

I. Executive Summary

I. Executive Summary

In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15123, this section of this Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) contains a brief summary of the Paseo Marina Project (Project) and its potential environmental effects. More detailed information regarding the Project and its potential environmental effects is provided in the following sections of this Recirculated Draft EIR. Also included in this section of this Recirculated Draft EIR is an overview of the purpose and focus of this Recirculated Draft EIR, a general description of the Project and proposed entitlements, a description of the organization of this Recirculated Draft EIR, an overview of the Project, a general description of areas of controversy, a description of the public review process for this Recirculated Draft EIR, and a summary of the alternatives to the Project evaluated in this Recirculated Draft EIR, including identification of the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

1. Purpose of this Recirculated Draft EIR

As described in Section 15121(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR is an informational document that will inform public agency decision-makers and the public of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize any significant effects, and describe reasonable project alternatives. Therefore, the purpose of this Recirculated Draft EIR is to focus the discussion on the Project's potential environmental effects that the City of Los Angeles (City), as the Lead Agency, has determined to be, or potentially may be significant. In addition, feasible mitigation measures are recommended, when applicable, that could reduce or avoid the Project's significant environmental impacts.

The City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning previously prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the Project pursuant to CEQA. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review in March 2019. In response to public input, the project previously evaluated in the Draft EIR has been modified to include a second development option (referred to herein as Option B). As such, the City has prepared this Recirculated Draft EIR that addresses the project previously evaluated in the Draft EIR (now referred to as Option A) as well as Option B. When the option does not affect the analysis included in this Recirculated Draft EIR, the term "Project" is used.

This Recirculated Draft EIR serves as the environmental document for all actions associated with the Project. This EIR is a “Project EIR” as defined by Section 15161 of the CEQA Guidelines. Furthermore, this Recirculated Draft EIR complies with Section 15064 of the CEQA Guidelines which discusses determining the significance of the environmental effects caused by a project.

2. Recirculated Draft EIR Focus and Effects Found Not to Be Significant

In accordance with Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR shall contain a brief statement indicating reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and not discussed in detail in the Recirculated Draft EIR. An Initial Study was prepared for the Project and a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed for public comment to the State Clearinghouse, Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, responsible agencies, and other interested parties on June 9, 2017, for a 30-day review period. On June 23, 2017, a second notice was distributed to inform the public that the comment period for the NOP had been extended through July 18, 2017. The Initial Study, NOP, the NOP extension notice, and NOP comment letters are included in Appendix A of this Recirculated Draft EIR. The Initial Study provides a detailed discussion of the potential environmental impact areas and the reasons that each environmental area is or is not analyzed further in this Recirculated Draft EIR. The City determined through the Initial Study the potential for significant impacts in the following environmental issue areas:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Public Services (including fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, and libraries)

- Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems (including water supply and infrastructure, wastewater, solid waste, and energy infrastructure¹)

The City determined through the Initial Study that the Project would not have the potential to cause significant impacts related to aesthetics (scenic vistas and scenic resources); agricultural and forestry resources; air quality (objectionable odors); biological resources; cultural resources (historic resources, archaeological resources [with mitigation]; and human remains); geology and soils (landslides, septic tanks, and paleontological resources [with mitigation]²); hazards and hazardous materials (airport or airstrip-related hazards and wildland fires); hydrology and water quality (flood hazards and inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow); land use and planning (physical division of an established community); mineral resources; noise (airport and airstrip noise); population and housing; transportation (changes in air traffic patterns or hazardous design features); and utilities and service systems (statues and regulations related to solid waste). Therefore, these areas were not analyzed in this Recirculated Draft EIR. The Initial Study demonstrating that no significant impacts would occur for these issue areas is included in Appendix A of this Recirculated Draft EIR.

3. Recirculated Draft EIR Organization

This Recirculated Draft EIR is comprised of the following sections:

- I. **Executive Summary.** This section describes the purpose of this Recirculated Draft EIR, Recirculated Draft EIR focus and effects found not to be significant, Recirculated Draft EIR organization, Project summary, areas of controversy

¹ In January 2018, the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) proposed comprehensive updates to the CEQA Guidelines which revised thresholds for aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, transportation, and utilities and service systems. At the time the NOP was issued, the Appendix G checklist did not include a question about Energy Infrastructure. The Initial Study prepared for the Project did, however, note that energy would be evaluated in the Draft EIR in accordance with Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines. Refer to Section 4., Revisions to State CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, below for further details on the 2018 updates to Appendix G.

² Prior to the release of the revised thresholds, the question or threshold related to potential impacts to paleontological resources was considered under cultural resources. This threshold has since been moved and is now addressed under geology and soils.

and issues to be resolved, public review process, summary of alternatives, and a summary of environmental impacts and mitigation measures.

- II. Project Description.** This section describes the Project location, existing conditions, Project objectives, and characteristics of the Project.
- III. Environmental Setting.** This section contains a description of the existing physical and built environment and a list of related projects anticipated to be built in the vicinity of the Project Site.
- IV. Environmental Impact Analysis.** This section contains the environmental setting, project and cumulative impact analyses, mitigation measures (where necessary), and conclusions regarding the level of significance after mitigation for each of the following environmental issues: aesthetics; air quality; energy; geology and soils; greenhouse gas emissions; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use and planning; noise; public services (fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and recreation, and libraries); transportation; tribal cultural resources; and utilities and service systems (water supply and infrastructure, wastewater, solid waste, and energy infrastructure).
- V. Alternatives.** This section provides an analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project including: No Project/No Build Alternative, Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning Alternative, Reduced Development Alternative, and Reduced Excavation Alternative.
- VI. Other CEQA Considerations.** This section provides a discussion of significant unavoidable impacts that would result from the Project and the reasons why the Project is being proposed notwithstanding the significant unavoidable impacts. An analysis of the significant irreversible changes in the environment and potential secondary effects that would result from the Project is also presented here. This section also analyzes potential growth-inducing impacts of the Project and potential secondary effects caused by the implementation of the mitigation measures for the Project. Lastly, a summary of the possible effects of the Project that were determined not to be significant within the Initial Study is provided.
- VII. References.** This section lists the references and sources used in the preparation of this Recirculated Draft EIR.
- VIII. Acronyms and Abbreviations.** This section provides a list of acronyms and abbreviations used in this Recirculated Draft EIR.

IX. List of Preparers. This section lists the persons, public agencies, and organizations that were consulted or contributed to the preparation of this Recirculated Draft EIR.

This Recirculated Draft EIR includes the environmental analysis prepared for the Project and appendices as follows:

- Appendix A—Initial Study, NOP, and NOP Comment Letters
 - Appendix A.1—Initial Study
 - Appendix A.2—Notice of Preparation
 - Appendix A.3—NOP Extension Notice
 - Appendix A.4—NOP Comment Letters
- Appendix B—Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
 - Appendix B.1—Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Methodology
 - Appendix B.2—Air Quality Worksheets and Modeling Output Files
 - Appendix B.3—Greenhouse Gas Worksheets and Modeling Output Files
- Appendix C—Energy Calculations
- Appendix D—Geology and Soils
 - Appendix D.1—Geotechnical Feasibility Report Update
 - Appendix D.2—Geotechnical Feasibility Report
 - Appendix D.3—Soils Report Approval Letter
- Appendix E—Hazards and Hazardous Materials
 - Appendix E.1—Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Update
 - Appendix E.2—Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
 - Appendix E.3—Methane Investigation Report
- Appendix F—Water Resources Technical Report
- Appendix G—Land Use Plans Consistency Analysis Tables
- Appendix H—Noise Calculation Worksheets

- Appendix I—Public Service Letters
 - Appendix I.1—Los Angeles Fire Department Response Letter
 - Appendix I.2—Los Angeles Police Department Response Letter
 - Appendix I.3—Los Angeles Unified School District Response Letter
 - Appendix I.4—Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks Response Letter
 - Appendix I.5—Los Angeles Public Library Response Letter
- Appendix J—Transportation
 - Appendix J.1—Updated LADOT Assessment Letter
 - Appendix J.2—Updated Option B VMT Analysis
 - Appendix J.3—LADOT Assessment Letter
 - Appendix J.4—Transportation Assessment
- Appendix K—Tribal Cultural Resources
 - Appendix K.1—Tribal Consultation Documentation
 - Appendix K.2—Tribal Cultural Resources Report
- Appendix L—Water Supply and Infrastructure
 - Appendix L.1—LADWP Conformance Review and Water Supply Assessment
 - Appendix L.2—Water and Sewer Infrastructure Assessment
- Appendix M—Energy Infrastructure
 - Appendix M.1—Dry Utility Overview
 - Appendix M.2—LADWP and SoCalGas Will-Serve Letters
- Appendix N—VMT Calculator Runs for Alternatives 2–4

4. Revisions to State CEQA Guidelines Appendix G

In January 2018, OPR proposed comprehensive updates to the CEQA Guidelines which revised the threshold question for aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and

housing, transportation, and utilities and service systems and included additional threshold questions to address wildfires. This Recirculated Draft EIR considers the revised thresholds for the environmental topics addressed herein in Section IV, Environmental Impact Analysis. In addition, the new topic of telecommunications facilities added to the revised threshold questions for utilities and service systems as well as the new threshold questions addressing wildfires are addressed in Section VI. Other CEQA Considerations, of this Recirculated Draft EIR.

5. Existing Project Site Conditions

The Project Site is currently improved with three structures, including a two-story Barnes & Noble bookstore located along the northeast corner of the Project Site, near the Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue intersection; a single-story building providing a United States Post Office and a variety of retail uses located generally within the southern portion of the Project Site, along Glencoe Avenue; a two-story commercial and retail building located generally within the western portion of the Project Site; and associated surface parking and circulation areas. The existing surface parking areas within the Project Site include a total of 418 parking spaces. Vehicular access to the Project Site is currently provided via driveways on Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue. Pedestrians may access the Project Site using the vehicular ingress/egress driveways and from other areas along Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue. Landscaping within the Project Site includes ornamental landscaping and hardscape features. Street trees and trees within the Project Site consist of various non-native species, including palm, pine, fig, gum, fern, cajeput, carrotwood, octopus, strawberry, and olive trees that are not subject to the City's Protected Tree Regulations.³ The Project Site includes 101 ornamental trees.

The Project Site is located within the planning boundary of the Palms–Mar Vista–Del Rey Community Plan area and is designated for Limited Manufacturing land uses (CM, MR1, and M1 zones). The Project Site is zoned by the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) as [Q]M1-1 (Qualified Limited Industrial, Height District 1). The Limited Industrial zone permits a wide array of land uses. Specifically, the M1 Zone permits any commercial land use permitted in the MR1 and C2 zones, in addition to other specified uses including (but not limited to) foundry, rental of equipment commonly used by contractors, stadiums, arenas, auditoriums, and indoor swap meets. Residential uses are generally not permitted. Height District 1 within the M1 Zone normally imposes no height limitation and a maximum FAR of 1.5:1. However, pursuant to Ordinance No. 167,962, adopted in 1992, the Q conditions for the Project Site restrict building heights to 45 feet. The Q Conditions also

³ *The City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Regulations apply to Oak, Southern California Black Walnut, Western Sycamore, and California Bay tree species that are native to Southern California, and excludes trees grown by a nursery or trees planted or grown as part of a tree planting program.*

provide that if any use not permitted in the MR1 Zone is developed on the Project Site, the FAR for such uses shall be limited to 0.5 to 1. In addition, per Ordinance No. 167,962, no portion of a building or structure shall exceed 35 feet in height within 50 feet of the Glencoe Avenue right-of-way. The Q conditions also establish recycling and graffiti removal requirements for the Project Site. The Project Site is also within the boundaries of the Los Angeles Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan established pursuant to Ordinance No. 168,999, effective on September 22, 1993, and amended on June 28, 2019.⁴

6. Description of the Proposed Project

As previously discussed above, the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning previously prepared a Draft EIR for the Project pursuant to CEQA. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review in March 2019. In response to public input, the project previously evaluated in the Draft EIR has been modified to include a second development option (referred to herein as Option B). As such, the City has prepared this Recirculated Draft EIR that addresses the project previously evaluated in the Draft EIR (now referred to as Option A) as well as Option B. When the option does not affect the analysis included in this Recirculated Draft EIR, the term “Project” is used.

a. Project Overview

The Project is a new mixed-use development proposed on an approximately 6.06-acre (263,811 square feet) portion of the existing Marina Marketplace shopping center. The Project proposes two development options referred to herein as Option A and Option B. Under each option, the existing three buildings on the Project Site that together comprise approximately 100,781 square feet and associated surface parking areas would be demolished.

Option A, which was previously evaluated in the Draft EIR, proposes the development of 658 multi-family residential units (including 10 percent Very Low Income units) and up to 27,300 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial uses, including up to 13,650 square feet of retail space and up to 13,650 square feet of restaurant space. The multi-family residential and commercial uses proposed under Option A would be provided within three seven-story buildings with a maximum height of 77 feet. The proposed uses would be supported by 1,217 automobile parking spaces and 752 bicycle parking spaces located in two subterranean parking levels and in two above-grade parking levels located within each of the three buildings. In accordance with the requirements of the LAMC, Option A would provide up to 70,175 square feet of open space and recreational amenities,

⁴ *City of Los Angeles, Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan, effective September 22, 1993, amended June 28, 2019.*

including paved plazas with seating, landscaped paseos, and landscaped open space at the ground level that would be privately maintained and publicly accessible. The proposed plazas located along the northwest portion and in the center of the Project Site would connect to publicly accessible, privately maintained open space area via north–south and east–west pedestrian paseos. This open space area includes a one-story amenity building and additional seating located along the southwestern portion of the Project Site. Overall, Option A would remove approximately 100,781 square feet of existing commercial floor area and construct up to 674,329 square feet of new residential and commercial floor area, resulting in a net increase of up to 573,548 square feet of net new floor area within the Project Site for a maximum total floor area ratio (FAR) of 2.6 to 1.

Option B proposes the development of 425 multi-family residential units, 90,000 square feet of office space, and 40,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial uses, including approximately 20,000 square feet of retail space and approximately 20,000 square feet of restaurant space. The proposed multi-family residential, office, and commercial uses would be provided within four buildings. The proposed multi-family residential buildings would be six to seven stories tall with a maximum height of up to 79 feet, while the office building would be four stories tall (three stories of office space above one level of ground floor commercial space). The office building would include a higher floor plate (approximately 16.5 feet per floor), and would have a height of up to 69 feet. The proposed commercial uses would be provided at the ground floor of two of the three residential buildings and the proposed office building. The proposed uses would be supported by 1,287 parking spaces that would be distributed throughout the Project Site in three subterranean levels, in one at grade parking level, and a small surface parking area. Option B would provide up to 109,745 square feet of open space and recreational amenities, including a large publicly accessible open space area along Glencoe Avenue, paved plazas with seating, and courtyards, exceeding the open space requirements of the LAMC. Overall, Option B would remove approximately 100,781 square feet of existing floor area and construct 558,994 square feet of new floor area, resulting in a net increase of 458,213 square feet of net new floor area within the Project Site for a maximum total FAR of 2.15 to 1.

7. Areas of Controversy

Based on the NOP comment letters provided in Appendix A of this Recirculated Draft EIR, issues known to be of concern included, but were not limited to, Project impacts on aesthetics; air quality; land use; noise; public services; transportation; and utilities and service systems. Refer to Appendix A of this Recirculated Draft EIR for copies of the NOP comment letters.

8. Public Review Process

The City prepared an Initial Study and circulated an NOP for public comment to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, responsible agencies, and other interested parties on June 9, 2017, for a 30-day review period. On June 23, 2017, the review period was extended to July 18, 2017. The Initial Study, NOP, and NOP comment letters are included in Appendix A of this Recirculated Draft EIR.

This Recirculated Draft EIR is being circulated for a 45-day public comment period. Following the public comment period, a Final EIR will be prepared that will include responses to the comments raised regarding this Recirculated Draft EIR.

9. Summary of Environmental Impacts

Table I-1 on page I-11 provides a summary of the environmental impacts of the Project evaluated in this Recirculated Draft EIR. These impacts are summarized as follows:

**Table I-1
Summary of Impacts Under the Project**

Environmental Issue	Proposed Project Impact
A. AESTHETICS	
Conflict with Zoning and Regulations Governing Scenic Quality	Less Than Significant
Light/Glare	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
B. AIR QUALITY	
Construction	
<i>Regional Emissions</i>	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
<i>Localized Emissions</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Toxic Air Contaminants</i>	Less Than Significant
Operation	
<i>Regional Emissions</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Localized Emissions</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Toxic Air Contaminants</i>	Less Than Significant
C. Energy	
Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Conflict with Plans for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency</i>	Less Than Significant
D. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	
	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
E. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	
	Less Than Significant
F. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	
Construction	Less Than Significant
Operation	Less Than Significant
G. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	
Surface Water Quality	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
Groundwater Quality	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
Surface Water Hydrology	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
Groundwater Hydrology	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Environmental Issue	Proposed Project Impact
H. LAND USE AND PLANNING	
Conflict with Land Use Plans	Less Than Significant
I. NOISE	
Construction	
<i>On-Site Noise</i> ⁵	Significant and Unavoidable
<i>Off-Site Noise</i> ⁶	Less Than Significant
<i>On-Site Vibration (Building Damage)</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>On-Site Vibration (Human Annoyance)</i>	Significant and Unavoidable
<i>Off-Site Vibration (Building Damage)</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Off-Site Vibration (Human Annoyance)</i> ⁷	Significant and Unavoidable
Operation	
<i>On-Site Noise</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Off-Site Noise</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Vibration</i>	Less Than Significant
J. PUBLIC SERVICES	
Fire Protection	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
Police Protection	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
Schools	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
Parks and Recreation	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
Libraries	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant

⁵ As discussed in Section IV.I, Noise, of this Recirculated Draft EIR, cumulative impacts from on-site noise sources during construction would be significant and unavoidable.

⁶ As discussed in Section IV.I, Noise, of this Recirculated Draft EIR, cumulative impacts from off-site noise sources during construction would be significant and unavoidable.

⁷ As discussed in Section IV.I, Noise, of this Recirculated Draft EIR, cumulative vibration impacts from off-site construction with respect to human annoyance would be significant and unavoidable.

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Environmental Issue	Proposed Project Impact
K. TRANSPORTATION	
Conflicts with Plans	Less Than Significant
Vehicle Miles Traveled	Less Than Significant (Option A) Less Than Significant with Mitigation (Option B)
Freeway Safety Analysis	Less Than Significant
Inadequate Emergency Access	Less Than Significant
L. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	Less Than Significant ^a
M. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	
Water Supply and Infrastructure	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
Wastewater	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
Solid Waste	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
Energy Infrastructure	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
<p>^a As provided in Section IV.L, Tribal Cultural Resources, of this Recirculated Draft EIR, while impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant, in consideration of the known sensitivity of the surrounding area, the recommendation of the Tribal Cultural Resources Report to provide periodic monitoring during ground disturbance is included as Mitigation Measure TCR-MM-1.</p> <p>Source: Eystone Environmental, 2023.</p>	

10. Project Design Features

The following project design features would be implemented as part of the Project:

a. Aesthetics

AES-PDF-1: Temporary construction fencing will be placed along the periphery of the Project Site to screen construction activity from view at the street level.

AES-PDF-2: The Project Applicant will ensure through appropriate postings and daily visual inspections that no unauthorized materials are posted on any temporary construction barriers or temporary pedestrian walkways

that are accessible/visible to the public, and that such temporary barriers and walkways are maintained in a visually attractive manner (i.e., free of trash, graffiti, peeling postings and of uniform paint color or graphic treatment) throughout the construction period.

- AES-PDF-3:** Outdoor lighting used during construction will be shielded and/or aimed such that the light source cannot be seen from adjacent residential properties, the public right-of-way, or from the above. However, construction lighting shall not be so limited as to compromise the safety of construction workers.
- AES-PDF-4:** New on-site utilities that may be required to serve the Project shall be installed underground.
- AES-PDF-5:** Mechanical, electrical, and roof top equipment (including Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning [HVAC] systems), as well as building appurtenances, shall be integrated into the Project's architectural design (e.g., placed behind parapet walls) and be screened from view from public rights-of-way.
- AES-PDF-6:** All new outdoor lighting required for the Project shall be shielded and directed towards the interior of the Project Site such that the light source does not project directly upon any adjacent property.
- AES-PDF-7:** Glass used in building façades will be anti-reflective or treated with an anti-reflective coating in order to minimize glare (e.g., minimize the use of glass with mirror coatings). Consistent with applicable energy and building code requirements, including Section 140.3 of the California Energy Code as may be amended, glass with coatings required to meet the Energy Code requirements shall be permitted.

b. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- GHG-PDF-1:** Buildings shall be designed and constructed to incorporate environmentally sustainable design features equivalent to a minimum Silver certification under the U.S. Green Building Council's LEED® Rating System for new construction.

c. Noise

- NOI-PDF-1:** Project construction will not include the use of driven (impact) pile systems.

NOI-PDF-2: All outdoor mounted mechanical equipment will be enclosed or screened from off-site noise sensitive receptors.⁸

NOI-PDF-3: Loading and trash collection areas will be enclosed or screened from off-site noise-sensitive receptors.

NOI-PDF-4: Outdoor amplified sound systems (e.g., speaker and stereo systems, amplification systems, or other sound-producing devices) will be designed as follows:

Option A:

- (i) Ground level pedestrian plazas: maximum 70 dBA (L_{eq-1hr}) at a distance of 25 feet from the amplified sound systems,
- (ii) Ground level retail and pedestrian plazas: maximum 75 dBA (L_{eq-1hr}) at a distance of 25 feet from the amplified sound systems,
- (iii) Ground level outdoor dining areas (patios), community park, and the roof decks at Buildings 1, 2 and 3: maximum 80 dBA (L_{eq-1hr}) at a distance of 25 feet from the amplified sound systems, and
- (iv) Podium level courtyards (pool deck) at Buildings 1, 2 and 3: maximum 85 dBA (L_{eq-1hr}) at a distance of 25 feet for the amplified sound systems.

Option B:

- (i) Ground level retail and publicly accessible open space area, Building 1 Podium Level pool deck, and Buildings 3 and 4 Level 6 decks: maximum 70 dBA (L_{eq-1hr}) at a distance of 25 feet from the amplified sound systems,
- (ii) Podium level courtyards (pool deck) at Buildings 2 and 3: maximum 75 dBA (L_{eq-1hr}) at a distance of 25 feet for the amplified sound systems.
- (ii) A qualified noise consultant will provide written documentation that the design of the system complies with these maximum noise levels.

d. Public Services—Police Protection

POL-PDF-1: During construction, the Applicant shall implement temporary security measures including security fencing (e.g., chain-link fencing), low-level security lighting, and locked entry (e.g., padlocked gates or guard-restricted access) to limit access by the general public. Regular

⁸ Per L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide, noise-sensitive uses include: residences, transient lodgings, schools, libraries, churches, hospitals, nursing homes, auditoriums, concert halls, amphitheaters, playgrounds, and parks.

security patrols during non-construction hours shall also be provided. During construction activities, the contractor shall document the security measures and the documentation shall be made available to the construction monitor.

- POL-PDF-2:** The Project shall include a closed circuit camera system and keycard entry for the residential buildings and the residential parking areas.
- POL-PDF-3:** The Project shall provide proper lighting of buildings and walkways to provide for pedestrian orientation and clearly identify a secure route between parking areas and points of entry into buildings.
- POL-PDF-4:** The Project shall provide sufficient lighting of parking areas to maximize visibility and reduce areas of concealment.
- POL-PDF-5:** The Project shall design entrances to, and exits from buildings, open spaces around buildings, and pedestrian walkways to be open and in view of surrounding sites.
- POL-PDF-6:** Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall consult with LAPD's Crime Prevention Unit regarding the incorporation of feasible crime prevention features appropriate for the design of the Project, including applicable features in LAPD's Design Out Crime Guidelines.
- POL-PDF-7:** Upon completion of the Project and prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the Applicant shall submit a diagram of the Project Site to the LAPD's Pacific Area Commanding Officer that includes access routes and any additional information that might facilitate police response.

e. Transportation

- TR-PDF-1:** Prior to the start of construction, the Project Applicant will prepare a Construction Staging and Traffic Management Plan and submit it to LADOT for review and approval. The Construction Staging and Traffic Management Plan will include a Worksite Traffic Control Plan and will be submitted it to the Los Angeles Department of Transportation for review and approval. The Worksite Traffic Control Plan will identify the location of any temporary street parking or sidewalk closures; show traffic/bus detours, haul routes, and hours of operation; provide for the posting of signs advising transit riders and pedestrians of temporary sidewalk closures and providing alternative routes; provide for the installation of other construction-related warning signs; and show access to abutting properties. Furthermore, the Construction Staging and Traffic Management Plan and Worksite Traffic Control Plan will include, but not be limited to, the following measures:
- Maintain access for land uses in the vicinity of the Project Site during construction;

- Coordinate with the City and emergency service providers to ensure adequate access, including emergency access, is maintained to the Project Site and neighboring businesses and residences. Emergency access points will be marked accordingly in consultation with LAFD, as necessary.
- Schedule construction material deliveries during off-peak periods to the extent practical;
- Organize Project Site deliveries and the staging of all equipment and materials in the most efficient manner possible, and on-site where possible, to avoid an impact to the surrounding roadways;
- Coordinate truck activity and deliveries to ensure trucks do not wait to unload or load at the Project Site and impact roadway traffic, and if needed, utilize an organized off-site staging area;
- Control truck and vehicle access to the Project Site with flagmen;
- Prepare a haul truck route program that specifies the construction truck routes to and from the Project Site;
- Limit sidewalk and lane closures to the maximum extent practical, and avoid peak hours to the extent practical. Where such closures are necessary, the Project's Worksite Traffic Control Plan will identify the location of any sidewalk or lane closures and identify all traffic control measures, signs, delineators, and work instructions to be implemented by the construction contractor through the duration of demolition and construction activity; and/or
- Parking for construction workers will be provided either on-site or at off-site, off-street locations.

TR-PDF-2: As part of the Project, the Applicant, in conjunction with LADOT, will design and implement roadway striping changes along Maxella Avenue at the Ocean Way intersection. Specifically, the existing signalized crosswalk located approximately 100 feet west of the east leg of the intersection will be removed, and crosswalks will be installed at the Ocean Way/Maxella Avenue intersection. Additionally, the Applicant, in conjunction with LADOT, will install a traffic signal at the intersection with controlled crossing devices (i.e., signalized crosswalks).

f. Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure

WAT-PDF-1: In addition to regulatory requirements, the Project design will incorporate the following water conservation features to support water conservation in addition to those measures required by the City's current codes and ordinances:

- High-Efficiency Dual-Flush Toilets for residential units with a flush volume of 0.92 to 1.28 gallons per flush.
- High-Efficiency Showerheads with a flow rate of 1.5 gallons per minute.
- Domestic Water Heating System located in close proximity to point(s) of use.
- Individual metering and billing for water use for every residential dwelling unit.
- Tankless and on-demand Water Heaters installed in non-residential restrooms
- Water-Saving Pool Filter.
- Pool/Spa recirculating filtration equipment.
- Installation of a meter on the pool make-up line such that water use can be monitored and leaks can be identified and repaired.
- Leak Detection System for swimming pools and spa.
- Drip/Subsurface Irrigation (Micro-Irrigation).
- Artificial turf in dog park areas.
- Proper Hydro-zoning/Zoned Irrigation (groups plants with similar water requirements together).
- Drought-Tolerant Plants—minimum of 85 percent of total landscaping.

g. Utilities and Service Systems—Solid Waste

SW-PDF-1: Use of building materials with a minimum of 10 percent recycled content for the construction of the Project.

11. Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would be implemented as part of the Project:

a. Air Quality

AIR-MM-1: Prior to demolition, the Project representative shall make available to the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety and the South Coast Air Quality Management District a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 25 horsepower, that will be used for construction of the Project. The inventory shall include the horsepower rating, engine production

year, and certification of the specified Tier standard. A copy of each unit's certified tier specification, Best Available Control Technology documentation, and California Air Resources Board or Air Quality Management District operating permit shall be available onsite at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment to allow the Construction Monitor to compare the on-site equipment with the inventory and certified Tier specification and operating permit. Off-road diesel-powered equipment within the construction inventory list described above shall meet the Tier 4 Final standards.

b. Cultural Resources (Archaeological Resources)⁹

CUL-MM-1: During the construction phase and prior to the issuance of building permits, the Applicant shall retain an independent and qualified Construction Monitor who shall be responsible for coordinating with a certified archaeologist to implement and enforce the following:

- a. All initial grading and all excavation activities shall be monitored by a Project archaeologist. The Project archaeologist shall be present full-time during disturbances of material with potential to contain cultural deposits and will document activity.
- b. The services of an archaeologist, qualified for historic resource evaluation, as defined in CEQA and Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) Guidelines, shall be secured to implement the archaeological monitoring program. The qualified archaeologist shall be listed, or be eligible for listing, in the Register of Professional Archaeologist (RPA). Recommendations may be obtained by contacting the South Central Coastal Information Center (657-278-5395) located at California State University Fullerton.
- c. In the event of a discovery, or when requested by the Project archaeologist, the contractor shall divert, direct, or temporarily halt ground disturbing activities in an area in order to evaluate potentially significant archaeological resources.
 - i. It shall be the responsibility of the Project archaeologist to: determine the scope and significance of the find; determine the appropriate documentation; ensure preservation, conservation, and/or relocation of the find; and determine when grading/excavation activities may resume in the area of the find.

⁹ Refer to the Initial Study included in Appendix A of this Recirculated Draft EIR.

- ii. Determining the significance of the find shall be guided by California Public Resources Code Division 13, Chapter 1, Section 21083.2, subdivision (g) and (h). If the find is determined to be a “unique archaeological resource”, then the applicant, in conjunction with the recommendation of the Project archaeologist, shall comply with Section 21083.2, subdivisions (b) through (f).
 - iii. If at any time the Project Site, or a portion of the Project Site, is determined to be a “historical resource” as defined in California Code of Regulations Chapter 3, Article 1, Section 15064.5, subdivision (a), the Project archaeologist shall prepare and issue a mitigation plan in conformance with Section 15126.4, subdivision (b).
 - iv. If the Project archaeologist determines that continuation of the Project or Project-related activities will result in an adverse impact on a discovered historic resource which cannot be mitigated, all further activities resulting in the impact shall immediately cease, and the Lead Agency shall be contacted for further evaluation and direction.
 - v. The applicant shall comply with the recommendations of the Project archaeologist with respect to the documentation, preservation, conservation, and/or relocation of the find.
 - vi. The Construction Monitor shall also prepare and submit documentation of the Applicant’s compliance with the Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-1 during construction every 30 days in a form satisfactory to the Department of City Planning. The documentation must be signed by the Applicant and Construction Monitor and be included as part of the Applicant’s Compliance Report. The Construction Monitor shall be obligated to immediately report to the Enforcement Agency any non-compliance with the mitigation measure within two business days if the Applicant does not correct the non-compliance within a reasonable time of notification to the Applicant by the monitor or if the non-compliance is repeated. Such non-compliance shall be appropriately addressed by the Enforcement Agency.
- d. Monitoring activities may cease when:
- i. Initial grading and all excavation activities have concluded; or
 - ii. By written consent of the Project archaeologist, agreeing that no further monitoring is necessary. In this case, a signed and dated copy of such agreement shall be submitted to the Dept. of City Planning for retention in the administrative record for Case No. ENV-2016-3343-EIR.

- e. At the conclusion of monitoring activities, and only if archaeological materials were encountered, the Project archaeologist shall prepare and submit a report of the findings to the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), located at:

SCCIC Department of Anthropology
McCarthy Hall 477
CSU Fullerton
800 North State College Boulevard
Fullerton, CA 92834

- f. At the conclusion of monitoring activities, the Project archaeologist shall prepare a signed statement indicating the first and last dates monitoring activities took place, and submit it to the Dept. of City Planning, for retention in the administrative file for Case No. ENV-2016-3343-EIR

c. Geology and Soils

GEO-MM-1: Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Applicant shall submit final design plans and a final design-level geotechnical report to the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety for review and approval. The design-level geotechnical report shall be used for final design of the foundation system for the structures and shall take into consideration the engineering properties beneath the proposed structures and the projected loads. The final report shall specify geotechnical design parameters that are needed by structural engineers to determine the type and sizing of structural building materials. The final report shall be subject to the specific performance criteria imposed by all applicable state and local codes and standards. The final geotechnical report shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer or certified engineering geologist and include appropriate measures to address seismic hazards and ensure structural safety of the proposed structure. The proposed structure shall be designed and constructed in accordance with all applicable provisions of the California Building Code and the Los Angeles Building Code. The design-level geotechnical report shall address each of the recommendations provided in the *Geotechnical Feasibility Report Marina Marketplace Phase III 13450 W. Maxella Avenue, Marina del Rey, California* prepared by Golder Associates, Inc., dated January 16, 2015 (Revised March 16, 2017) and as updated in the *Geotechnical Feasibility Report Update* dated September 11, 2020, including, but not limited to the following:

- A mat foundation shall be required on native soils with a static allowable bearing pressure per the final geotechnical recommendations.

- A mat foundation with an allowable passive resistance and friction factor shall be based on the recommendations of the geotechnical consultant.
- Waterproofing of the base and sides of the mat foundation shall be required to prevent moisture intrusion and water seepage through walls.
- Basement walls shall be designed per the recommendations of the final geotechnical report.
- Retaining walls shall be designed using the active and at-rest earth pressures provided in the final geotechnical report.
- Wall backfill specifications (e.g., material gradation, compaction requirements, etc.), and surcharge conditions shall be designed per the recommendations of final geotechnical report.
- Walls shall be provided with backdrains to prevent buildup of hydrostatic pressures behind walls or be designed to withstand hydrostatic pressures.
- Backdrains, if utilized, shall be designed per the recommendations of the final geotechnical report.
- Corrosivity testing shall be performed during the final design.
- Concrete mix design shall be reviewed by a qualified corrosion engineer to evaluate the general corrosion potential of the Project Site.
- Buried metallic structures and elements shall be designed with corrosion protection as determined by a qualified corrosion engineer.
- Project Site soils shall be evaluated for expansion in the final geotechnical report.
- All surface water shall be diverted away from excavations.
- All basement excavations including sloping and/or shoring shall be designed per the recommendations of the final geotechnical report.

CUL-MM-2:¹⁰ During the construction phase and prior to the issuance of building permits, the Applicant shall retain an independent and qualified

¹⁰ *In January 2018, OPR proposed comprehensive updates to the CEQA Guidelines. Prior to the release of the revised threshold questions, the question related to potential impacts to paleontological resources was considered under Cultural Resources. This threshold question has since been moved and is now addressed under Geology and Soils. Refer to the Initial Study included in Appendix A of this Recirculated Draft EIR.*

Construction Monitor who shall be responsible for coordinating with a certified paleontologist to implement and enforce the following:

- a. If any paleontological materials are encountered during the course of Project development, the Project Archaeologist, in accordance with CUL-MM-1, shall coordinate with the services of a certified paleontologist, and all further development activity shall halt and the following shall be undertaken:
 - i. The services of a paleontologist shall be secured by contacting the Center for Public Paleontology-USC, UCLA, California State University Los Angeles, California State University Long Beach, or the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum-who shall assess the discovered material(s) and prepare a survey, study or report evaluating the impact.
 - ii. The Construction Monitor shall also prepare and submit documentation of the Applicant's compliance with the Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-2 during construction every 30 days in a form satisfactory to the Department of City Planning. The documentation must be signed by the Applicant and Construction Monitor and be included as part of the Applicant's Compliance Report. The Construction Monitor shall be obligated to immediately report to the Enforcement Agency any non-compliance with the mitigation measure within two business days if the Applicant does not correct the non-compliance within a reasonable time of notification to the Applicant by the monitor or if the non-compliance is repeated. Such non-compliance shall be appropriately addressed by the Enforcement Agency.
 - iii. The paleontologist's survey, study or report shall contain a recommendation(s), if necessary, for the preservation, conservation, or relocation of the resource.
 - iv. The Applicant shall comply with the recommendations of the evaluating paleontologist, as contained in the survey, study or report.
- b. At the conclusion of monitoring activities, the Project paleontologist shall prepare a signed statement indicating the first and last dates monitoring activities took place, and submit it to the Dept. of City Planning, for retention in the administrative file for Case No. ENV-2016-3343-EIR.
- c. Project development activities may resume once copies of the paleontological survey, study or report are submitted to the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum.

CUL-MM-3:¹¹ Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the Project paleontologist shall submit a letter to the case file indicating what, if any, paleontological reports have been submitted, or a statement indicating that no material was discovered

d. Noise

NOI-MM-1: A temporary and impermeable sound barrier shall be erected at the locations listed below. At plan check, building plans shall include documentation prepared by a noise consultant verifying compliance with this measure.

- Along the northeastern property line of the Project Site between the construction areas and the apartment building at the northeast corner of Glencoe Avenue and Maxella Avenue (receptor location R4). The temporary sound barrier shall be designed to provide a minimum 8-dBA noise reduction at receptor location R4, for both Option A and Option B.
- Along the eastern property line of the Project Site between the construction areas and multi-family residential use located on Glencoe Avenue (receptor location R3). The temporary sound barrier shall be designed to provide a minimum 13-dBA (for Option A) and 12-dBA (for Option B) noise reduction at receptor location R3. Along the western property line of the Project Site between the construction area and the multi-family residential (receptor location R1) and hotel (receptor location R2) uses west and southwest of the Project Site, respectively. The temporary sound barrier shall be designed to provide a minimum 20-dBA noise reduction at the ground level of receptor locations R1 and R2 for both Option A and Option B, respectively.

e. Transportation

TR-MM-1: The Project Applicant shall implement the following TDM measures (from Table 2-2-2 of the TAG) under Option B:

- **Transit Subsidies:** This TDM strategy involves the subsidization of transit fares for residents and employees of Option B. The subsidy shall be proactively offered to each resident and employee at least once annually for a minimum of five years. At the time of initial

¹¹ In January 2018, OPR proposed comprehensive updates to the CEQA Guidelines. Prior to the release of the revised threshold questions, the question related to potential impacts to paleontological resources was considered under Cultural Resources. This threshold question has since been moved and is now addressed under Geology and Soils. Refer to the Initial Study included in Appendix A of this Recirculated Draft EIR.

opening, Option B shall offer a daily transit subsidy to all (i.e., 100%) residents and employees of \$2.98 per day.

- **Promotions and Marketing:** Utilize promotional and marketing tools to educate and inform residents and employees about alternative transportation options and the effects of their travel choices. Rather than two-way communication tools or tools that would encourage an individual to consider a different mode of travel at the time the trip is taken (i.e., smartphone application, daily email, etc.), this TDM strategy includes passive educational and promotional materials, such as posters, information boards, or a website with information that residents and employees can choose to read at their own leisure.
- **Alternative Work Schedules and Telecommuting Program:** The strategy encourages employees to work alternative schedules or telecommute, including staggered start times, flexible schedules, or compressed workweeks. At the time of initial opening of the development, Option B shall offer 1.5 days per week of telecommuting to at least 5 percent of all employees.
- **Include Bike Parking per Los Angeles Municipal Code:** Per LAMC Table 12.21 A.16(a)(1)(i), provide 18 short-term and 181 long-term bicycle parking spaces for the residential component. Per LAMC Table 12.21 A.16(a)(2), provide 29 short-term spaces and 48 long-term spaces for the restaurant, commercial and office components.
- **Include Secure Bicycle Parking and Showers:** This strategy involves implementation of additional end-of-trip bicycle facilities to support safe and comfortable bicycle travel by providing amenities at destinations. Option B shall provide short-term and long-term bicycle parking in accordance with LAMC Section 12.21 A.16(d)(2). In addition, Option B shall provide showers in accordance with LAMC Section 91.6307.
- **Pedestrian Network Improvements:** This strategy involves implementation of pedestrian network improvements throughout and around the Project Site that encourage people to walk. This includes internally linking all uses within the Project Site with pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks and connecting the Project Site to the surrounding pedestrian network. Option B includes pedestrian access points directly to sidewalks on the adjacent streets, including Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue. Additionally, Option B will add street trees and landscaping, including a park along the Project Site's easterly frontage, to enhance the pedestrian network and improve exterior lighting along the sidewalks to improve safety.

TR-MM-2: The Project Applicant shall participate in the U-Pass program, which funds transit passes for college students throughout Los Angeles

County. The Project Applicant shall contribute the required amount of \$18,578.00 to the U-Pass program annually for a minimum of seven (7) years. Future evaluations may be prepared using LADOT's VMT Calculator which may demonstrate that the Project's Option B TDM measures alone are sufficient to mitigate its significant VMT impact and that the purchase of transit passes for students is no longer required. Additionally, the annual fee shall be reduced if it is determined that fewer than 246 VMT are needed to be reduced to achieve a less than significant impact.

f. Tribal Cultural Resources

TCR-MM-1: Prior to commencing any ground disturbance activities, including excavating, digging, trenching, plowing, drilling, tunneling, quarrying, grading, leveling, removing asphalt, clearing, pounding posts, augering, blasting, stripping topsoil or a similar activity at the Project Site, the Applicant, or its successor, shall retain and pay for archeological and tribal monitors, determined by both the City's Office of Historic Resources and the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians—Kizh Nation to be qualified to identify subsurface tribal cultural resources.

The qualified archeological and tribal monitors shall observe all ground disturbance activities on the Project Site at all times while ground disturbance activities are taking place. If ground disturbance activities are simultaneously occurring at multiple locations on the Project Site, an archeological and tribal monitor shall be assigned to each location where the ground disturbance activities are occurring. The on-site monitoring shall end when the ground disturbing activities are completed, or when the archeological and tribal monitor both indicate that the site has a low potential for impacting tribal cultural resources.

Prior to the commencement of any ground disturbance activities at the Project Site, the Applicant, or its successor, shall notify any California Native American tribes that have informed the City they are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the Project Site that ground disturbance activities are about to commence and invite the tribes to observe the ground disturbance activities, if the tribes wish to monitor.

In addition, prior to commencement of ground disturbance activities, the archeological monitor in consultation with the tribal monitor, shall provide a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training to construction crews involved in ground disturbance activities that provides information on regulatory requirements for the protection of tribal cultural resources. As part of the WEAP training, construction crews shall be briefed on proper procedures to follow should a crew member discover tribal cultural resources during ground-disturbance

activities. In addition, workers will be shown examples of the types of resources that would require notification of the archaeological monitor and tribal monitor. The Applicant shall maintain on the Project Site, for City inspection, documentation establishing the training was completed for all members of the construction crew involved in ground disturbance activities.

In the event that any subsurface objects or artifacts that may be tribal cultural resources are encountered during the course of any ground disturbance activities, all such activities shall temporarily cease within the area of discovery, the radius of which shall be determined by the qualified archaeologist, in consultation with a qualified tribal monitor, until the potential tribal cultural resources are properly assessed and addressed pursuant to the process set forth below:

1. Upon a discovery of a potential tribal cultural resource, the Applicant, or its successor, shall immediately stop all ground disturbance activities and contact the following: (1) all California Native American tribes that have informed the City they are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the Project; (2) and the Department of City Planning, Office of Historic Resources.
2. If the City Office of Historic Resources determines, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21074 (a)(2), that the object or artifact appears to be a tribal cultural resource in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, the City shall provide any affected tribe a reasonable period of time, not less than 14 days, to conduct a site visit and make recommendations to the Applicant, or its successor, and the City regarding the monitoring of future ground disturbance activities, as well as the treatment and disposition of any discovered tribal cultural resources.
3. The Applicant, or its successor, shall implement the tribe's recommendations if a qualified archaeologist, retained by the City and paid for by the Applicant, or its successor, in consultation with the tribal monitor, reasonably conclude that the tribe's recommendations are reasonable and feasible.
4. In addition to any recommendations from the applicable tribe(s), a qualified archeologist shall develop a list of actions that shall be taken to avoid or minimize impacts to the identified tribal cultural resources substantially consistent with best practices identified by the Native American Heritage Commission and in compliance with any applicable federal, state or local law, rule or regulation.
5. If the Applicant, or its successor, does not accept a particular recommendation determined to be reasonable and feasible by the qualified archaeologist or qualified tribal monitor, the Applicant, or its successor, may request mediation by a mediator agreed to by

the Applicant, or its successor, and the City. The mediator must have the requisite professional qualifications and experience to mediate such a dispute. The City shall make the determination as to whether the mediator is at least minimally qualified to mediate the dispute. After making a reasonable effort to mediate this particular dispute, the City may: (1) require the recommendation be implemented as originally proposed by the archaeologist or tribal monitor; (2) require the recommendation, as modified by the City, be implemented as it is at least as equally effective to mitigate a potentially significant impact; (3) require a substitute recommendation be implemented that is at least as equally effective to mitigate a potentially significant impact to a tribal cultural resource; or (4) not require the recommendation be implemented because it is not necessary to mitigate any significant impacts to tribal cultural resources. The Applicant, or its successor, shall pay all costs and fees associated with the mediation.

6. The Applicant, or its successor, may recommence ground disturbance activities outside of a specified radius of the discovery site, so long as this radius has been reviewed by both the qualified archaeologist and qualified tribal monitor and determined to be reasonable and appropriate.
7. The Applicant, or its successor, may recommence ground disturbance activities inside of the specified radius of the discovery site only after it has complied with all of the recommendations developed and approved pursuant to the process set forth in paragraphs 2 through 5 above.
8. Copies of any subsequent prehistoric archaeological study, tribal cultural resources study or report, detailing the nature of any significant tribal cultural resources, remedial actions taken, and disposition of any significant tribal cultural resources shall be submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) at California State University, Fullerton and to the Native American Heritage Commission for inclusion in its Sacred Lands File.
9. Notwithstanding paragraph 8 above, any information that the Department of City Planning, in consultation with the City Attorney's Office, determines to be confidential in nature shall be excluded from submission to the SCCIC or provided to the general public under the applicable provisions of the California Public Records Act, California Public Resources Code Section 6254(r), and in compliance with the City's AB 52 Confidentiality Protocols.

12. Summary of Alternatives

This Recirculated Draft EIR examined four alternatives to the Project in detail, which include the No Project/No Build Alternative, the No Project/Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning Alternative, the Reduced Development Alternative, and the Reduced Excavation Alternative. A general description of these alternatives is provided below. Refer to Section V, Alternatives, of this Recirculated Draft EIR for a more detailed description of these alternatives, a comparative analysis of the impacts of these alternatives with those of the Project, and a description of the alternatives considered but rejected as infeasible.

a. Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative

Alternative 1, the No Project/No Build Alternative, assumes that the Project would not be approved, no new permanent development would occur within the Project Site, and the existing environment would be maintained. Thus, the physical conditions of the Project Site would generally remain as they are today. Specifically, the three existing structures, including the two-story Barnes & Noble bookstore, the single-story commercial building, and the two-story commercial building, as well as the surface parking spaces, would remain on the Project Site, and no new construction would occur.

While the No Project/No Build Alternative would avoid all of the Project's significant environmental impacts, the No Project/No Build Alternative would not implement best management practices that would improve stormwater flows; therefore, this alternative would result in a greater impact with respect to surface water quality and groundwater hydrology during operation. Additionally, the No Project/No Build Alternative would not meet any of the Project's basic objectives.

b. Alternative 2: Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning Alternative

Alternative 2, the Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning Alternative, considers development of the Project Site in accordance with the parameters set forth by the existing zoning on the Project Site, which is [Q]M1-1 (Qualified Limited Industrial, Height District 1). Specifically, Alternative 2 would include the development of 370,274 square feet of office uses in accordance with the office uses permitted in the MR1 zone.¹²

¹² *The MR1 zone permits corporate headquarters, record-keeping and computer support facilities for the processing of retrievable information and systems control, and office buildings if used only for offices of industrial firms, industrial engineering firms, and other professional, administrative, and clerical services needed by industries in the area.*

(Footnote continued on next page)

As with the Project, the existing shopping center-related buildings within the Project Site that together comprise approximately 100,781 square feet would be removed. Overall, Alternative 2 would construct 269,493 square feet of net new floor area within the Project Site for a total floor area ratio of 1.5:1 (a reduction of 304,055 square feet compared to Option A's 573,548 square feet of net new floor area and a reduction in FAR from 2.6:1 to 1.5:1 and a reduction of 188,720 square feet compared to Option B's 458,213 square feet of net new floor area and a reduction in FAR from 2.15:1 to 1.5:1).

The proposed office uses would be located within two three-story buildings. One building would be located generally along the western half of the Project Site, while the other building would be situated generally along the eastern portion of the Project Site, along Glencoe Avenue. The proposed buildings would be 35 feet to 45 feet in height, consistent with the existing zoning, and would be reduced compared to the seven-story (77 to 79-foot maximum height) buildings proposed as part of the Project. The architectural features, lighting and signage, and sustainability intent of Alternative 2 would be similar to that of the Project.

With regard to vehicular parking, 741 parking spaces would be required and would be provided in accordance with the requirements of the LAMC. These parking spaces would be provided in one and one-half levels of subterranean parking below the proposed buildings (compared to the two subterranean levels proposed as part of Option A and three subterranean parking levels proposed as part of Option B). Vehicular access to the proposed parking garage would be provided via one entry/exit driveway along the private driveway west of the Project Site and along Glencoe Avenue. Pedestrian and bicycle access would be provided along the perimeters of the Project Site.

Alternative 2 would provide a landscaped Office Plaza in the center of the Project Site and smaller landscaped courtyards at building perimeters. As office uses are not required to provide open space, the open space to be provided as part of Alternative 2 would be substantially reduced compared to the Project. Trees and other landscaping features would also be planted throughout the Project Site and along Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue to activate these streets and provide a pedestrian-friendly environment.

Similar to the Project, construction of Alternative 2 would be developed in one phase. However, given the reduced subterranean parking proposed as part of Alternative 2, the amount of export would be reduced from 241,800 cubic yards under Option A and 251,000 cubic yards under Option B to approximately 181,350 cubic yards (a reduction of approximately 60,450 cubic yards or 25 percent compared to Option A and a reduction of approximately 69,650 cubic yards or 28 percent compared to Option B). Similarly, due to

the reduction in excavation and export associated with a reduced subterranean parking garage and the reduction in floor area, the overall construction period would be reduced compared to that of the Project.

As with the Project, Alternative 2 would require a Coastal Development Permit, and a Vesting Tentative Tract Map and haul route. In lieu of the Project's Site Plan Review, Alternative 2 would require a Major Development Project Conditional Use Permit. However, Alternative 2 would not require a General Plan Amendment, Vesting Zone and Height District Change, Mello Act Compliance Review, and Master Conditional Use Permit as would the Project.

As provided in Section V, Alternatives, of this Recirculated Draft EIR, Alternative 2 would not eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to noise from on-site construction and vibration and off-site construction with respect to human annoyance. Furthermore, the following impact areas would be greater than the impacts of the Project under Option B: police protection during operation. Alternative 2 also would not eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts related to construction noise from on-site and off-site noise sources and off-site construction vibration with respect to human annoyance. However, Alternative 2 would reduce the peak excavation construction phase of the Project such that these impacts occur for a shorter duration as compared to the Project and the overall impact from these significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project would be less under Alternative 2, while remaining significant and unavoidable. The following impact areas would be greater than the impacts of the Project: surface water hydrology and groundwater hydrology. The remaining impacts would be similar to or less than those of the Project.

c. Alternative 3: Reduced Development Alternative

Alternative 3, the Reduced Development Alternative, would reduce both the residential and neighborhood-serving commercial uses proposed by Option A and would reduce the neighborhood-serving commercial uses proposed by Option B while providing additional residential units compared to Option B and eliminating the office uses proposed by Option B. Specifically, Alternative 3 proposes the development of 494 dwelling units (a reduction of 165 units compared to Option A and an increase of 69 units compared to Option B) and 20,475 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial uses (a reduction of 6,825 square feet compared to Option A and a reduction of 19,525 compared to Option B). Overall, the Reduced Development Alternative would construct 505,747 square feet of new floor area (a reduction of 168,582 square feet compared to Option A and a reduction of 53,247 square feet compared to Option B).

Under Alternative 3, the Project Site would be developed similar to Option A. Specifically, the proposed multi-family residential and neighborhood-serving commercial

uses would be provided within three mixed-use buildings (herein referred to as Building 1, Building 2, and Building 3) that would be organized around an outdoor pedestrian paseo. Similar to Option A, the proposed pedestrian paseo would be orientated both east–west across the Project Site and north–south through the center of the Project Site and connect to a public plaza along the northwestern portion of the Project Site and a publicly accessible, privately maintained open space area along the southwestern portion of the Project Site that would include an amenity building. However, the height of the buildings would be reduced from seven stories and a height of 77 feet to six stories with an approximate height of 67 feet. The overall design of the buildings under Alternative 3, including architectural features, lighting and signage, and sustainability, would be similar to that of Option A. Similarly, Alternative 3 would feature similar vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle access as Option A.

With regard to vehicular parking, given the reduction in residential units and commercial square footage under this alternative, 913 parking spaces would be required and would be provided in accordance with the requirements set forth in the LAMC. As with Option A, the parking spaces would be distributed throughout the Project Site in two subterranean levels that would extend to a depth of approximately 28 feet and in two above-grade parking levels located within each of the three buildings.

As with the Project, Alternative 3 would provide a variety of open space and recreational amenities. In addition, to enhance the streetscape, a landscaped public plaza would be provided at the northwest corner of the Project Site, along Maxella Avenue, that would connect to the proposed landscaped pedestrian paseo. Trees and other landscaping features would also be planted throughout the Project Site and along Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue to activate these streets and provide a pedestrian-friendly environment. In total, Alternative 3 would provide 52,631 square feet of open space and recreational amenities in accordance with the open space requirements set forth in the LAMC (a reduction of 17,544 square feet compared to Option A's 70,175 square feet of open space and recreational amenities and a reduction of 57,114 square feet compared to Option B's 109,745 square feet of open space and recreational amenities).

Similar to the Project, to provide for development of Alternative 3, demolition of the existing uses would occur. In addition, as with the Project, construction of Alternative 3 would be developed in one phase. Furthermore, as Alternative 3 would include two levels of subterranean parking similar to Option A, Alternative 3 would require similar excavation and export as Option A, and less excavation and export compared to Option B, which would include three subterranean parking levels. However, given the overall reduction in uses, the overall construction period would be reduced compared to that of the Project.

As with the Project, Alternative 3 would require a General Plan Amendment to the Palms–Mar Vista–Del Rey Community Plan to change the Community Plan land use

designation from Limited Manufacturing to General Commercial; a Vesting Zone and Height District Change from [Q]M1-1 to (T)(Q)C2-2D; Site Plan Review; a Master Conditional Use Permit to allow the on-site and off-site sale of a full line of alcoholic beverages; Coastal Development Permit; Mello Act Compliance Review; and Vesting Tentative Tract Map and haul route.

Alternative 3 would not eliminate any of the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts. Specifically, the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to noise from on-site construction and vibration from on-site and off-site construction with respect to human annoyance would remain with development of Alternative 3. Furthermore, the following impact areas would be greater than the impacts of the Project under Option B: police protection during operation, schools during operation, parks and creation during operation, and libraries during operation. Alternative 3 also would not eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts related to construction noise from on-site and off-site noise sources, and off-site construction vibration with respect to human annoyance. All other impacts would be similar to, or less than, those of the Project. However, it is noted that with an overall reduction in proposed development, the impacts of this alternative would be experienced for a shorter period of time compared to the Project.

d. Alternative 4: Reduced Excavation Alternative

Alternative 4, the Reduced Excavation Alternative, would construct a mixed-use project similar to the Project but would eliminate the 90,000 square feet of office uses proposed by the Project under Option B and would reduce the number of subterranean parking levels. Specifically, Alternative 4 proposes the development of 601 dwelling units and 27,300 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial uses. Alternative 4 would result in a reduction of 57 units compared to Option A and an increase of 176 units compared to Option B. Alternative 4 would provide the same amount of neighborhood-serving commercial uses proposed under Option A, but would reduce the amount of neighborhood-serving commercial uses by 12,700 square feet compared to Option B. Overall, the Reduced Excavation Alternative would construct 516,337 square feet of new floor area (a reduction of 57,211 square feet compared to Option A and 42,657 square feet compared to Option B).

Under Alternative 4, the proposed uses would be provided within one large, five-story mixed-use building that would extend across the entire Project Site. The 601 residential dwelling units would be provided in the first through fifth stories throughout the proposed building and the neighborhood-serving commercial uses would be provided on the ground floor along Maxella Avenue. The ground floor would also include a parking area with access to services and loading areas. One large outdoor courtyard would be provided in the center of the Project Site, while three smaller outdoor courtyards would be provided along Glencoe Avenue. The height of the building would be reduced to five stories with a

height of 62 feet. The overall design of the building under Alternative 4, including architectural features, lighting and signage, and sustainability features, would be similar to that of the Project. Vehicular access would be provided via several driveways off of Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue. Pedestrian and bicycle access would be available throughout the Project Site.

With regard to vehicular parking, given the reduction in total floor area under this alternative, 1,126 parking spaces would be required by Alternative 4, compared to 1,217 parking spaces required by Option A and 1,287 parking spaces required by Option B, and would be provided in accordance with the requirements set forth in the LAMC. The parking spaces would be distributed throughout the Project Site in one subterranean level that would extend to a depth of approximately 14 feet and on one ground floor level.

As with the Project, Alternative 4 would provide a variety of open space and recreational amenities. Trees and other landscaping features would also be planted throughout the Project Site and along Maxella Avenue and Glencoe Avenue to activate these streets and provide a pedestrian-friendly environment. In total, Alternative 4 would provide 64,000 square feet of open space and recreational amenities in accordance with the open space requirements set for in LAMC (a reduction of 6,175 square feet compared to Option A's 70,175 square feet of open space and recreational amenities and a reduction of 45,745 square feet compared to Option B's 109,745 square feet of open space and recreation amenities).

Similar to the Project, to provide for development of Alternative 4, demolition of the existing uses would occur. In addition, as with the Project, construction of Alternative 4 would be developed in one phase. However, as Alternative 4 would include one level of subterranean parking, Alternative 4 would result in a reduction in excavation and export compared to the Project. Specifically, Alternative 4 would require approximately 120,900 cubic yards of export compared to the 241,800 cubic yards under Option A and 251,000 cubic yards under Option B (a reduction of approximately 120,900 cubic yards compared to Option A and a reduction of approximately 130,100 cubic yards compared to Option B). Additionally, given the reduction in overall square footage, the building construction period may be slightly reduced compared to that of the Project.

As with the Project, Alternative 4 would require a General Plan Amendment to the Palms–Mar Vista–Del Rey Community Plan to change the Community Plan land use designation from Limited Manufacturing to General Commercial; a Vesting Zone and Height District Change from [Q]M1-1 to (T)(Q)C2-2D; Site Plan Review; a Master Conditional Use Permit to allow the onsite and offsite sale of a full line of alcoholic beverages; Coastal Development Permit; Mello Act Compliance Review; and Vesting Tentative Tract Map and haul route approval.

Alternative 4 would not eliminate any of the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts. Specifically, the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to noise from on-site construction and vibration from on-site and off-site construction with respect to human annoyance would remain with development of Alternative 4. Alternative 4 also would not eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts related to construction noise from on-site and off-site noise sources and off-site construction vibration with respect to human annoyance. However, Alternative 4 would reduce the duration of the excavation phase of the Project such that these impacts would occur for a shorter duration during this phase. Impacts on surface water hydrology and groundwater hydrology would be greater compared to the Project given the reduced open space areas to be provided by this alternative. Furthermore, the following impact areas would be greater than the impacts of the Project under Option B: fire protection during operation, police protection during operation, schools during operation, parks and recreation during operation, and libraries during operation. The remaining impacts would be similar to, or less than, those of the Project.

e. Environmentally Superior Alternative

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

Of the alternatives analyzed in this Recirculated Draft EIR, Alternative 1, the No Project/No Build Alternative would avoid all of the Project's significant environmental impacts, including the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to noise from on-site construction and vibration from on-site and off-site construction with respect to human annoyance. Alternative 1 would also avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts related to construction noise from on-site and off-site noise sources and off-site construction vibration with respect to human annoyance. Alternative 1 would also reduce all of the Project's less-than-significant and less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts. However, the No Project/No Build Alternative would not meet any of the Project's basic objectives.

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines requirement to identify an Environmentally Superior Alternative other than the No Project/No Build Alternative, a comparative evaluation of the remaining alternatives indicates that Alternative 2, the Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning Alternative, would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative. As discussed above, while Alternative 2 would not eliminate any of the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts, given the reduction in uses and excavation,

Alternative 2 would reduce many of the Project's less-than-significant impacts compared to the other alternatives. In addition, Alternative 2 would lessen the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to construction noise from on-site and off-site noise sources and off-site construction vibration with respect to human annoyance as a result of reducing the amount and duration of the peak construction phase of the Project (the excavation phase). Thus, of the range of alternatives analyzed, Alternative 2 would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative.