prior to the issuance of any use of land, grading, or building permit, the applicant shall obtain a sign-off from the Fire Department indicating that all on-site hazardous materials, including contamination of the soil and groundwater, have been suitably remediated, or that the proposed project will not impede proposed or ongoing remediation measures.

---

23 Department of Toxic Substances Control, "Envirostor" (Last Updated 2013), Accessed January 5, 2015, http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.

24 State Water Resources Control Board, "GeoTracker" (2015), Accessed January 5, 2015, http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.

Methane Gas

According to the City of Los Angeles Methane Zone map,[25] the Project Site is not located within a methane or methane buffer zone. No impacts would occur.

Radon

According to the Radon Potential Zone Map for Southern Los Angeles County, California,[26] the Project Site is located within a radon zone designated "Moderate Potential for Indoor Radon Levels above 4.0 Picocuries per Liter." Impacts would be less than significant, as potential for indoor radon levels is minimal.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Less than Significant Impact. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant impact to hazards and hazardous materials if (a) the project involved a risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation); or (b) the project involved the creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard. According to the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of significance shall be made on a case-by-case basis considering the following factors: (a) the regulatory framework for the health hazard; (b) the probable frequency and severity of consequences to people or property as a result of a potential accidental release or explosion of a hazardous substance; (c) the degree to which project design will reduce the frequency or severity of a potential accidental release or explosion of a hazardous substance; (d) the probable frequency and severity of consequences to people from exposure to the health hazard; and (e) the degree to which project design would reduce the frequency of exposure or severity of consequences to exposure to the health hazard.

The closest school to the Project Site is the Los Angeles Unified School District's King Middle School located at 4201 Fountain Avenue, approximately 0.4 miles east of the Project Site. As previously stated in **Section 4.3, Air Quality**, the emissions from the construction equipment would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds.

---

25 City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Methane and Methane Buffer Zones, Map (March 2004), http://methanetesting.org/PDF/LA_MethaneZones.pdf.

26 California Geological Survey, Radon Potential Zone Map for Southern Los Angeles County, California (January 2005), Accessed January 5, 2015, http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/minerals/hazardous_minerals/radon/Documents/SR182Map.pdf.

Operation of the Proposed Project would not generate direct emissions or handle substantial amounts of hazardous materials that would impact people at an existing school.

The Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard through hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project Site was not identified in the government database review. A summary of the environmental concerns are as follows:

Leaking Underground Storage Tanks

In the early 1980s, the threat posed by releases from leaking underground storage tanks (LUSTs) to groundwater quality was recognized. The discovery of soil and groundwater pollution from LUSTs prompted local, State, and federal lawmakers to enact laws governing USTs. The greatest potential hazard from a LUST is that its contents (petroleum or other hazardous substances) can seep into the soil and contaminate groundwater. Uses that may contain LUSTs include gasoline stations, auto repair shops, and other light industrial uses.

Although 12 LUST sites are located within 0.5 miles of the Project Site, no evidence of LUSTs was found on the Project Site. Ten of the 12 LUST sites are all listed as case closed.[27,28] Two sites are listed as open. The site listed at 1630 N. Vermont Avenue was in remediation as of March 14, 2011 and the case remains open. The site is located approximately 0.3 miles away from the Project Site. The site listed at 4550 Santa Monica Boulevard is also listed as open and is located approximately 0.4 miles away from the Project Site. The site is currently undergoing assessment and interim remedial action as of August 26, 2014.[29] Based

27 Department of Toxic Substances Control, "Envirostor" (Last Updated 2013), Accessed January 5, 2015, http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.

28 State Water Resources Control Board, "GeoTracker" (2015), Accessed January 5, 2015, http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.

29 State Water Resources Control Board, "GeoTracker" (2015), Accessed January 5, 2015, http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.

on these distances, the LUST sites do not represent an environmental risk to the Project Site. Additionally, Proposed Project construction would not impact these sites due to these distances. No impacts would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

Regulatory Agency Database Review

A description of each database and the number of sites near the Proposed Project listed in each database is provided below in **Table 4.8-1, Regulatory Agency Database Review.** The radius varies based on the standard distance for each database. Listing on a database does not mean a site presents a health or safety risk.

Table 4.8-1
Regulatory Agency Database Review

Database Description	Number of Sites in Project Area
EnviroStor: The Department of Toxic Substances Control's (DTSC's) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program's (SMBRP's) EnviroStor database identifies sites that have known contamination or sites for which there may be reasons to investigate further. The database includes the following site types: Federal Superfund sites (National Priorities List (NPL); State Response, including Military Facilities and State Superfund; Voluntary Cleanup; and School sites. EnviroStor provides similar information to the information that was available in CalSites, and provides additional site information, including, but not limited to, identification of formerly contaminated properties that have been released for reuse, properties where environmental deed restrictions have been recorded to prevent inappropriate land uses, and risk characterization information that is used to assess potential impacts to public health and the environment at contaminated sites.	6 within 1 mile
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST): LUST Incident Reports contain an inventory of reported leaking underground storage tank incidents. The data comes from the State Water Resources control Board (SWRCB) LUST Information System.	12 within 0.5 miles

Source: Department of Toxic Substances Control, "Envirostor" (Last Updated 2013), Accessed January 5, 2015, http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/; State Water Resources Control Board, "GeoTracker" (2015), Accessed January 5, 2015, http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.

None of the sites listed in **Table 4.8-1** are located near enough to the Project Site to present a health or safety risk to the Proposed Project. Impacts would less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or

public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. The closest public airports to the Project Site are the Burbank Airport (BUR) and the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). However, since BUR is located approximately 8 miles northwest and LAX is located approximately 12.5 miles southwest of the Project Site, it is not considered to be located within an airport hazard area.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. The Proposed Project is not located near a private airstrip and not within an area that would expose parking structure occupants and maintenance workers to a safety hazard. The closest private airports are located in Palmdale. Nichols Farms Airport is located approximately 43 miles northeast of the Project Site and Grey Butte Airport, located approximately 48 miles northeast of the Project Site.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

g. Would the project impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less than Significant Impact. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant impact to hazards and hazardous materials if the project involved possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

The Proposed Project is not located on or near an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.[30] Development of the Project Site may require temporary and/or partial street closures along De Longpre Avenue and Lyman Place due to construction activities. While such closures may cause temporary inconvenience, they would not be expected to substantially interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans. The Project Site is located less than 0.25 miles east of Hollywood Presbyterian Medical

30 *City of Los Angeles General Plan,* "Safety Element," Exhibit H, Critical Facilities and Lifeline Systems in the City of Los Angeles, http://cityplanning.lacity.org/cwd/gnlpln/saftyelt.pdf.

Center and Children's Hospital Los Angeles, located at 1300 Vermont Avenue, and east of Hollywood Community Hospital located at 4650 Sunset Boulevard. The Proposed Project would not cause permanent alterations to vehicular circulation routes and patterns and/or impede public access or travel on public rights-of-way. Environmental impacts may result from project construction because of limited access to emergency response equipment. However, these potential impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level by the implementation of an emergency evacuation plan as required by the City of Los Angeles. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant is required to develop an emergency response plan in consultaiion with the Fire Department which includes mapping of emergency exits, evactuation routes for vehicles and pedestrians, location of nearest hospitals and fire departments. As such, impacts of the project in the interference of an emergency response plan is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No Mitigation Measures required.

h. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project exposed people and structures to high risk of wildfire. The Project Site is located in a highly urbanized area of Los Angeles and does not include wildlands or high fire hazard terrain or vegetation. The Project Site is not located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ).[31] Consequently, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No Mitigation is required.

31 City of Los Angeles Department of Planning, Zone Information and Map Access System (ZIMAS), http://zimas.lacity.org/, accessed December 30, 2014.

4.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Impact Analysis

a. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Less than Significant Impact. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant impact on surface water quality if discharges associated with the project would create pollution, contamination, or nuisance as defined in Section 13050 of the California Water Code (CWC) or would cause regulatory standards to be violated, as defined in the applicable National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater permit or Water Quality Control Plan for the receiving water body. For the purpose of this specific issue, a significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project would discharge water not meeting the quality standards of local agencies that regulate surface water quality and water discharge into stormwater drainage systems. The proposed project is a parking structure. As is typical of most non-industrial urban development, stormwater runoff from the proposed project has the potential to introduce small amounts of pollutants into the stormwater system. Pollutants would be associated with runoff from landscaped areas (pesticides and fertilizers) and paved surfaces (ordinary household cleaners). Thus, the proposed project would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) standards and the City's Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control regulations (Ordinance No. 172,176 and No. 173,494) to ensure pollutant loads from the project site are minimized for downstream receiving waters. The Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control Ordinances contain requirements for construction activities and operation of development and redevelopment projects to integrate low impact development practices and standards for stormwater pollution mitigation, and maximize open, green and pervious space on all developments and redevelopments consistent with the City's landscape ordinance and other related requirements in the City's Development Best Management Practices (BMPs) Handbook. Conformance would be ensured during the City's building plan review and approval process. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts and would not violate water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, or stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

Construction Impacts

Three general sources of potential short-term, construction-related stormwater pollution associated with the Proposed Project include: 1) the handling, storage, and disposal of construction materials containing pollutants; 2) the maintenance and operation of construction equipment; and 3) earth moving activities that, when not controlled, may generate soil erosion via storm runoff or mechanical equipment. Under the NPDES, since the Project Site is greater than one acre in size, the Project Applicant is responsible for

preparing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to mitigate the effects of erosion and the inherent potential for sedimentation and other pollutants entering the stormwater system.

Surface water runoff from the Project Site would continue to be collected on the site and directed toward existing storm drains with adequate capacity in the Proposed Project vicinity. Pursuant to local practice and City policy, stormwater retention will be required as part of the Low Impact Development (LID) and SUSMP implementation features (despite no increased imperviousness of the site). Any contaminants gathered during routine cleaning of construction equipment would be disposed of in compliance with applicable stormwater pollution prevention permits.

Additionally, any pollutants from the parking areas would be subject to the requirements and regulations of the NPDES and applicable LID Ordinance. The Proposed Project would be required to demonstrate compliance with LID Ordinance standards and retain or treat the first ¾ inch of rainfall in a 24-hour period, which would reduce the Proposed Project's impact to the stormwater infrastructure. The Proposed Project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Furthermore, the implementation of the City's landscape ordinance and other related requirements in the City's Development Best Management Practices (BMPs) Handbook would ensure that the Proposed Project's construction-related water quality impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No Mitigation is required.

Operational Impacts

Before operation, surface water runoff from the Project Site would continue to be collected on the site and directed toward existing storm drains in the Project vicinity that have adequate capacity. The Project would be required to incorporate operational BMPs per the City SUSMP permit requirements. The Project's SUSMP would set forth long-term BMPs to prevent adverse impacts to water quality during Project operations. For example, the SUSMP would set forth structural BMPs that must be built into the Project for ongoing water quality purposes and would be subject to review by the City for compliance with the City of Los Angeles' Development Best Management Practices Handbook, Part B: Planning Activities. Long-term BMPs for this Project could include, but are not limited to, ensuring that discharge from downspouts, roof drains, and scuppers would not be permitted on unprotected soils. The final selection of BMPs would be completed through coordination with the City of Los Angeles. Through preparation and implementation of the SUSMP, operational water quality impacts of the Proposed Project would be

minimized. Pursuant to local practice and City policy, stormwater retention will be required as part of the Low Impact Development (LID) and SUSMP implementation features.[32]

Similar to the existing uses on the Project Site, the Proposed Project would continue to generate surface water runoff during operation. The Project Site is primarily covered with impervious surfaces with some ornamental landscaping areas. Therefore, the majority of the surface water runoff from the Project Site is directed to adjacent storm drains and does not percolate into the groundwater table beneath the site. Potential impacts to surface water runoff would be mitigated to a level below insignificance by incorporating stormwater pollution control measures, as required by the City's Stormwater LID Ordinance. The Proposed Project would be required to demonstrate compliance with LID Ordinance standards and retain and treat the first ¾-inch of rainfall in a 24-hour period. When in compliance with the LID Ordinance, the Proposed Project would minimize the amount of polluted surface water runoff from entering the local storm drains. City of Los Angeles Ordinances No. 172,176 and No. 173,494 specify Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control that requires the application of BMPs. The Proposed Project would also comply with water quality standards and wastewater discharge requirements set forth by the SUSMP for Los Angeles County and Cities in Los Angeles County and approved by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB). Full compliance with the LID Ordinance and implementation of design-related BMPs would ensure that the operation of the Proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

The Proposed Project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control Ordinances contain requirements for construction activities and operation of development and redevelopment projects to integrate low impact development practices and standards for stormwater pollution mitigation, and maximize open, green and pervious space on all developments and redevelopments consistent with the City's landscape ordinance and other related requirements in the City's Development Best Management Practices (BMPs) Handbook. Conformance would be ensured during the City's building plan review and approval process. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts and would not violate water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, or stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

32 City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles Municipal Code, ch. 6, art. 4.4, sec. 64.70.01 and 64.72; and ch. 9, art. 1, sec. 64.72.05 (October 2011).

Mitigation Measures: No mitigations required.

b. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would substantially deplete groundwater or interferes with groundwater recharge. The proposed project would not require the use of groundwater at the project site. Potable water would be supplied by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), which draws its water supplies from distant sources for which it conducts its own assessment and mitigation of potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the project would not require direct additions or withdrawals of groundwater. Excavation to accommodate subterranean levels is not proposed at a depth that would result in the interception of existing aquifers or penetration of the existing water table. In addition, since the existing project site is mostly impervious, the proposed project would not reduce any existing percolation of surface water into the groundwater table. Therefore, project development would not impact groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge, and no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less than Significant Impact. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant impact on surface water hydrology if it would result in a permanent, adverse change to the movement of surface water sufficient to produce a substantial change in the current or direction of water flow. The Project Site is located in a highly urbanized area of Los Angeles, and no streams or river courses are located on or within the Project vicinity. The majority of the Project Site consists of impervious surfaces with some ornamental landscape. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not increase site runoff or result in any changes in the local drainage patterns. Implementation of the SWPPP, however, would reduce the amount of surface water runoff after storm events, as the Proposed Project would be required to implement stormwater BMPs to retain or treat the runoff from a storm event producing 3/4-inch of rainfall in a 24-hour period.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

No Impact. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant impact on surface water hydrology if it would result in a permanent, adverse change to the movement of surface water sufficient to produce a substantial change in the current or direction of water flow. As previously indicated, the Proposed Project will be designed to include SUSMP and LID BMPs to maintain and treat the first 3/4-inch of a 24-hour storm. Therefore, the existing off-site surface water runoff would be maintained. Examples of BMPs include, but are not limited to, ensuring that discharge from downspouts, roof drains, and scuppers would not be permitted on unprotected soils. The Proposed Project would not result in a significant increase in site runoff, or any changes in the local drainage patterns, which would result in flooding on- or off-site.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e. Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less than Significant Impact. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant impact on surface water quality if discharges associated with the project would create pollution, contamination, or nuisance as defined in Section 13050 of the CWC or that cause regulatory standards to be violated, as defined in the applicable NPDES stormwater permit or Water Quality Control Plan for the receiving water body. For the purpose of this specific issue, a significant impact may occur if the volume of stormwater runoff from the Project Site were to increase to a level that exceeds the capacity of the storm drain system serving the Project Site or provides substantial sources of polluted runoff. A Project-related significant adverse effect would also occur if the Proposed Project would substantially increase the probability that polluted runoff would reach the storm drain system or that would increase runoff of any water.

Two existing storm drain catch basins are located adjacent to the Project Site at the intersection of N. Lyman Place and Fountain Avenue and at the intersection of N. Virgil Avenue and Fountain Avenue, which connects to a storm drain trunk line running away from the Project Site along N. Lyman Place and N. Virgil Avenue, respectively.[33] Storm drain facilities are owned and maintained by City of Los Angeles.

The majority of the Project Site is impervious with ornamental landscape cover over the remaining portions of the site and all surface water is directed off site to the adjacent storm drain system. The Proposed Project would not result in a significant increase in site runoff, or any changes in the local drainage patterns. Runoff from the Project Site currently is, and would continue to be, collected on the site and directed towards existing storm drains in the Project vicinity that have adequate capacity. Pursuant to local practice and City policy, stormwater retention would be required as part of the LID/SUSMP implementation features (despite no increased imperviousness of the site). Any contaminants gathered during routine cleaning of construction equipment would be disposed of in compliance with applicable stormwater pollution prevention permits. Further, any pollutants from the Project Site would be subject to the requirements and regulations of the NPDES and applicable LID Ordinance requirements. Accordingly, the Proposed Project would be required to demonstrate compliance with LID Ordinance standards and retain or treat the first ¾ -inch of rainfall in a 24-hour period. The Proposed Project would not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

f. Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

No Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project includes potential sources of water pollutants that would have the potential to substantially degrade water quality. As previously indicated, the Proposed Project would include BMPs to treat and retain the first ¾ inch of rainfall over a 24-hour period on site, including planter boxes and permeable pavement. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality of surface water leaving the site. Furthermore, the Proposed Project does not include potential sources of contaminants that could potentially degrade water quality and would comply with all federal, State, and local regulations governing stormwater discharge.

No Impacts would occur.

33 Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, "Los Angeles County Storm Drain System," http://dpw.lacounty.gov/fcd/stormdrain/index.cfm.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

g. Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project were to place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. A 100-year flood is defined as a flood, resulting from a severe rainstorm that has a probability of occurring approximately once every 100 years. According to the Safety Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan, the Project Site is not located within a designated flood zone.[34] Additionally, the Proposed Project would not include any housing units. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

h. Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?

No Impact. A significant impact may occur if the Project Site was located within a 100-year flood zone, which would impede or redirect flood flows. According to the Safety Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan, the Project Site is not in an area designated as a 100-year flood hazard area.[35] The Project Site is located in a highly urbanized area and no changes to the local drainage pattern would occur with implementation of the Proposed Project; therefore, the Proposed Project would not have the potential to impede or redirect floodwater flows.

No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

i. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project exposes people or structures to a significant risk of loss or death caused by the failure of a levee or dam. Based on the map of Inundation

34 City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, *Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan*, p. 57 (November 1996), http://cityplanning.lacity.org/cwd/gnlpln/saftyelt.pdf.

35 City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, *Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan*, p. 57 (November 1996), http://cityplanning.lacity.org/cwd/gnlpln/saftyelt.pdf.

and Tsunami Hazards in the City of Los Angeles, the Project Site is located within a potential inundation area.[36] The Hollywood Reservoir is located approximately 3 miles northwest of the Project Site. Based on the distance of the dam from the Project Site, the risk associated with flooding resulting from dam failure is considered less than significant. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

j. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if the Project Site is sufficiently close to the ocean or other water body to potentially be at risk of the effects of seismically induced tidal phenomena (i.e., seiche and tsunami), or if the Project Site is located adjacent to a hillside area with soil characteristics that would indicate potential susceptibility to mudslides or mudflows. The Project Site is not located in a potential seiche or tsunami zone. With respect to the potential impact from a mudflow, the Project Site is relatively flat and surrounded by urban development; the Project Site is located greater than 1 mile from Griffith Park and the eastern end of the Santa Monica Mountains (which are identified as areas with the potential for landslides).[37] Therefore, there are no sources of mudflow near the Project Site.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

36 City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, *Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan*, p. 59 (November 1996), http://cityplanning.lacity.org/cwd/gnlpln/saftyelt.pdf.

37 *City of Los Angele General Plan,* "Safety Element," Exhibit C Landslide Inventory & Hillside Areas (1996), p. 51.

4.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Impact Analysis

a. Would the project physically divide an established community?

No Impact. A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project is sufficiently large enough or otherwise configured in such a way as to create a physical barrier within an established community. According to the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of significance shall be made on a case- by-case basis considering the following factors: (1) the extent of the area that would be impacted, the nature and degree of impacts, and the types of land uses within that area; (2) the extent to which existing neighborhoods, communities, or land uses would be disrupted, divided or isolated, and the duration of the disruptions; and (3) the number, degree, and type of secondary impacts to surrounding land uses that could result from implementation of the Proposed Project.

The Project Site is located within an urbanized area of the Hollywood community and is consistent with the existing physical arrangement of the properties near the site. While a 1-story single-family residence is being demolished, the Proposed Project would not displace surrounding residences. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the established community.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b. Would the project conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project is inconsistent with the *General Plan* or zoning designations currently applicable to a project site, and would cause adverse environmental effects, which the *General Plan* and zoning ordinance are designed to avoid or mitigate.

The Project Site is located within the jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles, and is therefore subject to the designations and regulations of several local and regional land use and zoning plans. At the regional level, the Project Site is located within the planning area of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). The Proposed Project is also located within the South Coast Air Basin and, therefore, is within the jurisdiction of SCAQMD. At the local level, development of the Project Site is guided by the General Plan

of the City of Los Angeles, the LAMC, and the Hollywood Community Plan, and the SNAP, which are intended to guide local land use decisions and development patterns.

Regional Plans

SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan. As noted in **Section 5.3, Air Quality**, the Proposed Project would not exceed the daily emissions thresholds during the construction or operational phases. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the AQMP.

SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan. The Project Site is located within the six-county region that comprises the SCAG planning area. The SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) includes growth management policies that strive to improve the standard of living, maintain the regional quality of life, and provide social, political, and cultural equity. The Proposed Project would not generate any additional residents. The Proposed Project would be consistent with policies set forth in the RCP because it would replace the existing 1-story single-family residence, two 1-story maintenance buildings, and a surface parking lot with a parking structure containing 654 parking spaces accessible to staff and visitors in a way that is least likely to cause an adverse environmental impact. Furthermore, as the Proposed Project would replace the existing 1-story single-family house with a parking structure, the Proposed Project would not generate any new residents. The Proposed Project would be consistent with SCAG growth projections for the City of Los Angeles.

SCAG 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies (2012 RTP/SCS). SCAG's 2012 RTP/SCS presents a long-term transportation vision through the year 2035 for the SCAG region. The mission of the 2012–2035 RTP/SCS is to provide "leadership, vision and progress which promote economic growth, personal well-being, and livable communities for all Southern Californians." The 2012–2035 RTP/SCS places a greater emphasis on sustainability and integrated planning compared to previous versions of the RTP, and identifies mobility, economy, and sustainability as the three principles most critical to the future of the region. The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS goals include the following: (1) maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region; (2) ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region; (3) preserve and ensure a sustainable regional transportation system; (4) maximize the productivity of the transportation system; (5) encourage land use and growth patterns that facilitate transit and nonmotorized transportation; and (6) protect the environment and health of residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation (nonmotorized transportation, such as bicycling and walking). The Proposed Project would be consistent with these goals by maximizing parking opportunities for hospital staff in an area that is already served by nearby commercial uses, public infrastructure, and transportation. Specifically, regional access is provided by US 101, I-5, and SR 2. In addition, the Project area is well-served by transit facilities, including Metro Rapid bus lines 780 and 757,

and MTA bus lines 2, 175, 204, 206, 217, 302, and 754. The Proposed Project would comply with City design standards for access driveways and would not include any hazardous design features that could pose safety issues to travelers. Therefore, the Proposed Project would also support the goal to ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region. Further, as discussed below in Section 4.16, Transportation/Circulation, Proposed Project impacts related to the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program, which serves as the monitoring and analytical basis for regional transportation funding decisions, would be less than significant. The Proposed Project would also support the use and productivity of the public transportation system by providing a pedestrian-accessible environment and concentrating new development within an area well served by a regional transportation system and transit opportunities.

Local Plans

City of Los Angeles General Plan

The Proposed Project would conform to the applicable objectives outlined in the City of Los Angeles General Plan (General Plan).[38] The General Plan is a comprehensive, long-range declaration of purposes, policies, and programs for the development of the City consisting of 11 elements: 10 Citywide elements (Air Quality Element, Conservation Element, Historic Preservation and Cultural Resources Element, Housing Element, Infrastructure Systems Element, Noise Element, Open Space Element, Public Facilities and Services Element, Safety Element, and Transportation Element) and the Land Use Element, which provides individual plans for each of the City's 35 Community Planning Areas.

The elements that would be most applicable to the Proposed Project are the Air Quality Element, Land Use Element, and Transportation Element. Analysis of these elements follows:

Air Quality Element

The Proposed Project would comply with SB 375 and AB 32 by contributing to a reduction in GHG emissions through integrated land use, housing, and transportation planning. The key component of GHG emissions is the reduction of emissions from passenger vehicles, which represents about one-third of overall GHG emissions in the United States. Land use is among the top strategies to reduce such emissions. Compact development, which includes access and proximity to transit and concentrations of population and/or employment as a result of high-density residential and/or commercial development, can reduce congestion, lower infrastructure costs, and reduce household expenses related to transportation and energy, according to a 2010 report published by the Urban Land Institute.[39] The key to successful compact

38 City of Los Angeles, *General Plan of the City of Los Angeles* (2002).

39 Urban Land Institute, *The Role Compact Development Can Play in Reducing Green House Gas Emissions, Evidence from Three Recent Studies* (2010), 4.

development is a land use pattern that has a high-quality pedestrian network and a variety of land uses within walking distance of each other.[40]

The Proposed Project's location would be located within 0.25 miles east of an existing Metro station and close to numerous bus lines and mixed land uses (including housing, employment, and public space). In addition, existing uses within walking distance include the Municipal Art Gallery, Von's grocery store, hospitals and medical offices, schools, restaurants, coffee shops, a Wells Fargo and Chase Banks, and office buildings. As such, the Proposed Project would conform to the Air Quality Element.

Land Use Element

The Proposed Project is located 0.5 miles from the existing Hollywood Boulevard and New Hampshire Avenue, and 0.25 miles from the closest Metro station at Vermont Avenue and Sunset Boulevard. This is consistent with the City's intent that the highest development intensities are targeted generally within 0.25 miles of the transit stations.[41]

The new parking garage is the type of development encouraged by the City because it places the new development that supports the HPMC in a commercial and high intensity area, while preserving the surrounding neighborhoods adjacent to the area. The Land Use Element states that a considerable mix of uses be accommodated to provide population support and enhance activity near the stations. This may encompass a range of retail commercial, offices, personal services, entertainment, restaurants, and housing that serve both transit users and local residents.[42]

Because the Project Site would be located near existing bus stops and the Metro Red Line, it would reduce the need for automobile trips and miles traveled, and increase public transportation ridership. As such, the Proposed Project would conform to the goals and policies of the Land Use Element.

Transportation Element

The Proposed Project is in close proximity to Sunset Boulevard, which is a major transportation corridor providing substantial public transit opportunities and facilities, including Metro Bus lines 2, 175, 204, 206, 217, 302, and 754.[43] The development of the Proposed Project would promote pedestrian activity and circulation, create direct pedestrian connections between the Proposed Project and the Metro transit infrastructure, and conform to the Transportation Element's policies and objectives.

---

40 Urban Land Institute, *Land Use and Driving* (2010), 5.
41 *City of Los Angeles General Plan*, "Land Use Element," Goal 3k; Policy 3.15.3.
42 *City of Los Angeles General Plan*, "Land Use Element" Objective 3.4; Policy 3.4.1.
43 *City of Los Angeles General Plan,* "Transportation Element," Objective 3.5, Policy 3.12.

Los Angeles Municipal Code

The Proposed Project would not conflict with the goals, objectives, and allowable land uses in the Hollywood Community Plan and the LAMC.[44] The General Plan land use designation for the Project Site is a mix of Highway Oriented Commercial and High Density Residential, zoned C4-1-SN, [T][Q]C2-1, and R4-2, which allow for hospital, medical, residential and commercial retail land uses. The Proposed Project is comprised of a parking structure. Parking structures are permitted on lots zoned for C2, C4, and R4 uses that are located within the Hollywood Community Plan area. Therefore, the Proposed Project would conform to the allowable land uses pursuant to the LAMC.

Hollywood Community Plan

All on-site development activity is subject to the land use regulations of the Community Plan. The Community Plan goals and objectives include providing organized growth; furthering the development of Hollywood as a major center of population, employment, retail services, and entertainment; and providing a full range of housing choices for employees and residents of all economic segments in the Hollywood area. The Community Plan designates the Project Site for Neighborhood Office Commercial and High Density Residential land uses. The Proposed Project, which would provide a parking structure development in an underutilized area of Hollywood, would conform to the goals, objectives, and land uses identified in the Community Plan.

Vermont/Western Transit Oriented District Specific Plan

As noted previously, the Project Site is located within the SNAP area of the Hollywood Community Plan area, which is identified as an area with a mix of residential, commercial, and retail uses.[45] The SNAP area offers an opportunity for a concerted public and private effort to bring about new vitality and amenities in Hollywood. Additionally, the SNAP area is being planned as a pedestrian- and transit-friendly district with a significant amount of open space; recreational, cultural, and civic uses; retail activities; community buildings; and restaurants along transit and commercial corridors.

The Proposed Project is located within land use Subarea C (Community Center). Subarea C allows for multiple dwelling residential uses, including single-family residences, apartment buildings, and child care; commercial uses (includes limited commercial uses, as well as retail with limited manufacturing, service stations, and garages), and hospital and medical uses. Section 9.I of the SNAP requires that all projects be in substantial conformance with certain Development Standards and Design Guidelines for Subarea C.[46]

---

44 City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Parcel Profile Reports, Zoning Information and Map Access System (ZIMAS), http://www.zimas.lacity.org.

45 City of Los Angeles, SNAP (2001).

46 *SNAP*, Development Standards and Design Guidelines (2000).

Use

Section 9.A of the SNAP states that commercial uses and hospital and medical uses are permitted on any lot in located within Subarea C.[47] The parking structure is for the Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center, located in Subarea C and therefore is a permitted use in Subarea C.

Height and Floor Area

Section 9.B.3 (a) of the SNAP states that Hospital and Medical Use buildings shall not exceed a maximum height of 100 feet and a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 3.0.[48]

The highest point of the Proposed Project is 56 feet above grade at the corner of De Longpre Avenue and Virgil Avenue, with mechanical equipment above that is appropriately screened and set back from the street. The Proposed Project complies with the height standard set forth in the SNAP.

Additionally, the FAR standard applies to the habitable structures on a lot and to the buildable area of a lot to determine the maximum allowable square footage of all buildings on the lot, but does not include the area within parking structures. The FAR standard does not apply to the Project.

Bicycle Parking Requirements

Section 9.E.2 of the SNAP sets forth bicycle parking requirements for projects involving non-residential uses.[49]

Pursuant to the SNAP, the parking structure is required to provide one bicycle parking space for every 1,000 square feet of non-residential area for the first 10,000 square feet of floor area, and one bicycle parking space for every additional 10,000 square feet of floor area. As the FAR standards would not apply to the structure and because the structure is not located on the frontage of Vermont Avenue or Sunset Boulevard, this requirement is not applicable. While this standard is not applicable, the parking structure will contain 2 bicycle racks (32 spaces) at the southeast portion of the Project site, at-grade.

Project Parking Requirements

As stated in **Section 3.0, Project Description,** the Proposed Project would be compliant with the parking requirements of the SNAP. Section 9.E.4(i) of the SNAP requires that hospitals provide a minimum of one

47 City of Los Angeles, Vermont/Western Transit Oriented District Specific Plan (Station Neighborhood Area Plan), sec. 9.A, Project Parking Requirements, Hospital and Medical Uses (2001).

48 City of Los Angeles, Vermont/Western Transit Oriented District Specific Plan (Station Neighborhood Area Plan), sec. 9.B.3, Project Parking Requirements, Hospital and Medical Uses (2001).

49 City of Los Angeles, Vermont/Western Transit Oriented District Specific Plan (Station Neighborhood Area Plan), sec. 9.E.2, Project Parking Requirements, Hospital and Medical Uses (2001).

parking space for each patient bed for which the hospital is licensed, and a maximum of two parking spaces for each patient bed for which the hospital is licensed.[50]

As discussed previously, when accounting for hospital beds and other ancillary hospital uses, HPMC currently has a total of 1,059 parking spaces, while the maximum amount of parking spaces allowed for HPMC is 1,591 spaces. Construction of the Proposed Project would result in a loss of 76 spaces, bringing the revised total to 983 spaces. Completion of the new parking structure will contain 654 spaces, resulting in a combined total of 1,637 parking spaces throughout HPMC. Therefore, prior to the Proposed Project being operational, a minimum total of 46 spaces will be removed from the existing parking area, located west of Lyman Place in order to not exceed the maximum allowed parking count of 1,591. Therefore, the Proposed Project would satisfy this requirement.

Vermont/Western SNAP Development Standards and Design Guidelines

Section 9.I of the SNAP requires that all hospital projects be in substantial conformance with the following standards for Hospital and Medical Uses contained in the Vermont/Western Station Neighborhood Area Plan, Development Standards and Design Guidelines, Chapter VIII: Development Standards for Hospitals and Medical Centers.[51] The Proposed Project conforms with the Vermont/Western SNAP Development Standards and Design Guidelines for integrating a mixture of land uses, transforming commercial streets away from a highway-oriented, suburban format into a distinctly urban, pedestrian-oriented and enlivened atmosphere. The Proposed Project would create a pedestrian-friendly environment allowing pedestrians, HPMC employees and visitors, to walk to the HPMC near the Project Site, as well as to nearby restaurants and shops. The SNAP Development Standards and Design Guidelines encourage street design features and pedestrian-friendly land uses to create streets that are interesting and inviting for walkers. The Proposed Project would utilize street design features to enhance the urban appeal and walkability of the parking structure. The façade of the building would be articulated along all street frontages. The architectural design incorporates a number of design features to reduce the visual mass of the building and create visual interest. Accent lights would uplight this elevation at night to create visual interest and create a welcoming pedestrian environment along De Longpre Avenue by providing additional lighting. The Proposed Project would attract more pedestrian activity, which will help create a more walkable pedestrian-oriented area.

Plan Consistency

As discussed previously, the Proposed Project would not conflict with local and regional plans applicable to the Project Site. Pursuant to the provisions of LAMC Section 11.5.7.C, the Applicant is requesting the

50 City of Los Angeles, Vermont/Western Transit Oriented District Specific Plan (Station Neighborhood Area Plan), sec. 9.E.4, Project Parking Requirements, Hospital and Medical Uses (2001).

51 City of Los Angeles, Vermont/Western Transit Oriented District Specific Plan (Station Neighborhood Area Plan), sec. 9.I, Project Parking Requirements, Hospital and Medical Uses (2001).

approval of a Project Permit Compliance Review, to allow for the Proposed Project located within the geographic boundaries of the Vermont/Western SNAP to proceed. Pursuant to the provisions of LAMC Section 11.5.7.E, the Applicant is requesting a Project Permit Adjustment to allow the Proposed Project to reduce pedestrian path minimum horizontal clearance from 10' to 6' and minimum vertical clearance from 12' to an approximate range of 8-9.' The parking structure design is intended to be minimal in size to enhance aesthetics and does not permit the larger clearances specified in the Vermont/Western SNAP Development Standards and Design Guidelines. This pedestrian path qualifies as a minor adjustment from the Specific Plan regulation, which does not substantially alter the intent of the Specific Plan regulation and is not a change to "the permitted use, floor area, density or intensity, height or bulk , setbacks or yards, lot coverage limitations, or parking standards regulated by the specific plan." LAMC Sec. 11.5.7.E.2(g). The Applicant would request approvals and permits from the Department of Building and Safety (and other municipal agencies) for project construction activities including, but not limited to, the following: demolition, excavation, and haul route.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c. Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact. A project-related significant adverse effect could occur if a project site were located within an area governed by a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. As discussed previously, no such plans presently exist that govern any portion of the Project Site. Further, the Project Site is located in an area that is already fully developed with commercial uses, and is also within a heavily urbanized area of Los Angeles. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have the potential to cause such effects.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

Impact Analysis

a. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?

No Impact. A significant impact may occur if the Project Site is located in an area used or available for extraction of a regionally important mineral resource, or if the project development would convert an existing or future regionally important mineral extraction use to another use, or if the project development would affect access to a site used or potentially available for regionally important mineral resource extraction. According to the LA CEQA Thresholds Guide, the determination of significance shall be made on a case-by-case basis, considering (a) whether, or the degree to which, the project might result in the permanent loss of, or loss of access to, a mineral resource that is located in a State Mining and Geology Board Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2) Area, or other known or potential mineral resource area, and (b) whether the mineral resource is of regional or Statewide significance, or is noted in the Conservation Element as being of local importance.

The Project Site is not located within a MRZ-2 Area, an Oil Drilling/Surface Mining Supplemental Use District, or an Oil Field/Drilling Area.[52] No mineral resources are known to exist beneath the Project Site. No impacts associated with the loss of availability of a known mineral resource would occur.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

No Impact. As noted, the Project Site is not located within a MRZ-2 Area.[53] The Project Site is not designated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

No impacts would occur.

---

52 Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, *Mineral Resources and Oil Fields in East Los Angeles County, Los Angeles County Bicycle Master Plan,* Figure 3.8-2 (January 2012).

53 Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, *Mineral Resources and Oil Fields in East Los Angeles County, Los Angeles County Bicycle Master Plan,* Figure 3.8-2 (January 2012).

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.12 NOISE

Impact Analysis

a. Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project would generate excess noise that would cause the ambient noise environment at the project site to exceed noise level standards set forth in the City of Los Angeles General Plan Noise Element (Noise Element) and the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance (Noise Ordinance). Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in an increase in ambient noise levels during both construction and operation, as discussed in further detail below.

Construction

Construction-related noise impacts would be significant if, as indicated in Section 112.05 of the LAMC, noise from construction equipment within 500 feet of a residential zone exceeds 75 decibels (dB[A]) at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source. This noise limitation does not apply where compliance is technically infeasible. "Technically infeasible" means that the above noise limitation cannot be complied with despite the use of mufflers, shields, sound barriers and/or any other noise reduction device or techniques during the operation of the equipment. As defined in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide* for construction noise impacts, a significant impact would occur if construction activities lasting more than one day would increase the ambient noise levels by 10 dB(A) or more at any off-site, noise-sensitive location. Furthermore, according to the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide,* construction activities that would last more than 10 days in a three-month period and increase ambient exterior noise levels by 5 dB(A) or more at a noise-sensitive use would also normally result in a significant impact.

Construction of the Proposed Project would require the use of heavy equipment for demolition, site clearing, grading, excavation and foundation preparation, the installation of utilities, paving, and building construction. During each construction phase there would be a different mix of equipment operating and noise levels would vary based on the amount of equipment in operation and the location of each activity. Equipment is assumed to be typical for a parking structure and would include excavators, dozers, loaders, a crane, an auger drill, and paving equipment.

Outdoor Construction Noise Levels, respectively, at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source (i.e., reference distance). The noise levels shown in **Table 4.12-1** represent composite noise levels associated with typical construction activities, which take into account both the number of pieces and spacing of heavy construction equipment that are typically used during each phase of construction. As shown in **Table 4.12-2**, construction noise during the heavier initial periods of construction is presented as 86 dB(A)

Leq when measured at a reference distance of 50 feet from the center of construction activity.[54] These noise levels would diminish rapidly with distance from the construction site at a rate of approximately 6 dB(A) per doubling of distance. For example, a noise level of 84 dB(A) Leq measured at 50 feet from the noise source to the receptor would reduce to 78 dB(A) Leq at 100 feet from the source to the receptor, and reduce by another 6 dB(A) Leq to 72 dB(A) Leq at 200 feet from the source to the receptor.

Table 4.12-1
Noise Range of Typical Construction Equipment

Construction Equipment	Noise Level in dB(A) Leq at 50 Feet[a]
Front Loader	73-86
Trucks	82-95
Cranes (moveable)	75-88
Cranes (derrick)	86-89
Vibrator	68-82
Saws	72-82
Pneumatic impact equipment	83-88
Jackhammers	81-98
Pumps	68-72
Generators	71-83
Compressors	75-87
Concrete mixers	75-88
Concrete pumps	81-85
Back Hoe	73-95
Tractor	77-98
Scraper/Grader	80-93
Paver	85-88

Source: US Environmental Protection Agency, Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment and Home Appliances, EPA-68-04-0047 (1971).

[a] *Machinery equipped with noise control devices or other noise-reducing design features does not generate the same level of noise emissions as that shown in this table.*

54 Although the peak noise levels generated by certain construction equipment may be greater than 86 dB(A) at a distance of 50 feet, the equivalent noise level would be approximately 86 dB(A) Leq (i.e., the equipment does not operate at the peak noise level over the entire duration).

Table 4.12-2
Typical Outdoor Construction Noise Levels

Construction Phase	Approximate L_{eq} dB(A) with Mufflers			
	50 Feet	60 Feet	100 Feet	200 Feet
Ground clearing	82	80	76	70
Excavation, grading	86	84	80	74
Foundations	77	75	71	65
Structural	83	81	77	71
Finishing	86	84	80	74

Source: US Environmental Protection Agency, Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment and Home Appliance, EPA-68-04-0047 (1971).

Land uses on the properties surrounding the Project Site primarily include surface parking lots, office/commercial, warehouse/industrial, single-family and multifamily residential uses. Among these land uses, a single-family residence and multifamily residential uses have been identified and depicted in **Figure 4.12-1, Noise Monitoring and Sensitive Receptor Location Map**, as the most likely sensitive receptors to experience noise level increases during Project construction. To identify the existing ambient noise levels at these nearby off- site sensitive receptors, as well as the general vicinity of the Project Site, noise measurements were taken with a Larson Davis Model 831 sound level meter, which conforms to industry standards set forth in American National Standard Institute (ANSI) S1.4-1983 (R2001)—Specification for Sound Level Meters. Additionally, this noise meter meets the requirement specified in Section 111.01(l) of the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) that the instruments be "Type S2A" standard instruments or better (See **Appendix D, Noise Background and Modeling Data Data**). This instrument was calibrated and operated according to the manufacturer's written specifications. At the measurement sites, the microphone was placed at a height of approximately 5 feet above grade. The measured noise levels are shown in **Table 4.12-3, Existing Ambient Daytime Noise Levels in Project Site Vicinity**.

Table 4.12-3
Existing Ambient Daytime Noise Levels in Project Site Vicinity

Location	Primary Noise Sources	Leq	Lmin	Lmax
Southeast corner of De Longpre Ave and Lyman Place	Minor traffic noise along De Longpre Ave and Lyman Place, occasional brief ambulance siren at distance	60.6	54.0	72.6
Southwest corner of De Longpre Ave and N Virgil Ave	Traffic noise along Virgil Ave, minor traffic noise along De Longpre Ave, brief ambulance siren along Virgil Ave	72.7	56.8	96.0
West sidewalk of Virgil Ave at southeast corner of Project site	Traffic noise along Virgil Ave, occasional brief ambulance siren along Virgil Ave	67.1	53.1	80.6
East sidewalk on Lyman Place approx. 105 feet south of southwestern corner of site	Minor traffic noise along Lyman Pl, brief dog barking from 1314-1316 Lyman Pl, occasional ambulance siren at distance	57.6	50.2	68.3

*Source: Noise modeling data sheets can be seen in **Appendix D**.*

Due to the use of construction equipment during each construction phase, the Proposed Project would expose surrounding off-site receptors to increased ambient exterior noise levels comparable to those listed in **Table 4.12-3**. It should be noted that any increase in noise levels at off-site receptors during construction of the Proposed Project would be temporary in nature and would not generate continuously high noise levels, although occasional single-event disturbances from construction are possible. In addition, the construction noise during the heavier initial periods of construction (i.e., demolition, excavation, and grading work) would typically be reduced in the later construction phases (i.e., interior building construction at the proposed building) because the physical structure of the apartment building would break the line-of-sight noise transmission from the construction area to the nearby receptors.

Figure 4.12-1, Noise Monitoring and Sensitive Receptor Location Map

Since construction activities associated with the proposed development at the Project Site would last for more than 10 days in a 3-month period, the Proposed Project would cause a significant noise impact during construction if the ambient exterior noise levels at the identified off-site sensitive receptor located 25 feet from the Project Site (1316 N Lyman Place) would be increased by 5 dB(A) or more. The next closest sensitive receptor is located approximately 25 feet to the southwest of the Project Site. Based on the results shown in **Table 4.12-4, Estimated Exterior Construction Noise at Nearest Sensitive Receptors,** the ambient exterior noise levels at 1316 N Lyman Place could be exceeded by 5 dB(A) or more. Based on the criteria established in the LA *CEQA Threshold Guide,* a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels would occur at 1316 N Lyman Place.

Table 4.12-4
Estimated Exterior Construction Noise at Nearest Sensitive Receptor

Construction Phase	Existing Monitored Daytime Ambient Noise Levels (dB[A] L_{eq})	Estimated Peak Construction Noise Levels (dB[A] L_{eq})	Noise Level Increase (dB[A] L_{eq})
Demolition	57.6	91.6	34.0
Site Preparation	57.6	86.8	29.2
Grading	57.6	87.6	30.0
Building Construction	57.6	90.1	32.5
Paving	57.6	88.1	30.5
Architectural Coating	57.6	70.0	12.4

*Source: Noise monitoring data sheets can be seen in **Appendix D**.*

Section 41.40 of the LAMC regulates noise from demolition and construction activities. Exterior demolition and construction activities that generate noise are prohibited between the hours of 9:00 PM and 7:00 AM Monday through Friday, and between 6:00 PM and 8:00 AM on Saturday. Demolition and construction are prohibited on Sundays and all federal holidays. The construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would comply with these LAMC requirements. In addition, pursuant to the City Noise Ordinance (LAMC Section 112.05), construction noise levels are exempt from the 75 dB(A) noise threshold if all technically feasible noise attenuation measures are implemented. The estimated construction-related noise levels associated with the Proposed Project could exceed the numerical noise threshold of 75 dB(A) at 50 feet from the noise source as outlined in the City Noise Ordinance, and the typical construction noise levels associated with the Proposed Project would exceed the existing ambient noise levels at 1316 N Lyman Place, the identified off-site sensitive receptor, by more than the 5 dB(A) threshold established by the L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide during all construction phases. Implementation of the

following mitigation measure would reduce the noise levels associated with construction of the Proposed Project to the maximum extent that is technically feasible. The measure would ensure that (1) construction activities would be limited to the hours identified in the LAMC; (2) the construction equipment would be scheduled to avoid operating several pieces of equipment simultaneously; and (3) construction equipment would be equipped with noise shielding and muffling devices to the extent feasible. Thus, based on the provisions set forth in LAMC 112.05, and compliance with the *City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance No. 144,331* and *161,574*, and any subsequent ordinances, which prohibit the emission or creation of noise beyond certain levels at adjacent uses unless technically infeasible, the project will pose a less than significant impact to noise levels.

Mitigation Measures: No Mitigation Measures Required.

Operational

Parking Garage Noise

Noise would be generated by activities within the new parking garage associated with the Proposed Project. Parking would be provided within 7 levels, including 4 above ground levels and 2.5 to 3 subterranean parking levels under the Project Site. Sources of noise within the parking structure would include engines accelerating, doors slamming, car alarms, and people talking. Noise levels within the parking areas would fluctuate with the amount of automobile and human activity. As the subterranean parking level serving the Proposed Project would be entirely underground and enclosed, noise generated at these levels would likely be imperceptible at ground level locations on and adjacent to the Project Site. As is typical for parking structures, cars entering and exiting the structure at all hours of the day and night can become a nuisance to occupants of adjacent buildings. As such, the Department of City Planning recommends the driveway ramps be constructed of noise-attenuating materials such as concrete surfaces. With implementation of mitigation measures **MM XII-40** and **MM XII-30**, noise impacts associated with the Proposed Project's subterranean parking garage and at-grade parking spaces would be reduced to ensure operational noise impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures are proposed.

MM XII-40 Increased Noise Levels (Parking Structure Ramps)

- Concrete, not metal, shall be used for construction of parking ramps.
- The interior ramps shall be textured to prevent tire squeal at turning areas.

MM XII-30 Increased Noise Levels (Parking Wall)

- A 6-foot-high solid decorative masonry wall adjacent to residential use and/or zones shall be constructed if no such wall exists.

b. *Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?*

Less than significant impact. Vibration is sound radiated through the ground. Vibration can result from a source (e.g., subway operations, vehicles, machinery equipment, etc.) causing the adjacent ground to move, thereby creating vibration waves that propagate through the soil to the foundations of nearby buildings. This effect is referred to as groundborne vibration. The peak particle velocity (PPV) or the root mean square (RMS) velocity is usually used to describe vibration levels. PPV is defined as the maximum instantaneous peak of the vibration level, while RMS is defined as the square root of the average of the squared amplitude of the level. PPV is typically used for evaluating potential building damage, while RMS velocity in decibels (VdB) is typically more suitable for evaluating human response.

The background vibration velocity level in residential areas is usually around 50 VdB. The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB. A vibration velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels for most people. Most perceptible indoor vibration is caused by sources within buildings such as operation of mechanical equipment, movement of people, or slamming of doors. Typical outdoor sources of perceptible groundborne vibration are construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads. If a roadway is smooth, the groundborne vibration from traffic is rarely perceptible. The range of interest is from approximately 50 VdB, which is the typical background vibration velocity level, to 100 VdB, which is the general threshold where minor damage can occur in fragile buildings.

Construction

Construction activities for the Proposed Project have the potential to generate low levels of groundborne vibration. The operation of construction equipment generates vibrations that propagate though the ground and diminishes in intensity with distance from the source. Vibration impacts can range from no perceptible effects at the lowest vibration levels, to low rumbling sounds and perceptible vibration at moderate levels, to slight damage of buildings at the highest levels. The construction activities associated with the Proposed Project could have an adverse impact on both sensitive structures (e.g., building damage) and populations (e.g., annoyance).

In terms of construction-related impacts on buildings, the City of Los Angeles has not adopted policies or guidelines relative to groundborne vibration. While the Los Angeles County Code (LACC Section 12.08.350) states a presumed perception threshold of 0.01 inch per second RMS, this threshold applies to

groundborne vibrations from long-term operational activities, not construction. Consequently, as both the City of Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles do not have a significance threshold to assess vibration impacts during construction, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and California Department of Transportation's (Caltrans) adopted vibration standards for buildings are used to evaluate potential impacts related to project construction. Based on the FTA and Caltrans criteria, construction impacts relative to groundborne vibration would be considered significant if the following were to occur:[55]

- Project construction activities would cause a PPV groundborne vibration level to exceed 0.5 inches per second (ips) at any building that is constructed with reinforced concrete, steel, or timber.
- Project construction activities would cause a PPV groundborne vibration level to exceed 0.3 ips at any engineered concrete and masonry buildings.
- Project construction activities would cause a PPV groundborne vibration level to exceed 0.2 ips at any nonengineered timber and masonry buildings.
- Project construction activities would cause a PPV ground-borne vibration level to exceed 0.12 ips at any historical building or building that is extremely susceptible to vibration damage.

In addition, the City of Los Angeles has not adopted any thresholds associated with human annoyance for groundborne vibration impacts. Therefore, this analysis uses the FTA's vibration impact thresholds for human annoyance. These thresholds include 80 VdB at residences and buildings where people normally sleep (e.g., nearby residences) and 83 VdB at institutional buildings, such as schools and churches. No thresholds have been adopted or recommended for commercial and office uses.

Table 4.12-5, Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment, identifies various PPV and RMS velocity (in VdB) levels for the types of construction equipment that would operate at the Project Site during construction. As shown in **Table 4.12-5,** vibration velocities could range from 0.003 to 0.089 ips PPV at 25 feet from the source activity, with corresponding vibration levels ranging from 58 VdB to 87 VdB at 25 feet from the source activity, depending on the type of construction equipment in use.

55 US Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, May 2006; and California Department of Transportation, *Transportation- and Construction-Induced Vibration Guidance Manual*, June 2004.

Table 4.12-5
Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

	Approximate PPV (in/sec)					Approximate RMS (VdB)				
Equipment	25 Feet	50 Feet	60 Feet	75 Feet	100 Feet	25 Feet	50 Feet	60 Feet	75 Feet	100 Feet
Caisson Drilling	0.089	0.031	0.024	0.017	0.011	87	78	76	73	69
Loaded Trucks	0.076	0.027	0.020	0.015	0.010	86	77	75	72	68
Excavator	0.040	0.014	0.011	0.008	0.005	80	71	69	66	62
Jackhammer	0.035	0.012	0.009	0.007	0.004	79	70	68	65	61
Small Bulldozer	0.003	0.001	0.0008	0.0006	0.0004	58	49	47	44	40

Source: Federal Transit Administration, *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, Final Report, 2006.

The existing house at 1316 N Lyman Place and multifamily residences adjacent to the Project Site are located within 25 feet of the Project Site (approximately 5 feet from excavator activities); vibration levels could reach 0.112 ips at these sensitive receptors (see **Appendix D**). As discussed previously, the most restrictive threshold for building damage from vibration is 0.12 ips PPV for historic buildings and buildings that are extremely susceptible to vibration damage. However, the existing house is not considered historic and vibration levels at the existing house would not exceed the building damage threshold. As maximum off-site vibration levels would not exceed 0.12PPV, there would be no potential for Project construction to result in vibration levels exceeding the most restrictive threshold of significance. Impacts with respect to building damage resulting from Project-generated vibration would be less than significant.

In terms of human annoyance resulting from vibration generated during construction, the single-family residential use and multifamily residences located approximately 5 feet southwest and south of the Project Site boundary could be exposed to increased vibration levels. As identified in **Table 4.12-5**, construction-generated vibration levels experienced at 1316 N Lyman Place and adjacent multi-family residences may exceed the 80 VdB thresholds for residential uses (where people normally sleep); a setback distance of 5 feet from excavator activities generates an RMS of 101 VdB using FTA methodologies. However, as expressed in the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance No. 144,331 and 161,574 which prohibits the emission or creation of noise beyond certain levels at adjacent uses unless technically infeasible. Also, construction activities will be limited to daytime hours when residents are likely out of their homes and not typically sleeping (7:00 AM to 6:00 PM Monday to Friday, and 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM Saturday). Additionally, construction activities will be phased so as to prevent the concurrent operation of vibration-generating equipment, consistent with FTA and City of LA recommendations. The City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance would serve to reduce construction-related vibration levels to the maximum extent feasible. Human annoyance impacts with respect to construction-generated vibration increases would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Operational Vibration

The Proposed Project would not involve the use of stationary equipment that would result in high vibration levels, which are more typical for large commercial and industrial projects. The Project will not result in an increase in traffic and therefore incremental increases would not exceed 2 percent of existing traffic volumes, and therefore groundborne vibration due to regular vehicle traffic would not be perceptible.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c. Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less than Significant with Project Mitigation. A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project were to result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels above existing ambient noise levels without the Proposed Project. As defined in the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide* threshold for operational noise impacts, a project would normally have a significant impact on noise levels from project operations if the project causes the ambient noise level measured at the property line of affected uses that are shown in **Table 4.12-6, Community Noise Exposure (CNEL)**, to increase by 3 dB(A) in CNEL to or within the "normally unacceptable" or "clearly unacceptable" category, or any 5 dB(A) or greater noise increase. Thus, a significant impact would occur if noise levels associated with operation of the Proposed Project would increase the ambient noise levels by 3 dB(A) CNEL at homes where the resulting noise level would be at least 70 dB(A) CNEL. In addition, any long-term increase of 5 dB(A) CNEL or more is considered to cause a significant impact. To achieve a 3 dB(A) CNEL increase in ambient noise from traffic, the volume on any given roadway would need to double. In addition to analyzing potential impacts in terms of CNEL, the analysis also addresses increases in on-site noise sources per the provisions of the LAMC, which establishes a Leq standard of 5 dB(A) over ambient conditions as constituting a LAMC violation.

Table 4.12-6
Community Noise Exposure (CNEL)

Land Use	Normally Acceptable[a]	Conditionally Acceptable[b]	Normally Unacceptable[c]	Clearly Unacceptable[d]
Single-family, duplex, mobile homes	50 - 60	55 - 70	70 - 75	above 75
Multifamily homes	50 - 65	60 - 70	70 - 75	above 75

Land Use	Normally Acceptable[a]	Conditionally Acceptable[b]	Normally Unacceptable[c]	Clearly Unacceptable[d]
Schools, libraries, churches, hospitals, nursing homes	50 - 70	60 - 70	70 - 80	above 80
Transient lodging—motels, hotels	50 - 65	60 - 70	70 - 80	above 75
Auditoriums, concert halls, and amphitheaters	---	50 - 70	---	above 70
Sports arena, outdoor spectator sports	---	50 - 75	---	above 75
Playgrounds, neighborhood parks	50 – 70	---	67 - 75	above 75
Golf courses, riding stables, water recreation, cemeteries	50 - 75	---	70 - 80	above 80
Office buildings, business, and professional commercial	50 - 70	67 - 77	above 75	---
Industrial, manufacturing, utilities, agriculture	50 - 75	70 - 80	above 75	---

Source: Office of Planning and Research, State of California Genera Plan Guidelines (in coordination with the California Department of Health Services) (October 2003); City of Los Angeles, General Plan Noise Element, adopted February 1999.

[a] Normally Acceptable: Specified land use is satisfactory, based on the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction without any special noise insulation requirements.

[b] Conditionally Acceptable: New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning, will normally suffice.

[c] Normally Unacceptable: New construction or development should generally be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and necessary noise insulation features included in the design.

[d] Clearly Unacceptable: New construction or development should generally not be undertaken.

Traffic Noise

For a new noise source to be audible, there would need to be a 3 dB(A) or greater CNEL noise increase. As discussed above, the traffic volume on any given roadway segment would need to double as a result of the Proposed Project for a 3 dB(A) increase in ambient noise to occur. According to the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, if a project would result in traffic that is less than double the existing traffic, then the project's mobile noise impacts can be assumed to be less than significant.

According to the Traffic Study provided for the Proposed Project and discussed in **Section 4.16 Traffic and Transportation**, the proposed development would result in no additional vehicle trips in the area. As discussed in **Section 4.16** of this Initial Study, the V/C ratio at the two signalized study intersections would either remain unchanged or incrementally, but not significantly, increase (less than a 2 percent increase at each studied intersection) with the addition of ambient future traffic, related project traffic and Project traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have the potential to double the traffic volumes on any roadway segment near the Project Site, and therefore would not have the potential to increase roadway noise levels by 3 dB(A). Traffic-generated noise impacts would be considered less than significant.

Operational Noise—Stationary Noise Sources

New stationary sources of noise, such as rooftop mechanical HVAC equipment for the elevator, would be installed on the proposed structure at the Project Site. The design of this equipment would be required to comply with Section 112.02 of the LAMC, which prohibits noise from air conditioning, refrigeration, heating, pumping, and filtering equipment from exceeding the ambient noise level on the premises of other occupied properties by more than 5 decibels. Because the noise levels generated by the HVAC equipment serving the Proposed Project would not be allowed to exceed the ambient noise level by 5 decibels on the premises of the adjacent properties, a substantial permanent increase in noise levels would not occur at the nearby sensitive receptors. Impacts would be less than significant.

Parking Garage Noise

Noise would be generated by activities within the new parking garage associated with the Proposed Project. Sources of noise within the parking structure would include engines accelerating, doors slamming, car alarms, and people talking. Noise levels within the parking areas would fluctuate with the amount of automobile and human activity. Noise levels would be highest in the early morning and evening when the largest number of people would enter and exit the Project Site. Because the subterranean parking levels serving the Project would be almost entirely underground and enclosed, noise generated at these levels would likely be imperceptible at ground-level locations on and adjacent to the Project Site. Any parking noise that may be audible from outside of the parking garage would be substantially similar to the existing noise generated at the surface parking lot on the Project Site. Operational-related noise generated by motor-driven vehicles within the Project Site is regulated under the LAMC. With regard to motor-driven vehicles, Section 114.02 of the LAMC prohibits the operation of any motor-driven vehicles on any property within the City such that the created noise would cause the noise level on the premises of any occupied residential property to exceed the ambient noise level by more than 5 decibels. The Proposed Project would implement mitigation measure **MM XII-40** and **MM XII-30** to reduce potential noise impacts from the parking ramp and at-grade parking spaces. These mitigation measures will require ramps be constructed of concrete, and not metal, as well as contain texture to prevent tire squealing. Also, the project will include the construction of a 6-foot high solid decorative masonry wall adjacent to residential use and/or zones in order to reduce noise levels to a level of insignificance.

Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measures **MM XII-40** and **MM XII-30** are proposed to further reduce the already less than significant noise impact.

d. Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less than Significant with Project Mitigation. As discussed in subsections 4.12(a) through (c), impacts are expected to be less than significant for construction noise and vibration, and operational noise and vibration. Implementation of mitigation measures **MM XII-20, MM XII-40,** and **MM XII-30** would ensure the Proposed Project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels.

Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measures **MM XII-40,** and **MM XII-30** are proposed to further reduce the already less than significant noise impact.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. A significant impact may occur if a Proposed Project were located within an airport land use plan and would introduce substantial new sources of noise or substantially add to existing sources of noise within or near a project site. There are no airports within a 2-mile radius of the Project Site, nor is the Project Site within any airport land use plan or airport hazard zone. The Proposed Project would not expose people to excessive noise levels associated with airport uses.

No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. This question would apply to a project only if it were in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would subject area residents and workers to a safety hazard. The Project Site is not located near a private airstrip.

No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Impact Analysis

a. Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

No Impact. The construction of a parking structure would not result in an increase in residents within the City of Los Angeles. As such, the Proposed Project would not cause unexpected growth (i.e., new housing or employment generators). The Proposed Project would not accelerate development in an undeveloped area that exceeds growth projections that would result in an adverse physical change in the environment or introduce unplanned infrastructure that was not previously evaluated in the adopted Community Plan or General Plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not induce substantial population growth.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project would result in the displacement of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Based on the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of whether a project results in a significant impact on population and housing displacement shall be made considering the following factors:

- The total number of residential units to be demolished, converted to market rate, or removed through other means as a result of the project, in terms of net loss of market-rate and affordable units.
- The current and anticipated housing demand and supply of market rate and affordable housing units in the project area.
- The land use and demographic characteristics of the project area and the appropriateness of housing in the area.
- Whether the project is consistent with adopted City and regional housing policies such as the *F*ramework and Housing Elements, Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Consolidated Plan and Comprehensive Housing Affordability Study (CHAS) policies, redevelopment plan, Rent Stabilization Ordinance, and SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide RCPG.

The Proposed Project would demolish an existing 1-story single-family residence on the Project Site. According to the City of Los Angeles Demographic Research Unit, estimated household size for occupied

units in the Hollywood Community Plan area is 2.21 people per household.[56] Based on this estimated household size, approximately 2.21 residents occupy the existing 1-story home. The Hollywood Community Plan area has more than adequate housing capacity to accommodate these existing residents. Therefore, the implementation of the Proposed Project would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c. Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Less than Significant Impact. As previously mentioned, the Proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing. As previously indicated, the growth projections for Hollywood indicate adequate housing is projected to accommodate growth projections. The existing residents account for a small number of people within the City.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

Impact Analysis

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a. Fire protection

Less than Significant Impact. Based on the *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant impact on fire protection if it requires the addition of a new fire station or the expansion, consolidation, or relocation of an existing facility to maintain service. The City of Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) considers fire protection services for a project adequate if a project is within the maximum response distance for the land use proposed. Pursuant to *LAMC* Section 57.09.07A, the maximum response distance between residential land uses and a LAFD fire station that houses an engine or truck company is 1.5 miles. If this distance were exceeded, all structures located in the applicable residential or commercial area would be required to install automatic fire sprinkler systems.

The Proposed Project would include a parking structure with 654 parking spaces. The Proposed Project would not generate any new residents; therefore, the Proposed Project would not potentially increase the demand for LAFD services. As demand for LAFD services would be similar existing conditions, no new LAFD facilities would be required.

The Project Site is served by LAFD Station No. 35 located at 1601 Hillhurst Avenue (at Hillhurst Avenue and Clayton Avenue), approximately 0.25 miles north of the Project Site. Station No. 35 is equipped with a task force truck and Engine Company, a paramedic rescue ambulance, and 12 LAFD personnel.[57] Based on the response distance criteria specified in LAMC 57.512.1 and the relatively short distance from Fire Station No. 35 to the Project Site, fire protection response would be considered adequate.[58]

The required fire flow necessary for fire protection varies with the type of development, life hazard, occupancy, and the degree of fire hazard. Pursuant to LAMC Section 57.507.3.1, City-established fire flow requirements vary from 2,000 gallons per minute (gpm) in low-density residential areas to 12,000 gpm in

57 City of Los Angeles, Draft Program Environmental Impact Report, Hollywood Community Plan Area, Hollywood Community Plan Update (2011).

58 LAMC, ch. 5, art. 7, Fire Protection and Prevention (Fire Code), sec. 57.512.1, Response Distances (2014).

high-density commercial or industrial areas. In any instance, a minimum residual water pressure of 20 pounds per square inch (psi) is to remain in the water system while the required gpm is flowing. The required minimum fire flow for the development is estimated to be approximately 4,000 gpm based on the Proposed Project's scale and density.[59] Any potential changes in existing hydrants along the Project frontage would be reviewed by the LAFD prior to site plan approval. Standard LAFD regulations, including fire flow would be applied to the Proposed Project as standard conditions of approval by the LAFD and the City Planning Department. However, the Project would include the incorporation of regulatory compliance measures that require the project be evaluated and approved by the Fire Department either prior to the recordation of a final map or the approval of a building permit. The plot plan shall include the following minimum design features: fire lanes, where required, shall be a minimum of 20 feet in width; all structures must be within 300 feet of an approved fire hydrant. In complying with this regulation, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b. Police protection.

Less than Significant with Project Mitigation. A significant impact may occur if the City of Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) could not adequately serve a project without necessitating a new or physically altered station, the construction of which may cause significant environmental impacts. Based on the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of whether the project results in a significant impact on police protection shall be made considering the following factors: (a) the population increase resulting from the project, based on the net increase of residential units or square footage of nonresidential floor area; (b) the demand for police services anticipated at the time of project build-out compared to the expected level of service available, considering, as applicable, scheduled improvements to LAPD services (facilities, equipment, and officers) and the project's proportional contribution to the demand; and (c) whether the project includes security and/or design features that would reduce the demand for police services.

The Project Site is located in the Northeast Community Area division of the LAPD's Central Bureau. The Northeast Community Area is approximately 29 square miles and includes the communities of Atwater, Cypress Park, Eagle Rock, East Hollywood, Echo Park, Elysian Park, Elysian Valley, Franklin Hills, Garvanza, Griffith Park, Glassell Park, Highland Park, Los Feliz, Mount Washington, Silver Lake, and Solano Canyon.[60] There are approximately 313 sworn police officers and 25 civilian support staff deployed over three watches at the Northeast Community Area.[61] The Project Site is served by the Northeast Community

59 LAMC, ch. 5, art. 7, Fire Protection and Prevention (Fire Code), sec. 57.507.3.1, Fire-Flow Requirements (2014).

60 Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), Central Bureau, "Northeast Community Police Station" (January 2015), http://lapdonline.org/northeast_community_police_station.

61 City of Los Angeles, Integrated Resources Plan, Environmental Impact Report (November 2005).

Police Station, located at 3353 San Fernando Road. Based on the residential service population of approximately 250,000 residents within the LAPD's Hollywood Community service area, the officer to resident ratio is approximately 1.25 officers per 1,000 residents. Within the Hollywood Area, the Proposed Project is located within Reporting District (RD) 1152.

Construction

Construction sites have the potential to attract trespassers and/or vandals that would potentially result in graffiti, excess trash, and potentially unsafe conditions for the public. Such occurrences would adversely affect the aesthetic character of the Project Site and surrounding area and could potentially cause public health and safety concerns, thereby increasing demand upon the local police department. As such, the Proposed Project is required by the Los Angeles Municipal Code to construct a fence around the site during construction to minimize trespassing, vandalism, short-cut attractions and attractive nuisances. This compliance measure would render impacts less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Operation

Response time represents the period of time elapsed from the initiation of an assistance call to the appearance of a police unit at the scene. Calls for police assistance are prioritized based on the nature of the call. Unlike fire protection services, as previously discussed, police units are most often in a mobile state; hence, actual distance between a headquarters facility and a given project site is of little relevance. Instead, the number of police officers out on the street is more directly related to the realized response time. The LAPD has a preferred response time of seven minutes to emergency calls. The Northeast Community Police Station currently meets this response time.[62]

Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in an increase of residents thereby generating a potential increase in the number of service calls from the Project Site. Since there is no increase in residents, the potential increase in the number of service calls from the Project Site would be anticipated to be less than significant. The Projected Project would not result in increased traffic, and therefore would not increase the number of traffic-related incidents. As demand for LAPD services would be similar existing conditions, no new LAPD facilities would be required.

The Proposed Project would install security gates at both access driveways at Lyman Place and Virgil Avenue to increase safety for the Proposed Project. Additionally, the design of the pedestrian entrances were intentional, as limited pedestrian walkways and entrances would concentrate foot traffic to a single

62 Los Angeles Police Department correspondence for Barlow Hospital Replacement and Master Plan Project (May 2010).

area and provide enhanced security to staff and visitors, by facilitating monitoring. However, responses to thefts, vehicle burglaries, vehicle damage, and crimes against persons could result due to on-site activity. As such, the plans shall incorporate the Design Guidelines relative to security, semi-public and private spaces, which may include, but not be limited to, access control to building, secured parking facilities, walls/fences with key systems, well-illuminated public and semi-public space designed with a minimum of dead space to eliminate areas of concealment, and provision of security guard patrol throughout the Project Site if needed. Applicant shall comply with the "*Design Out Crime Guidelines: Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design*", published by the Los Angeles Police Department. These measures shall be approved by the Police Department prior to the issuance of building permits. Compliance with such measures would render impacts to a level of insignificance.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c. Schools.

No Impacts. A significant impact may occur if a project includes substantial employment or population growth, which could generate a demand for school facilities that would exceed the capacity of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). Based on the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of whether the project results in a significant impact on public schools shall be made considering the following factors: (a) the population increase resulting from the project, based on the net increase of residential units or square footage of nonresidential floor area; (b) the demand for school services anticipated at the time of project build-out compared to the expected level of service available. Consider, as applicable, scheduled improvements to LAUSD services (facilities, equipment, and personnel) and the project's proportional contribution to the demand; (c) whether (and to the degree to which) accommodation of the increased demand would require construction of new facilities, a major reorganization of students or classrooms, major revisions to the school calendar (such as year-round sessions), or other actions that would create a temporary or permanent impact on the school(s); and (d) whether the project includes features that would reduce the demand for school services (e.g., on-site school facilities or direct support to LAUSD).

The Project area is currently served by several LAUSD public schools, as shown in **Table 4.14-1, LAUSD Public Schools Within the Project Area.**

During construction activities, the haul route for the Project Site would utilize Sunset Boulevard and Fountain Avenue toward the US 101. None of these schools is located within the haul route for the Project, and would not result in temporary impacts to school services.

Table 4.14-1
LAUSD Public Schools within the Project Area

School	Address	Distance from Project Site (miles)	Students Served
Alexandria Elementary School	4211 Oakwood Avenue	1.4	Kindergarten through fifth grade
Cheremoya Elementary School	6017 Franklin Avenue	2.0	Kindergarten through sixth grade
Franklin Avenue Elementary School	1910 N. Commonwealth Avenue	0.7	Kindergarten through fifth grade
Grant Elementary School	1530 N. Wilton Place	1.4	Kindergarten through sixth grade
Harvard Elementary School	330 N. Harvard Boulevard	1.6	Kindergarten through fifth grade
Kingsley Elementary School	5200 Virginia Avenue	0.9	Kindergarten through fifth grade
Lockwood Elementary School	4345 Lockwood Avenue	0.5	Kindergarten through sixth grade
Los Feliz STEMM Magnet School (Elementary)	1740 N. New Hampshire Avenue	0.5	Kindergarten through sixth grade
Ramona Elementary School	1133 N. Mariposa Avenue	0.7	Kindergarten through sixth grade
Van Ness Avenue Elementary	501 N. Van Ness Avenue	1.9	Kindergarten through fifth grade
Vine Street Elementary	955 N. Vine Street	2.3	Kindergarten through sixth grade
King Middle School	4201 Fountain Avenue	0.4	Sixth through eighth grade
Joseph Le Conte Middle School	1316 N. Bronson Avenue	1.6	Sixth through eighth grade
John Marshall High School	3939 Tracy Street	1.0	Ninth through twelfth grade
Helen Bernstein High School	1309 N. Wilton Place	1.5	Ninth through twelfth grade

Source: Los Angeles Unified School District (Accessed January 2, 2015), http://notebook.lausd.net/schoolsearch/selector.jsp

The Proposed Project would not generate any residents; therefore, the Project would not generate any additional students. The demand for school services would not be increased and the need for new school facilities would not be required.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d. Parks

No Impact. Based on the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of whether the project results in a significant impact on recreation and parks shall be made considering the following factors: (a) the net population increase resulting from the project; (b) the demand for recreation and park services anticipated at the time of project build-out compared to the expected level of service available. Consider, as applicable, scheduled improvements to recreation and park services (renovation, expansion, or addition) and the project's proportional contribution to the demand; and (c) whether the project includes features that would reduce the demand for park services (e.g., on-site recreation facilities, land dedication, or direct financial support to the Department of Recreation and Parks).

As discussed in **Section 4.13, Population and Housing,** the development of the Proposed Project would not include any residential units. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in an increase of new residents to the Hollywood Community Plan Area. The Proposed Project would not generate a demand on recreational resources or a need for additional parkland.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e. Other public services

Libraries

No Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project includes substantial employment or population growth that could generate a demand for other public facilities (such as libraries), that would exceed the capacity available to serve the Project Site. Based on the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide,* the determination of whether the project results in a significant impact on libraries shall be made considering the following factors: (a) the net population increase resulting from the project; (b) the demand for library services anticipated at the time of project build-out compared to the expected level of service available. Consider, as applicable, scheduled improvements to existing library services (renovation, expansion, addition or relocation) and the project's proportional contribution to the demand; and (c) whether the project

includes features that would reduce the demand for library services (e.g., on-site library facilities or direct financial support to the Los Angeles Public Library [LAPL]).

The Proposed Project would not generate an increase in population and therefore would not increase the demand for library services.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.15 RECREATION

Impact Analysis

a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

No Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project includes substantial employment or population growth, which would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. Based on the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of whether the project results in a significant impact on recreation and parks shall be made considering the following factors: (a) the net population increase resulting from the project; (b) the demand for recreation and park services anticipated at the time of project completion and occupancy compared to the expected level of service available, considering, as applicable, scheduled improvements to recreation and park services (renovation, expansion, or addition) and the project's proportional contribution to the demand; and (c) whether the project includes features that would reduce the demand for park services (e.g., on-site recreation facilities, land dedication, or direct financial support to the Department of Recreation and Parks).

The Proposed Project would not generate an increase in population, and therefore would not increase the demand for recreation services.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

No Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project includes the construction or expansion of park facilities and such construction would have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

The Proposed Project does not include recreational facilities. As stated previously, the Proposed Project would not generate an increase in population, and therefore would not generate an increase in demand for existing for existing park or recreation facilities that would require the construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.16 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Impact Analysis

a. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

The following section summarizes and incorporates by reference information from the *Traffic Assessment for the Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center, Virgil Avenue Parking Garage Project, Hollywood, California* (Traffic Study) dated January 2015 and prepared by Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc.[63] The Traffic Study is included as **Appendix E** to this Initial Study.

Less than Significant with Project Mitigation. A significant impact could occur if a project were to result in substantial increases in traffic volumes near the project such that the existing street capacity experiences a decrease in the existing volume to capacity ratios (V/C), or experiences increased traffic congestion exceeding the Los Angeles Department of Transportation's (LADOT's) recommended level of service. Based on the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of whether the project results in a significant impact is based on whether an increase in the V/C ratio on the intersection operating condition would result after the addition of project traffic of one of the following:

- V/C ratio increase > 0.040 if final LOS[64] is C
- V/C ratio increase > 0.020 if final LOS is D
- V/C ratio increase > 0.010 if final LOS is E or F

LADOT has developed a sliding scale methodology in which the minimum allowable increase in the V/C ratio attributable to a project decreases as the V/C ratio of the intersection increases.

The level of service definitions for intersections may be found in **Table 4.16-1, Level of Service Definitions for Intersections.**

63 Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., *Traffic Assessment for Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center, Virgil Avenue Parking Garage Project, Hollywood, California* (January 2015). See Appendix E.

64 "Final LOS" is defined as projected future conditions, which include project, ambient, and related project growth but do not include project traffic mitigation.

Table 4.16-1
Level of Service Definitions for Intersections

Level of Service	Signalized V/C Ratio	Definition	Unsignalized Intersections Delay (seconds)
A	0.000–0.600	EXCELLENT. No vehicle waits longer than one red light and no approach phase is fully used	0-10
B	0.601–0.700	VERY GOOD. An occasional approach phase is fully utilized; many drivers begin to feel somewhat restricted within groups of vehicles.	10-15
C	0.707–0.800	GOOD. Occasionally drivers may have to wait through more than one red light; backups may develop behind turning vehicles.	15-25
D	0.801–0.900	FAIR. Delays may be substantial during portions of the rush hours, but enough lower-volume periods occur to permit clearing of developing lines, preventing excessive backups.	25-35
E	0.901–1.000	POOR. Represents the most vehicles intersection approaches can accommodate; may be long lines of waiting vehicles through several signal cycles.	35-50
F	> 1.000	FAILURE. Backups from nearby locations or on cross streets may restrict or prevent movement of vehicles out of the intersection approaches. Tremendous delays with continuously increasing queue lengths.	>50

Source: Traffic Assessment for the Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center, Virgil Avenue Parking Garage Project, Hollywood, California (January 2015).

Estimated Trip Generation

As shown in **Appendix E**, The Proposed Project is not expected to generate new trips as no demand-inducing land uses are proposed. Proposed Project traffic would consist of existing inbound and outbound traffic to and from the main parking area on the HPMC campus, and would represent a redistribution of existing traffic from the HPMC garage to a combination of the HPMC garage and the Proposed Project. **Table 4-16.2, Driveway Volume Estimates**, provides a summary of the existing and proposed peak hour volumes entering and exiting the existing and proposed driveways. As shown in Table 5, the Proposed Project would not generate any additional traffic, and instead will redistribute existing traffic flows around the HPMC campus.[65]

65 Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., *Traffic Assessment for Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center, Virgil Avenue Parking Garage Project, Hollywood, California* (January 2015). See Appendix E.

Table 4.16-2
Driveway Volume Estimates

Land Use	AM Peak-Hour Trips			PM Peak-Hour Trips		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Existing Peak Hour Driveway Volumes						
North HPMC Driveway	85	26	111	38	86	124
East HPMC Driveway	11	0	11	0	11	11
Southwest HPMC Driveway	113	50	163	76	105	181
Southeast HPMC Driveway	79	59	138	20	79	99
Total Existing Driveway Volumes	**288**	**135**	**423**	**134**	**281**	**415**
Proposed Peak Hour Driveway Volumes						
North HPMC Driveway	51	10	61	22	52	74
East HPMC Driveway	11	0	11	0	11	11
Southwest HPMC Driveway	56	23	79	49	49	98
Southeast HPMC Driveway	56	48	104	9	57	66
West Virgil Garage Driveway	75	35	110	35	73	108
East Virgil Garage Driveway	41	19	60	19	39	58
Total Proposed Driveway Volumes[1,2]	**290**	**135**	**425**	**134**	**281**	**415**

Source: Traffic Assessment for the Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center, Virgil Avenue Parking Garage Project, Hollywood, California (January 2015).
Note:
[1] *Proposed driveway volumes include a 40% shift of traffic from main HPMC campus to Virgil Garage*
[2] *Background rounding leads to discrepancy in total driveway volumes, higher volumes represent worst-case scenario.*

Construction—Traffic

The Proposed Project would require the use of haul trucks during site clearing and excavation and the use of a variety of other construction vehicles throughout the construction of the Proposed Project. The addition of these vehicles into the street system would contribute to increased traffic in the Project vicinity. The haul trips would occur outside of the peak hours and during the permissible hauling hours identified in the haul route to be approved by the Department of Building and Safety. The Proposed Project's construction trip traffic would be a fraction of the operational traffic, which would not cause any significant impacts at the studied intersection. Therefore, it is not anticipated that they could contribute to a significant increase in the overall congestion in the Project vicinity. In addition, any truck trips would be limited to the length of time required for the Project's construction. Due to the off-peak and temporary nature of the traffic, the Proposed Project would incorporate mitigation measure **MM XVI-30**.

Impacts would less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measure is proposed to reduce the already less than significant transportation and traffic impact.

MM XVI-30 Transportation (Haul Route)

- The developer shall install traffic signs in accordance with the LAMC around the site to ensure pedestrian and vehicle safety.

Operational Traffic

Twelve study intersections were identified, in conjunction with LADOT staff, for inclusion in the traffic analysis. The analyzed locations are shown in the Traffic Study and correspond to locations where potential traffic impacts from the Proposed Project are most likely to occur. The following 12 intersections, including four existing and two proposed HPMC driveways, that were identified for analysis are as follows:

1. Vermont Avenue & De Longpre Avenue
2. North HPMC Driveway & De Longpre Avenue (existing driveway)
3. Lyman Place & De Longpre Avenue
4. Virgil Avenue & De Longpre Avenue
5. Lyman Place & East HPMC Driveway (existing driveway)
6. Vermont Avenue & Fountain Avenue
7. Southwest HPMC Driveway & Fountain Avenue (existing driveway)
8. Southeast HPMC Driveway & Fountain Avenue (existing driveway)
9. Lyman Place & Fountain Avenue
10. Virgil Avenue & Fountain Avenue
11. West Virgil Garage Driveway & Lyman Place (proposed driveway)
12. East Virgil Garage Driveway & Virgil Avenue (proposed driveway)

Existing Conditions

Table 4.16-3, Existing Conditions (Year 2015) Signalized Intersection Levels of Service (LOS), summarizes the weekday morning and afternoon peak-hour LOS results for each of the signalized study intersections under existing conditions.

Table 4.16-3
Existing Conditions (Year 2015)
Signalized Intersection Levels of Service (LOS)

No.	Intersection	Peak Hour	Existing Conditions V/C	Existing Conditions LOS
6	Vermont Avenue & Fountain Avenue[1]	AM	0.574	A
		PM	0.747	C
10	Virgil Avenue & Fountain Avenue	AM	0.507	A
		PM	0.503	A

Source: Traffic Assessment for the Virgil Avenue Parking Structure Project, Los Angeles, California (January 2015).
Note:
[1] *Field observations showed traffic from every phase clearing the signal. LOS results are accurate.*

Additionally, **Table 4.16-4, Existing Conditions (Year 2015) Unsignalized Intersection Levels of Service (LOS)**, summarizes the weekday morning and afternoon peak-hour LOS results for each of the unsignalized study intersections under existing conditions. As indicated in **Table 4.16-4**, the 10 study intersections currently operate at LOS C or better during both the morning and afternoon peak hours.

Table 4.16-4
Existing Conditions (Year 2015)
Unsignalized Intersection Levels of Service (LOS)

			Existing Conditions	
No.	Intersection	Peak Hour	Delay[1]	LOS
1	Vermont Avenue & De Longpre Avenue	AM	0.9	A
		PM	0.9	A
2	North HPMC Driveway & De Longpre Avenue	AM	7.2	A
		PM	7.3	A
3	Lyman Place & De Longpre Avenue	AM	7.4	A
		PM	7.9	A
4	Virgil Avenue & De Longpre Avenue	AM	1.0	A
		PM	2.0	A
5	Lyman Place & East HPMC Driveway	AM	0.4	A
		PM	0.6	A
7	Southwest HPMC Driveway & Fountain Avenue	AM	1.4	A
		PM	1.5	A
8	Southeast HPMC Driveway & Fountain Avenue	AM	1.3	A
		PM	0.9	A
9	Lyman Place & Fountain Avenue	AM	1.5	A
		PM	2.1	A

Source: Traffic Assessment for the Virgil Avenue Parking Structure Project, Los Angeles, California (January 2015).
Note:
[1] *Delay reported is average intersection delay.*

Existing with Project Intersection Levels of Service

Table 4.16-5, Existing and Existing with Project Signalized Intersection Level of Service, summarizes the results of the Existing with Project conditions during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours for the two signalized study intersections. The two signalized study intersections are expected to continue to operate at LOS C or better during both the morning and afternoon peak hours under Existing with Project conditions.

Table 4.16-6, Existing and Existing with Project Unsignalized Intersection Level of Service, summarizes the results of the Existing with Project conditions during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours for the 10 unsignalized study intersections. The 10 unsignalized study intersections are expected to continue to operate at LOS C or better during both the morning and afternoon peak hours under Existing with Project conditions.

As detailed in **Tables 4.16-5** and **4.16-6**, when measuring the Existing with Project conditions against Existing conditions, the Project is not anticipated to result in a significant traffic impact at any of the 12 study intersections. Incremental, but not significant, impacts are noted at the study intersections. Because there are no significant impacts, no traffic mitigation measures are required or recommended for the study intersections under the Existing with Project conditions.

Future without Project Intersection Levels of Service

Table 4.16-7, Future without Project (Year 2016) Signalized Intersection Levels of Service, summarizes the weekday morning and afternoon peak-hour LOS results for each of the two signalized study intersections under Future without Project Conditions. **Table 4.16-8, Future without Project (Year 2016) Unsignalized Intersection Levels of Service,** summarizes the weekday morning and afternoon peak-hour LOS results for each of the 10 unsignalized study intersections under Future without Project Conditions. **Tables 4.16-7** and **4.16-8** indicate that 9 out of 10 unsignalized study intersections are projected to operate at LOS A during both the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours. The remaining intersection would operate at LOS B during the weekday morning peak hours and LOS C during the weekday afternoon peak hours.

Table 4.16-5
Existing and Existing with Project Signalized Intersection Levels of Service

			Existing Conditions		Existing With Project Conditions			
No.	**Intersection**	**Peak Hour**	**V/C**	**LOS**	**V/C**	**LOS**	**Change in V/C**	**Impact**
6	Vermont Avenue & Fountain Avenue	AM	0.574	A	0.574	A	0.000	NO
		PM	0.747	C	0.747	C	0.000	NO
10	Virgil Avenue & Fountain Avenue	AM	0.507	A	0.517	A	0.010	NO
		PM	0.503	A	0.502	A	-0.001	NO

Source: Traffic Assessment for the Virgil Avenue Parking Structure Project, Los Angeles, California (January 2015).

[1] Delay reported is average intersection delay.

Table 4.16-6
Existing and Existing with Project Unsignalized Intersection Levels of Service

			Existing Conditions		Existing With Project Conditions			
No.	Intersection	Peak Hour	Delay[1]	LOS	Delay[1]	LOS	Change in Delay	Impact
1	Vermont Avenue & De Longpre Avenue	AM	0.9	A	0.7	A	-0.2	NO
		PM	0.9	A	0.9	A	0.0	NO
2	North HPMC Driveway & De Longpre Avenue	AM	7.2	A	7.2	A	0.0	NO
		PM	7.3	A	7.2	A	-0.1	NO
3	Lyman Place & De Longpre Avenue	AM	7.4	A	7.5	A	0.1	NO
		PM	7.9	A	7.9	A	0.0	NO
4	Virgil Avenue & De Longpre Avenue	AM	1.0	A	1.2	A	0.2	NO
		PM	2.0	A	2.1	A	0.1	NO
5	Lyman Place & East HPMC Driveway	AM	0.4	A	0.3	A	-0.1	NO
		PM	0.6	A	0.6	A	0.0	NO
7	Southwest HPMC Driveway & Fountain Avenue	AM	1.4	A	0.6	A	-0.8	NO
		PM	1.5	C	0.8	A	-0.7	NO
8	Virgil Avenue & Fountain Avenue	AM	1.3	A	0.9	A	-0.4	NO
		PM	0.9	A	0.6	A	-0.3	NO
9	Lyman Place & Fountain Avenue	AM	1.5	A	2.3	A	0.8	NO
		PM	2.1	A	3.3	A	1.2	NO
11	Lyman Place & West Virgil Garage Driveway	AM	—	—	2.1	A	—	NO
		PM	—	—	3.1	A	—	NO
12	Virgil Avenue & East Virgil Garage Driveway	AM	—	—	0.4	A	—	NO
		PM	—	—	0.5	A	—	NO

Source: Traffic Assessment for the Virgil Avenue Parking Structure Project, Los Angeles, California (January 2015).

[1] *Delay reported is average intersection delay.*

Table 4.16-7
Future without Project (Year 2016)
Signalized Intersection Levels of Service

			Future without Project Conditions	
No.	**Intersection**	**Peak Hour**	**V/C**	**LOS**
6	Vermont Avenue & Fountain Avenue	AM	0.600	B
		PM	0.781	C
10	Virgil Avenue & Fountain Avenue	AM	0.532	A
		PM	0.527	A

Source: Traffic Assessment for the Virgil Avenue Parking Structure Project, Los Angeles, California (January 2015).

Table 4.16-8
Future without Project (Year 2016)
Unsignalized Intersection Levels of Service

			Future without Project Conditions	
No.	**Intersection**	**Peak Hour**	**Delay[1]**	**LOS**
1	Vermont Avenue & De Longpre Avenue	AM	0.8	A
		PM	1.0	A
2	North HPMC Driveway & De Longpre Avenue	AM	7.2	A
		PM	7.3	A
3	Lyman Place & De Longpre Avenue	AM	7.5	A
		PM	7.9	A
4	Virgil Avenue & De Longpre Avenue	AM	1.0	A
		PM	2.1	A
5	Lyman Place & East HPMC Driveway	AM	0.4	A
		PM	0.6	A
7	Southwest HPMC Driveway & Fountain Avenue	AM	1.3	A
		PM	1.6	A
8	Southeast HPMC Driveway & Fountain Avenue	AM	1.2	A
		PM	0.9	A
9	Lyman Place & Fountain Avenue	AM	1.5	A
		PM	2.3	A

Source: Traffic Assessment for the Virgil Avenue Parking Structure Project, Los Angeles, California (January 2015).

[1] *Delay reported is average intersection delay.*

Future with Project Intersection Levels of Service

Table 4.16-9, Future with and without Project Conditions (Year 2016) Signalized Intersection Analysis, compares the results of the Future with Project conditions to Future without Project conditions during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours for the two signalized study intersections. Both intersections are expected to continue to operate at LOS C or better during both the morning and afternoon peak hours under Future with Project conditions. As detailed in **Table 4.16-9**, when measuring the Future with Project conditions against Future without Project conditions, the V/C ratio at one of the two signalized study intersections would increase only incrementally with the addition of Project traffic and the V/C ratio at the other signalized study intersection would not increase with the addition of Project traffic. Therefore, the Project is not anticipated to result in a significant traffic impact at any of the two signalized study intersections and impacts would be less than significant.

Table 4.16-10, Future with and without Project Conditions (Year 2016) Unsignalized Intersection Analysis, compares the results of the Future with Project conditions to Future without Project conditions during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours for the eight unsignalized study intersections. All 10 unsignalized intersections are expected to continue to operate at LOS A during both the morning and afternoon peak hours under Future with Project conditions. As detailed in **Table 4.16-10**, when measuring the Future with Project conditions against Future without Project conditions, the delay at unsignalized study intersections would increase only incrementally with the addition of Project traffic and in some cases the delay would remain the same and even decrease with the addition of Project traffic. Therefore, the Project is not anticipated to result in a significant traffic impact at any of the 10 unsignalized study intersections and impacts would be less than significant.

Table 4.16-9
Future with and without Project Conditions (Year 2016) Signalized Intersection Analysis

			Future Base (Without Project) Conditions		Future With Project Conditions			
No.	Intersection	Peak Hour	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	Change in V/C	Impact
6	Vermont Avenue & Fountain Avenue	AM	0.600	B	0.600	A	0.000	NO
		PM	0.781	C	0.781	C	0.000	NO
10	Virgil Avenue & Fountain Avenue	AM	0.532	A	0.543	A	0.011	NO
		PM	0.527	A	0.527	A	0.000	NO

Source: Traffic Assessment for the Virgil Avenue Parking Structure Project, Los Angeles, California (January 2015).

Table 4.16-10
Future with and without Project Conditions(Year 2016) Unsignalized Intersection Analysis

			Future Base (Without Project) Conditions		Future With Project Conditions			
No.	Intersection	Peak Hour	Delay[1]	LOS	Delay[1]	LOS	Change in Delay	Impact
1	Vermont Avenue & De Longpre Avenue	AM	0.8	A	0.8	A	0.0	NO
		PM	1.0	A	1.0	A	0.0	NO
2	North HPMC Driveway & De Longpre Avenue	AM	7.2	A	7.2	A	0.1	NO
		PM	7.3	A	7.2	A	-0.1	NO
3	Lyman Place & De Longpre Avenue	AM	7.5	A	4.5	A	0.0	NO
		PM	7.9	A	8.0	A	0.1	NO
4	Virgil Avenue & De Longpre Avenue	AM	1.0	A	1.2	A	0.2	NO
		PM	2.1	A	2.2	A	0.1	NO
5	Lyman Place & East HPMC Driveway	AM	0.4	A	0.3	A	-0.1	NO
		PM	0.6	A	0.5	A	-0.1	NO
7	Southwest HPMC Driveway & Fountain Avenue	AM	1.3	A	0.6	A	-0.7	NO
		PM	1.6	A	0.8	A	-0.8	NO
8	Southeast HPMC Driveway & Fountain Avenue	AM	1.2	A	0.9	A	-0.3	NO
		PM	0.9	A	0.7	A	-0.2	NO
9	Lyman Place & Fountain Avenue	AM	1.5	A	2.3	A	0.8	NO
		PM	2.3	A	3.6	A	1.3	NO
11	Lyman Place & West Virgil Garage Driveway	AM	—	—	2.1	A	—	NO
		PM	—	—	3.1	A	—	NO
12	Virgil Avenue & East Virgil Garage Driveway	AM	—	—	0.4	A	—	NO
		PM	—	—	0.5	A	—	NO

Source: Traffic Assessment for the Virgil Avenue Parking Structure Project, Los Angeles, California (January 2015).

[1] *Delay reported is average intersection delay.*

Congestion Management Plan Analysis

The Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP) requires that a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) be performed on three types of facilities: arterial intersections, mainline freeway segments, and the public transit system.[66]

Arterial Intersections

The CMP requires that a TIA be performed for all CMP arterial-monitoring intersections where a project would add 50 or more trips during either the weekday morning or afternoon peak hours. A detailed analysis is not required if the project adds fewer than 50 trips to an arterial monitoring Intersection. Significant impact requiring mitigation occurs if project traffic causes an incremental increase in intersection V/C ratio of 0.02 or greater to a facility projected to operate at LOS F (V/C > 1.00) after the addition of project traffic.

The CMP identifies the following arterial monitoring intersections within approximately 2.5 miles of the Project Site:

- Western Avenue & Santa Monica Boulevard (1.02 miles southwest of the Project Site)

As shown in **Table 4.16-2**, the Project would not generate any additional traffic; therefore, the Project would not add 50 peak hour trips to any intersection. The Project's CMP arterial intersection impacts are considered less than significant, and no further analysis is required.

Mainline Freeway Segments

The CMP requires that a TIA be performed for all CMP mainline freeway monitoring locations where a project would add 150 or more trips (in either direction) during the weekday morning or afternoon peak hours. A detailed analysis is not required if the project adds fewer than 150 trips to a mainline freeway monitoring location. Similar to arterial monitoring intersections, a significant impact requiring mitigation occurs if project traffic causes an incremental increase in intersection V/C ratio of 0.02 or greater to a facility projected to operate at LOS F (V/C > 1.00) after the addition of project traffic.

The CMP identifies one freeway mainline monitoring location within the vicinity of the Project Site. The monitoring location is on US 101 at Santa Monica Boulevard, approximately 0.9 miles southwest of the Project Site. As shown in **Table 4.16-2**, the Project would not generate any new trips; therefore, the Project would not add 150 peak hour trips to any freeway monitoring station and no additional freeway analysis is required under the CMP criteria for existing or future conditions.

66 Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, *2010 Congestion Management Program,* 2010.

Regional Transit Impact Analysis

The CMP requires that a transit system analysis be performed to determine whether a project would increase transit ridership beyond the current capacity of the transit system. An analysis of potential Proposed Project impacts on the transit system was also performed, per the CMP requirements and guidelines. The CMP provides a methodology for estimating the number of transit trips expected to result from a proposed project based on the number of vehicle trips. This methodology assumes an average vehicle occupancy (AVO) factor of 1.4 to estimate the number of person-trips to and from the Project. As shown in **Table 4.16-2**, the Project would not generate any new trips; therefore, no regional transit impact is possible. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not cause the capacity of the transit system to be substantially exceeded, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b. Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

No Impact. As discussed in Section 4.16(a), no CMP freeway monitoring segment or intersection analysis is required, and there would be no Project-related impacts to the CMP. The Proposed Project would not conflict with any travel demand measures.

No Impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c. Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

No Impact. This question would apply to the Proposed Project only if it involved an aviation-related use or would influence changes to existing flight paths. No aviation-related use would occur.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less than Significant Impacts with Project Mitigation. A significant impact may occur if a project includes new roadway design or introduces a new land use or features into an area with specific transportation requirements and characteristics that have not been previously experienced in that area, or if project site access or other features were designed in such a way as to create hazard conditions. The Proposed Project would not include unusual or hazardous design features. However, the Proposed Project will include two new vehicular access driveways to the Project Site that, if not properly designed and constructed, could potentially conflict with pedestrian circulation in the Project area. With proper site planning and implementation of mitigation measure **MM XVI-40**, potential vehicle-pedestrian conflicts will be mitigated to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measure is proposed to reduce the already less than significant transportation and traffic impact.

MM XVI-40 Safety Hazards

- The developer shall install appropriate traffic signs around the site to ensure pedestrian and vehicle safety.
- The Applicant shall submit a parking and driveway plan that incorporates design features that reduce accidents, to the Bureau of Engineering and the Department of Transportation for approval.

e. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Less than Significant Impacts with Project Mitigation. A significant impact may occur if a project design would not provide emergency access meeting the requirements of the LAFD, or in any other way threatened the ability of emergency vehicles to access and serve the project site or adjacent uses.

As stated in **Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials**, the Proposed Project is not located on or near an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.[67] Development of the Project Site may require temporary and/or partial street closures along De Longpre Avenue due to construction activities. While such closures may cause temporary inconvenience, they would not be expected to substantially interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans. The Project Site is located approximately 0.25 miles east of Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center and Children's Hospital Los Angeles, located at 1300 Vermont

67 City of Los Angeles General Plan, "*Safety Element*," Exhibit H, Critical Facilities and Lifeline Systems in the City of Los Angeles, http://cityplanning.lacity.org/cwd/gnlpln/saftyelt.pdf.

Avenue, and east of Hollywood Community Hospital located at 4650 Sunset Boulevard. The Proposed Project would not cause permanent alterations to vehicular circulation routes and patterns and/or impede public access or travel on public rights-of-way. Development of the Proposed Project may temporarily affect access on De Longpre Avenue during construction. However, these potential impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measure **MM VIII-80**.

As described previously, the Proposed Project would satisfy the emergency response requirements of the LAFD. There are no hazardous design features included in the access design or site plan for the Proposed Project that could impede emergency access. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would be subject to the site plan review requirements of the LAFD and the LAPD to ensure that all access roads, driveways, and parking areas would remain accessible to emergency service vehicles. The Proposed Project would not be expected to result in inadequate emergency access.

Impacts would be less than significant mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measure **MM VIII-80** is proposed.

f. Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

No Impact. For the purpose of this Initial Study, a significant impact may occur if a project would conflict with adopted policies or involve modification of existing alternative transportation facilities located on or off site.

The Proposed Project would not require the disruption of public transportation services or the alteration of public transportation routes. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would not interfere with any Class I or Class II bikeway systems nor would it interfere with pedestrian facilities.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Impact Analysis

a. Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

No Impact. A significant impact would occur if a project exceeds wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB. According to Section 13260 of the California Water Code, persons discharging or proposing to discharge waste that could affect the quality of the waters of the State, other than into a community sewer system, shall file a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) containing information, which may be required by the appropriate RWQCB. The RWQCB then authorizes an NPDES permit that ensures compliance with wastewater treatment and discharge requirements. The LARWQCB enforces wastewater treatment and discharge requirements for properties in the Project area.

Wastewater from the Project Site is conveyed via municipal sewage infrastructure maintained by the Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation to the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP). The HTP is a public facility and, therefore, is subject to the State's wastewater treatment requirements. Wastewater from the Project Site would continue to be treated according to the wastewater treatment requirements enforced by the LARWQCB.

The Proposed Project is a parking structure that would not generate any wastewater. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b. Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project would increase water consumption or wastewater generation to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the project site would be exceeded. Based on the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of whether the project results in a significant impact on water shall be made considering the following factors: (a) the total estimated water demand for the project; (b) whether sufficient capacity exists in the water infrastructure that would serve the project, taking into account the anticipated conditions at project build-out; (c) the amount by which the project would cause the projected growth in population, housing, or employment for the Hollywood

Community Plan area to be exceeded in the year of the project completion; and (d) the degree to which scheduled water infrastructure improvements or project design features would reduce or offset service impacts.

Water Treatment Facilities and Existing Infrastructure

LADWP ensures the reliability and quality of its water supply through an extensive distribution system that includes more than 7,100 miles of pipes, more than 100 storage tanks and reservoirs within the City, and eight storage reservoirs along the Los Angeles Aqueducts. Much of the water flows north to south, entering Los Angeles in Sylmar at the Los Angeles Aqueduct Filtration Plant (LAAFP) in Sylmar, which is owned and operated by the LADWP. Water entering the LAAFP undergoes treatment and disinfection before being distributed throughout the LADWP's Water Service Area. The LAAFP has the capacity to treat approximately 600 million gallons per day (mgd). The average plant flow is approximately 450 mgd during the non-summer months and 550 mgd during the summer months; thus, the plant operates at between 75 and 90 percent capacity, respectively. Therefore, the LAAFP has a remaining treatment capacity of approximately 50 to 150 mgd, depending on the season.

The Proposed Project would require the use of water utilities for the 5,679 square feet of landscaping and automatic fire sprinkler systems. While landscaping and sprinklers would require the use of water supplies, the Proposed Project would not have any bathroom facilities, which would result in wastewater generation and implementation of the Proposed Project would not reduce the LAAFP's capacity of 600 mgd; therefore, no new or expanded water treatment facilities would be required.

The Proposed Project is a parking structure that does not have specific requirements for minimum fire flow.[68] The existing fire hydrants located along De Longpre Avenue and Lyman Place[69] would service the Proposed Project; no new public fire hydrant installations are anticipated for the Proposed Project.

In the event that any further water main and/or other infrastructure upgrades are required for the proposed development, such infrastructure improvements would be conducted within the right-of-way easements serving the Project area and would not create a significant impact to the physical environment. This is largely due to the fact that any disruption of service would be of a short-term nature, the replacement of the water mains would be within public rights-of-way, and any foreseeable infrastructure improvements would be limited to the immediate Project vicinity.

---

68 LAMC, ch. 5, art. 7, Fire Protection and Prevention (Fire Code), sec. 57.507.3.1, Fire-Flow Requirements (2014).

69 City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, City of Los Angeles Fire Hydrants ArcGIS, Accessed January 5, 2015, http://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=750fb02425724ab49a6e2c04fd6534bf.

Wastewater Treatment Facilities and Existing Infrastructure

Based on the criteria established in the *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant wastewater impact if (a) the project would cause a measurable increase in wastewater flows to a point where, and a time when, a sewer's capacity is already constrained or that would cause a sewer's capacity to become constrained; or (b) the project's additional wastewater flows would substantially or incrementally exceed the future scheduled capacity of any one treatment plant by generating flows greater than those anticipated in the Wastewater Facilities Plan or General Plan and its elements.

The Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation provides sewer service to the Proposed Project area. Sewage from the Project Site is conveyed via sewer infrastructure to the HTP. The HTP treats an average daily flow of 362 mgd and has the capacity to treat 450 mgd.[70] This equals a remaining capacity of 88 mgd of wastewater able to be treated at the HTP.[71]

The Proposed Project would require the use of water utilities for the 5,679 square feet of landscaping and automatic fire sprinkler systems. While landscaping and sprinklers would require the use of water supplies, the Proposed Project would not have any bathroom facilities, which would result in wastewater generation. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not reduce the available capacity treated at HTP; therefore, no new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities would be required.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c. Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No Impact. A significant impact may occur if the volume of stormwater runoff would increase to a level exceeding the capacity of the storm drain system serving a project site, resulting in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities. As described previously, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant increase in site runoff, or any changes in the local drainage patterns. Runoff from the Project Site currently is and would continue to be collected on the site and directed toward existing storm drains in the Project vicinity. The Proposed Project will be required to demonstrate compliance with Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance standards and retain or treat the first 3/4-inch of rainfall in a 24-hour

70 City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, Hyperion Treatment Plant, Accessed January 1, 2014, *http://san.lacity.org/lasewers/treatment_plants/hyperion/index.htm.*

71 City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, Hyperion Treatment Plant, Accessed January 1, 2014, *http://san.lacity.org/lasewers/treatment_plants/hyperion/index.htm.*

period. Thus, the rate of post-development runoff and pollutants from the multifamily buildings and parking areas would be reduced under the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project would not create or contribute water runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new and expanded entitlements needed?

Less Than Significant. A significant impact may occur if a project would increase water consumption to such a degree that new water sources would need to be identified. Based on the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of whether the project results in a significant impact on water shall be made considering the following factors: (a) the total estimated water demand for the project; (b) whether sufficient capacity exists in the water infrastructure that would serve the project, taking into account the anticipated conditions at project completion; (c) the amount by which the project would cause the projected growth in population, housing, or employment for the Community Plan area to be exceeded in the year of the project completion; and (d) the degree to which scheduled water infrastructure improvements or project design features would reduce or offset service impacts.

According to the City's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the City's projected demand for water, during dry seasons would be 2,236,000 acre-feet per year (afy) for 2015 and 2,188,000 afy for 2020.[72]

The Proposed Project would require the use of water utilities for the 5,679 square feet of landscaping and automatic fire sprinkler systems. Water for the 5,679 square feet of landscaping would result in a demand 541 gpd.[73] When accounting for water-efficiency requirements, the water demand would be reduced to 424 gpd.[74] This represents a fraction of a one percent demand on existing water supplies. Emergency sprinkler systems use approximately 8 to 24 gallons per minute. However, the use of the sprinkler systems would only occur during rare events such as fires and do not affect daily or annual water rates.

---

72 City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. *City of Los Angeles Urban Water Management Plan*. 2011.

73 Baseline landscaping water use is estimated per California Code of Regulations Title 23, Division 2, Chapter 2.7, Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance

74 Water-Efficiency Requirements Ordinance No. 180822, 2013 California Plumbing Code, 2013; California Green Building Code (CALGreen); 2014 Los Angeles Plumbing Code, and 2014 Los Angeles Green Building Code.

The Proposed Project is a parking structure that would generate minimal water demand. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not affect the City's total water demand and would not affect the growth projections in the UWMP.

Impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e. Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project, that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

No Impact. Based on the criteria established in the *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide*, a project would normally have a significant wastewater impact if (a) the project would cause a measurable increase in wastewater flows to a point where, and a time when, a sewer's capacity is already constrained or that would cause a sewer's capacity to become constrained; or (b) the project's additional wastewater flows would substantially or incrementally exceed the future scheduled capacity of any one treatment plant by generating flows greater than those anticipated in the Wastewater Facilities Plan or General Plan and its elements. As stated in **Section 4.17 (b)**, the HTP treats an average daily flow of 362 mgd, and has the capacity to treat 450 mgd, leaving a remaining capacity of 88 mgd of wastewater able to be treated at the HTP.

As discussed previously, the Proposed Project is a parking structure that would not have bathrooms, which would generate wastewater and would not reduce the available capacity.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measures are not required.

f. Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

Less than Significant. A significant impact may occur if a project were to increase solid waste generation to a degree such that the existing and projected landfill capacity would be insufficient to accommodate the additional solid waste. Based on the *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of whether a project results in a significant impact on solid waste shall be made considering the following factors: (a) amount of projected waste generation, diversion, and disposal during demolition, construction, and operation of the project, considering proposed design and operational features that could reduce typical

waste generation rates; (b) need for additional solid waste collection route, or recycling or disposal facility to adequately handle project-generated waste; and (c) whether the project conflicts with solid waste policies and objectives in the *S*ource Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) or its updates, the Solid Waste Management Policy Plan (CiSWMPP), or the Framework Element of the Curbside Recycling Program, including consideration of the land use-specific waste diversion goals contained in Volume 4 of the SRRE.

Solid waste generated within the City is disposed of at privately owned landfill facilities throughout Los Angeles County. While the Bureau of Sanitation provides waste collection services to single-family and some small multifamily developments, private haulers provide waste collection services for most multifamily residential and commercial developments within the City. Solid waste transported by both public and private haulers is recycled, reused, transformed at a waste-to-energy facility, or disposed of at a landfill. Within the City of Los Angeles, the Chiquita Canyon Landfill and the Manning Pit Landfill serve existing land uses within the City. Both landfills accept residential, commercial, and construction waste. The Chiquita Canyon Landfill currently has a remaining capacity of 3.97 million tons.[75] Chiquita Canyon Landfill has an estimated remaining life of 2 years. Although this is close to Project build-out, an expansion of the Chiquita Canyon Landfill that would increase capacity by 23,872,000 tons (a 21-year life expectancy) is currently under proposal. Therefore, there would be no break in service, and Chiquita Canyon Landfill would be sufficiently able to serve the Proposed Project.

The Proposed Project would follow all applicable solid waste policies and objectives that are required by law, statute, or regulation. The solid waste disposal needs would be directed to the local recycling facilities and landfills described above. Based on the gross development size of 251,840 square feet of floor area and a standard waste generation rate of 4.34 pounds per square foot, it is estimated that the construction of the Proposed Project would generate approximately 1,092,986 pounds, or 547 tons of debris during the construction process.[76] This estimate is conservative; it does not factor in any recycling or waste diversion programs. The amount of solid waste generated by the Proposed Project during construction is within the available capacities at area landfills. During operation, trash and recycling receptacles would be provided along each floor. Additionally, the Project will contain a room for trash and recycling storage (with a separate area for recyclable materials) that will not be visible to the public. The amount of solid waste generated by the Proposed Project would be minimal, as parking structures do not have a direct source that generates trash. In addition the project will be required to be in compliance with Assembly

---

75 Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, *2012 Annual Report: Los Angeles Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan* (Alhambra, CA: County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, August 2013).

76 United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery, Report No. EPA530-R-09-002, *Estimating 2003 Building-Related Construction and Demolition Materials Amount*, p. 8, (March 2009), http://www.epa.gov/epawaste/conserve/imr/cdm/pubs/cd-meas.pdf.

Bill (AB) 939, which would require the applicant to implement a Solid Waste Diversion Program and divert at least 50 percent of the solid waste generated by the project from the appropriate Landfill. The proposed project would also comply with all federal, State, and local regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact related to solid waste.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

g. Would the project comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if a project would generate solid waste that was not disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations. During construction, the Proposed Project would generate solid waste that is typical of a parking structure and would comply with all federal, State, and local statutes and regulations regarding proper disposal.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

h. Would the project require new (off-site) energy supply facilities and distribution infrastructure, or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities?

Energy

No Impact. CEQA Appendix F: Energy Conservation, states that the goal of conserving energy implies wise and efficient energy use. The means of achieving this goal include decreasing overall per capita energy consumption; decreasing reliance on fossil fuels such as coal, natural gas, and oil; and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources. Energy conservation implies that a project's cost effectiveness be reviewed in terms of energy requirements and the corresponding monetary cost.

Based on the LA *CEQA Thresholds Guide*, the determination of whether the project results in a significant impact on energy shall be made considering the following factors: (a) the extent to which the project would require new (off-site) energy supply facilities and distribution infrastructure, or capacity-enhancing alterations to existing facilities; (b) whether and when the needed infrastructure was anticipated by adopted plans; and (c) the degree to which the project design and/or operations incorporate energy conservation measures, particularly those that go beyond City requirements. A significant impact would occur if the Proposed Project required additional energy supply facilities and/or distribution infrastructure, creating significant direct or indirect impacts to the environment.

The Proposed Project would also comply with the California Energy Commission 2013 Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6). The Standards focus on several key areas to improve the energy efficiency of newly constructed buildings, and include requirements that will enable both demand reductions during critical peak periods and future solar electric and thermal system installations. The 2013 Standards also include updates to the energy efficiency divisions of the California Green Building Code Standards (Title 24, Part 11). A set of prerequisites has been established for both the residential and nonresidential Reach Standards, which include efficiency measures that should be installed in any building project striving to meet advanced levels of energy efficiency. Energy Commission staff estimates that the implementation of the 2013 Building Energy Efficiency Standards may reduce statewide annual electricity consumption by approximately 613 gigawatt-hours per year, electrical peak demand by 195 megawatts, and natural gas consumption by 10 million therms per year.

The Proposed Project will use minimal electricity for elevators, kiosks, and lighting. All lighting used throughout the parking structure would consist of energy-efficient LED light bulbs.

The Proposed Project would include a concrete top roof deck that will provide a cool roof to reduce the urban heat island effect. Cool roofs can result in decreased energy demand and are designed to maintain lower roof temperatures than traditional roofs. Cool roofs are made of highly reflective and emissive materials that remain approximately 50 to 60 degrees cooler than traditional roof materials during peak summer weather, while traditional roofs can reach temperatures of 150 to 180 degrees Fahrenheit during summer peak weather which creates hot surfaces and warmer air temperatures nearby.[77] Cool roofs can also reduce temperatures inside buildings.[78] The Proposed Project is a parking structure that would not generate substantial electricity demand. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not require additional energy supply facilities and/or distribution infrastructure.

No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

77 United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), Climate Protection Partnership Division, *Reducing Urban Heat Islands: Compendium of Strategies, Cool Roofs*, p. 1, (October 2008), http://www.epa.gov/heatisland/resources/pdf/CoolRoofsCompendium.pdf.

78 United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), Climate Protection Partnership Division, *Reducing Urban Heat Islands: Compendium of Strategies, Cool Roofs*, p. 11, (October 2008), http://www.epa.gov/heatisland/resources/pdf/CoolRoofsCompendium.pdf.

4.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Impact Analysis

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Less than Significant impact. Based on the analysis in this Initial Study, the proposed project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified and compliance with existing regulations would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigations measures required.

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

Less than Significant Impact. A significant impact may occur if the Proposed Project, in conjunction with other related projects in the area of the Project Site, would result in impacts that would be less than significant when viewed separately, but would be significant when viewed together. As concluded in this analysis, the Proposed Project's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts related to aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities would be less than significant.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less than Significant with Project Mitigation. Based on the preceding environmental analysis, the Proposed Project would not have significant environmental effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Any potentially significant impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels through the implementation of the applicable mitigation measures stated from **Section 4.1** to **Section 4.17.**

Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures: Applicable mitigation measures stated from **Section 4.1** to **Section 4.17** would be required.

5.0 REFERENCES

The following documents and information were used in the preparation of this Negative Declaration:

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). "CEQA & Climate Change: Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act." 2008. http://www.energy.ca.gov/2008publications/CAPCOA-1000-2008-010/CAPCOA-1000-2008-010.PDF.

California Air Resources Board. Final Supplement to the AB 32 Scoping Plan Functional Equivalent Document (FED). May 2014. Attachment D, p. 11.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program 2010.* January 2011. ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2010/los10.pdf.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. "The Land Conservation (Williamson) Act." 2013. http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/lca/Pages/Index.aspx.

California Department of Fish and Game Code, Section 3503.

California Department of Housing and Community Development. Map of Los Angeles–Hollywood State Enterprise Zone. 2010.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control. "*EnviroStor*." 2013. http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.

California Department of Transportation. "Officially Designated State Scenic Highways." October 2013. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/schwy.htm.

California Department of Transportation. *Transportation- and Construction-Induced Vibration Guidance Manual*. June 2004.

California Division of Land Resources Protection. Williamson Act Program. ftp://ftp.consrve.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/2012%20Statewide%20Map/WA_2012.pdf.

California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG). 1986. *Special Studies Zones Map of the Hollywood Quadrangle, Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act*, California.

California Geological Survey. Earthquake Fault Zones, Hollywood Quadrangle, Preliminary Review Map. January 8, 2014. http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Documents/Hollywood_EZRIM.pdf.

California Geological Survey. Earthquake Fault Zones, Hollywood Quadrangle, Preliminary Review Map. January 8, 2014. http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Documents/Hollywood_EZRIM.pdf.

California Geological Survey. Radon Potential Zone Map for Southern Los Angeles County, California January 2005. http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/minerals/hazardous_minerals/radon/Documents/SR182Map.pdf.

CEQA Guidelines. "Speculation," Section 15145.

City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning. *Central City Community Plan*. http://cityplanning.lacity.org/complan/pdf/CCYCPTXT.PDF.

City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning. *Environmental and Public Facilities Maps*. September 1996.

City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning. Los Angeles Tree Ordinance (No. 177404). LAMC, Section 12.21.

City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning. Zoning Information and Map Access System (ZIMAS). Accessed December 30, 2014. http://www.zimas.lacity.org.

City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning. Parking Requirements. LAMC, Section 12.21.A.4.

City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning. Parcel Profile Reports, Zoning Information and Map Access System (ZIMAS). http://www.zimas.lacity.org.

City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. Bureau of Sanitation. Hyperion Treatment Plant. http://san.lacity.org/lasewers/treatment_plants/hyperion/index.htm.

City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. *City of Los Angeles Urban Water Management Plan*. 2011.

City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, Methane and Methane Buffer Zones, Map (March 2004), http://methanetesting.org/PDF/LA_MethaneZones.pdf.

City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. City of Los Angeles Fire Hydrants ArcGIS,.http://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=750fb02425724ab49a6e2c04fd6534bf.

City of Los Angeles, EnvironmentLA, "Welcome." 2014. http://environmentla.org/index2.htm.

City of Los Angeles General Plan. Housing Element. 2013.

City of Los Angeles General Plan. Land Use Element.

City of Los Angeles General Plan, Noise Element. 1999.

City of Los Angeles General Plan. Safety Element 1996. http://cityplanning.lacity.org/cwd/gnlpln/saftyelt.pdf.

City of Los Angeles General Plan, Service Systems Element.

City of Los Angeles General Plan, "Transportation Element. 1999.

City of Los Angeles. Hollywood Community Plan. 1988.

City of Los Angeles. Integrated Resources Plan, Environmental Impact Report. November 2005.

City of Los Angeles. Vermont/Western SNAP, Development Standards and Design Guidelines. 2000.

City of Los Angeles. Vermont/Western Transit Oriented District Specific Plan (Station Neighborhood Area Plan). 2001.

Code of Federal Regulations, Title 50, Part 10.

Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. *2012 Annual Report: Los Angeles Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan* (Alhambra, CA: County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, August 2013).

Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. "Los Angeles County Storm Drain System." http://dpw.lacounty.gov/fcd/stormdrain/index.cfm.

Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. *Mineral Resources and Oil Fields in East Los Angeles County. Los Angeles County Bicycle Master Plan,* Figure 3.8-2. January 2012.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. 2010 Congestion Management Program. 2010.

Los Angeles Department of City Planning. "Planning Guidelines: Landform Grading Manual." 2012. http://cityplanning.lacity.org/Forms_Procedures/LandformGradingManual.pdf.

Los Angeles Municipal Code, Chapter 1, Article 2, Section 12.03, Definitions.

Los Angeles Municipal Code, Chapter 1, Article 2, Section 12.11.C.4, Definitions.

Los Angeles Municipal Code, Chapter 1, Article 2, Section 12.16.C.3, Definitions.

Los Angeles Municipal Code, Chapter 1, Article 2, Section 12.32, Land Use Legislative Actions, Special Zoning Classifications, D Development Limitations.

Los Angeles Municipal Code, Chapter 5, Article 7, Fire Protection and Prevention (Fire Code), Section 57.512.1, Response Distances. 2014.

Los Angeles Municipal Code, Chapter 5, Article 7, Fire Protection and Prevention (Fire Code), Section 57.507.3.1, Fire-Flow Requirements. 2014.

Los Angeles Municipal Code, Chapter 6, Article 4.4, Section 64.70.01 and 64.72.

Los Angeles Municipal Code, Chapter 9, Article 1, Section 64.72.05 (October 2011).

Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), Central Bureau. "Northeast Community Police Station." January 2015. http://lapdonline.org/northeast_community_police_station.

South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology.* October 21, 2009.

State Water Resources Control Board. "GeoTracker." 2015. http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.

United States Code, Title 33, Section 703 et seq.

Urban Land Institute. *Land Use and Driving.* 2010.

Urban Land Institute. *The Role Compact Development Can Play in Reducing Green House Gas Emissions, Evidence from Three Recent Studies.* 2010.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration. *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment.* May 2006.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), Climate Protection Partnership Division. *Reducing Urban Heat Islands: Compendium of Strategies, Cool Roofs*. p. 11. October 2008. http://www.epa.gov/heatisland/resources/pdf/CoolRoofsCompendium.pdf.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA), Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery. Report No. EPA530-R-09-002. *Estimating 2003 Building-Related Construction and Demolition Materials Amount*. p. 8. March 2009. http://www.epa.gov/epawaste/conserve/imr/cdm/pubs/cd-meas.pdf.

6.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

LEAD AGENCY

Los Angeles Department of City Planning

INITIAL STUDY PREPARATION

Meridian Consultants

Tony Locacciato, AICP, Principal

Roland Ok, Project Manager

Sarah Ekeberg, Project Planner

Anders Sutherland, Environmental Analyst

Lisa Maturkanic, Publications Coordinator

Bryna Fischer, Editor

Tom Brauer, Graphics Coordinator

Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc.

Patrick Gibson, President and Principal

Richard Gibson, Project Associate

Historic Resources Group

Peyton Hall, FAIA, Managing Principal

Laura Janssen, Senior Architectural Historian