

III. Revisions, Clarifications, and Corrections to the Draft EIR

A. Introduction

This chapter of the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) provides changes to the Draft EIR that have been made to revise, clarify, or correct the environmental impact analysis for the 4th and Hewitt Project (Project). Such changes are a result of public and agency comments received in response to the Draft EIR and/or additional information that has become available since publication of the Draft EIR. The changes described in this chapter do not result in the Project creating any new or increased significant environmental impacts.

This chapter includes three parts: Section III.A, Introduction; Section III.B, Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR Sections and Appendices; and Section III.C, Effect of Corrections and Revisions.

III. Revisions, Clarifications, and Corrections to the Draft EIR

B. Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR Sections and Appendices

1. Corrections and Additions to Draft EIR Sections and Appendices

Changes have been made to the Draft EIR as a result of public and agency comments received in response to the Draft EIR and/or new information that has become available since publication of the Draft EIR. Deletions are shown with ~~strikethrough text~~ and additions are shown in underlined text. Such changes are provided by EIR section. Existing text to remain unchanged is included as plain text, without strikethrough or double underlines, to provide context for the revisions, clarifications, and corrections, where necessary.

a) EIR Table of Contents

Page i-2. The following table title is revised:

Table IV.A-5 Project Maximum Daily Operational Emissions

Page i-3. The following table titles are revised:

Table IV.E-4 ~~Project Consistency with the 2008 AB 32 Scoping Plan Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Measures~~ Estimated Statewide Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions in the 2022 Scoping Plan

Table IV.E-5 ~~Project Consistency with the 2017 Scoping Plan~~ Major Climate Legislation and Executive Orders Enacted Since the 2017 Scoping Plan

b) EIR Chapter I, Introduction and Executive Summary

Page I-16. The following text is revised:

- **AQ-PDF-1:** The Applicant will make a reasonable effort to attain All-diesel-powered equipment utilized on-site during the construction period that will meet, at a minimum, United States Environmental Protection Agency Tier 4 Final emission reduction technology for nonroad diesel engines. to utilize during the construction period.

Page I-18. Under the heading Public Services, Police Protection Services, the following text is revised:

POL-PDF-1: Prior to issuance of a demolition permit, the Project ~~shall~~will:

- Provide security fencing around the perimeter of the Project Site during the construction phase; and
- Provide on-site security personnel whose duties ~~shall~~will include construction site entrance and exit monitoring.

Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the Project ~~shall~~will:

- Provide on-site security personnel whose duties ~~shall~~will include Office Building (including parking levels) video surveillance monitoring and fire/life/safety system monitoring; and
- Provide adequate security lighting of parking areas, elevators, lobbies, and pathways for pedestrian orientation and to reduce areas of concealment.

The Applicant ~~shall~~will consult with the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) to ensure that available and feasible crime prevention features have been incorporated during the construction period and into the Project design and receive LAPD's approval.

POL-PDF-2: Emergency Procedures Plan. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the Applicant or its successor ~~shall~~will develop an Emergency Procedures Plan that addresses emergency concerns and practices and provides a diagram that illustrates each portion of the property, including access routes. The plan ~~shall~~will be submitted to the Los Angeles Police Department Central Area Commanding Officer for review and approval.

Pages I-18 and I-19. Under the heading Transportation, the following text is revised:

TRANS-PDF-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan. The Applicant will prepare and submit a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan to the City for review and approval. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will include temporary street closure information, a detour plan, haul routes, and an equipment staging plan. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will formalize how construction ~~shall~~will be carried out and

identify specific actions that will be required to reduce effects on the surrounding community. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will be based on the nature and timing of the specific construction activities and other projects in the vicinity of the Project Site, and ~~shall~~will include, but not be limited to, the following elements, as appropriate:

- Advanced notification of adjacent property owners and occupants, as well as nearby schools, of upcoming construction activities, including durations and daily hours of construction.
- Prohibition of construction worker parking on adjacent residential streets.
- Prohibition of construction-related vehicle parking on surrounding public streets.
- Temporary pedestrian and vehicular traffic controls during all construction activities adjacent to East 4th Street, Colyton Street, and South Hewitt Street to ensure traffic safety on public rights-of-way. These controls shall include, but are not limited to, flag people trained in pedestrian and student safety.
- Temporary traffic control during all construction activities adjacent to public rights-of-way to improve traffic flow on public roadways (e.g., flag men).
- Scheduling of construction activities to reduce the effect on traffic flow on surrounding arterial streets.
- Safety precautions for pedestrians and bicyclists through such measures as alternate routing and protection barriers as appropriate, including along all identified Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) pedestrian routes to nearby schools.
- Scheduling of construction-related deliveries, haul trips, etc., so as to occur outside the commuter peak hours to the extent feasible, and so as to not impede school drop-off and pick-up activities and students using LAUSD's identified pedestrian routes to nearby schools.
- Coordination with public transit agencies to provide advanced notifications of stop relocations and durations.
- Advanced notification of temporary parking removals and duration of removals.
- Provision of detour plans to address temporary road closures during construction.

TRANS-PDF-2: Transportation Management Organization. The Applicant will provide its fair share of seed funding for the Arts District portion of a Downtown/Arts District Transportation Management Organization (TMO), following approval of the Project, by

providing funding for TMO operations and marketing efforts. The Applicant will commit its fair share required in the first year to cover the cost of launching the Arts District portion of a Downtown/Arts District TMO and ~~shall~~will continue to commit to nine additional years (10 years in total), as a charter member with annual dues.

Page I-27. Under the heading Alternative 1: No Project Alternative, the following text is revised:

Therefore, Alternative 1 would not meet the basic Project objective to redevelop the urban infill Project Site and provide a ~~high density~~, mixed-use, commercial office project at an increased FAR that increases job opportunities in proximity to public transit and other commercial and residential land uses.

Page I-28. Under the heading Alternative 2: Current Zoning and Land Use Designation Alternative, the following text is revised:

However, Alternative 2 would not meet the basic Project objective to redevelop the urban infill Project Site and provide a ~~high density~~, mixed-use, commercial office project at an increased FAR that increases job opportunities in proximity to public transit and other commercial and residential land uses to the same extent as the Project, because its reduced ~~density~~FAR would provide substantially fewer jobs.

Page I-30. Under the heading Alternative 3: Downtown Community Plan Alternative, the following text is revised:

As Alternative 3 would develop primarily live/work residential uses and not office uses, it would not meet the basic Project objective to redevelop the urban infill Project Site and provide a ~~high density~~, mixed-use, commercial office project at an increased FAR that provides job opportunities in proximity to public transit and other commercial and residential land uses ~~to the same extent as the Project~~, because the office uses of the Project would be replaced with live/work residential uses.

Page I-31. Under the heading Environmentally Superior Alternative, the following text is revised:

Alternative 2 represents a ~~commercial and office reduced density~~ development at a reduced FAR that is in accordance with the existing zoning designation, height limit, and FAR allowed within the Project Site.

However, Alternative 2 is selected as the Environmentally Superior Alternative, because unlike Alternative 3, which would develop a primarily residential use rather than office uses, Alternative 2 would still develop office and commercial uses, and as such would achieve the intent of the Project objectives, though to a lesser extent than the Project due to its substantially reduced ~~density~~FAR by comparison.

c) EIR Chapter II, Project Description

Page II-1. In the Introduction to the Project Description, the following text is revised:

The ground floor would include 112 bicycle parking spaces (40 short-term spaces and 72 long-term spaces); as well as amenities such as showers and a bicycle repair area for bicyclists; and other features essential to building operations, including a loading dock and trash collection area, a fuel storage room (the fuel will be used to power an emergency generator during an emergency and mandatory periodic testing), reception area, and building management and security personnel offices. Vehicle parking spaces would be provided within three subterranean levels and on the 2nd through 5th floors of the Office Building. Office space would comprise the 6th through 17th floors, and office and mechanical equipment would comprise the 18th floor and rooftop level.

Page II-29. In the discussion of Vehicle and Bicycle Parking, the following text is revised:

The Project would include 660 vehicle parking spaces. The parking calculations for the Project are provided in Table II-3, Vehicle Parking, below. A portion of the spaces provided on the 2nd through 5th floors of the Office Building would be comprised of mechanical double stackers.

Page II-29, Subsection f) Vehicle and Bicycle Parking, the following text is added:

The Project would provide 660 vehicle parking spaces. Under Assembly Bill 2097, signed into law by Governor Newsom in September 2022, public agencies are prohibited from imposing any minimum vehicle parking requirements on any residential, commercial, or other development projects within 0.5 miles of public transit. The Metro L (Gold) Line Little Tokyo/Arts District Station is located one-half mile to the north of the Project Site, and the Project area is also served by bus transit along 1st Street, 3rd Street, 4th Street, 6th Street, 7th Street, Olympic Boulevard, Central Avenue, Boyle Avenue, and Soto Street. The bus stops closest to the Project Site are located at East 4th Place and South Hewitt Street, and Merrick Street and Traction Avenue, and are served by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation's LADOT's DASH A line, a local community shuttle bus. As such, there is no minimum vehicle parking requirement applicable to the Project, however Applicants may choose to provide vehicle parking in accordance with the LAMC.

Pages II-33 and II-34. Under the heading Project Objectives, the following text is revised:

1. Redevelop low-intensity parcels in the Arts District with a mix of ~~high-density~~ commercial land uses at an increased FAR that provides an increased variety of job opportunities, thereby maximizing the creation of permanent jobs and economic investment in the City of Los Angeles and the Arts District.

2. Introduce a range of high quality ~~and high density~~ commercial spaces at the appropriate scale and intensity that would supply the increasing demand for office, incubator space, and innovative campus uses in the Arts District; contribute to the demand for office space; and provide neighborhood resources for the growing residential neighborhood within the Arts District.

Page II-31. Under Project Construction, the following text is revised in the first paragraph:

Construction of the Project is anticipated to begin in 2022 and would conclude in 2025, with an overall duration of ~~28~~approximately 30 months.

d) EIR Chapter III, Environmental Setting

Page III-2. Under the heading Existing Project Site Conditions, the following text is revised:

The Project Site is currently occupied by four structures – two occupiable and two storage accessory structures. One ~~occupiable structure with a commercial use~~was formerly occupied by the Architecture and Design (A+D) Museum and is located at the southeast corner of Colyton and East 4th Streets. A storage space for the commercial use building formerly occupied by the A+D Museum (located southeast of the commercial use former A+D Museum building in a separate 1,000-square foot structure), a one-story office structure and related garage/storage space (6,030 square feet combined), and associated surface parking lots (approximately 39,751 square feet) are also located on the Project Site.

Page III-4. Under the heading Related Projects, the following text is revised:

The Related Projects list is based on information provided by the City's Department of Transportation (LADOT) and City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning (Department of City Planning), recent case filings of major discretionary projects, and recent transportation studies prepared for projects located within 1.5 miles of the Project Site as of the date of the September 20, 2017 NOP and as subsequently updated between 2018 and 2019 by the LADOT and Department of City Planning to 1) remove duplicate listings of projects, ministerial projects that did not warrant transportation or CEQA analysis, and projects that had been terminated; and 2) to add projects for which new case filings had been submitted since 2017.

e) EIR Section IV.A, Air Quality

Page IV.A-14. The following text is added to the second paragraph:

The 2022 AQMP was adopted on December 2, 2022 by the SCAQMD Governing Board. The 2022 AQMP is focused on attaining the 2015 8-hour O₃ standard of 70 parts per billion. The 2022 AQMP builds upon measures already in place from previous AQMPs and includes a variety of additional strategies such as regulation, accelerated development of available clean technologies, incentives and other CAA measures to achieve this standard.

Page IV.A-14. The third paragraph is revised as follows:

SCAQMD's strategy to meet the NAAQS and CAAQS distributes the responsibility for emission reductions across federal, state, and local levels and industries. The 2016 and 2022 AQMPs are is composed of stationary and mobile source emission reductions from traditional regulatory control measures, incentive-based programs, co-benefits from climate programs, mobile source strategies, and reductions from federal sources, which include aircraft, locomotives and ocean-going vessels. These strategies are to be implemented in partnership with the CARB and USEPA.

Page IV.A-14. The first sentence of the fourth paragraph and footnote 18 are revised as follows:

The 2016 and 2022 AQMPs also incorporates the transportation strategy and transportation control measures from SCAG's adopted 2016–2040 RTP/SCS (2016-2040 RTP/SCS) Plan and 2020-2045 RTP/SCS Plan (2020-2045 RTP/SCS).¹⁸

¹⁸ SCAG, Final 2016 and 2022 RTP/SCS, 2016 and 2022

Page IV.A-15. The last sentence of the first paragraph is revised as follows:

The RTP/SCS and Transportation Control Measures, included as Appendix IV-C of the 2016 and 2022 AQMPs, are based on SCAG's 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and 2020-2045 RTP/SCS.

Page IV.A-15. The second paragraph and footnote 20 are revised as follows:

The 2016 AQMP forecasts the 2031 emissions inventories “with growth” based on SCAG's 2016-2040 RTP/SCS. The region is projected to see a 12-percent growth in population, 16-percent growth in housing units, 23-percent growth in employment, and 8-percent growth in vehicle miles traveled between 2012 and 2031. Additionally, the 2022 AQMP forecasts the 2037 emission inventories “with growth” based on SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. The region is projected to see a 12-percent growth in population, 17-percent growth in housing units, 11-percent growth in employment, and five-percent growth in vehicle miles traveled between 2018 and 2037. Despite regional growth in the past, air quality has improved substantially over the years, primarily due to the effects of air quality control programs at the local, state and federal levels.²⁰

²⁰ SCAQMD, Figure 1-4 of the Final 2016 AQMP and 2022 AQMP

Page IV.A-15. The third paragraph is removed as follows:

~~On September 3, 2020, SCAG's Regional Council adopted the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. The 2020-2045 RTP/SCS was determined to conform to the federally mandated SIP, for the attainment and maintenance of NAAQS standards. On October 30, 2020, CARB also accepted SCAG's determination that the SCS met the applicable future state GHG reduction target of 19 percent. The 2020-2045 RTP/SCS will be incorporated into the forthcoming 2022 AQMP.~~

Page IV.A-20. The second paragraph is revised as follows:

The City is also responsible for implementation of transportation control measures as outlined in the AQMPs.

Page IV.A-24. The following text under Sensitive Receptors is revised to clarify the number and locations of sensitive receptors located in the immediate Project vicinity:

The closest sensitive receptors (approximately 200 feet) to the Project Site are located at 428 South Hewitt Street, 825 East 4th Street, and 442 Colyton Street. The small, narrow structure at 428 South Hewitt Street is located approximately 80 feet southeast of the Project Site and houses a residential unit on the roof of its commercial (bar/club) use (Resident LA). The 6-story building at 825 East 4th Street, with a larger concentration of receptors, is located approximately 200 feet northwest of the Project Site and is comprised of multi-unit residences. The structure located at 442 Colyton Street, approximately 200 feet south of the Project Site, is a live/work space. ~~One sensitive receptor is located adjacent to the Project, and another sensitive receptor is located nearby. A small narrow structure, the 428 South Hewitt Street building, houses a residential unit in addition to its commercial use (Resident LA). This structure is located 80 feet southeast of the Project Site. The other sensitive use, with a larger concentration of receptors, is the 6-story multi-unit residential building located at 825 East 4th Street, which is located 200 feet northwest of the Project Site.~~

Page IV.A-30. The following text in the first paragraph is revised as follows:

In accordance with the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the City used the following criteria to evaluate Project consistency with the SCAQMD's 2016 and 2022 AQMPs and the Air Quality Element:

- Criterion 1) Would the Project:
 - Result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations;
 - Cause or contribute to new air quality violations; and/or
 - Delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the AQMP.
- Criterion 2) Would the Project exceed the assumptions utilized in preparing the AQMP?

Page IV.A-32. The following text under Operations – Regional Emissions is revised:

During long-term Project operations (i.e., after construction is complete), the Project would result in emissions of criteria pollutants from area sources such as use of landscape equipment and consumer products, energy sources including use of electricity and natural gas, and mobile sources associated with vehicle use. In addition, a proposed emergency generator for the Office Building, which requires monthly testing on a routine basis in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1470, represents a stationary source during Project operation.

Page IV.A-34. The following text is revised:

- **AQ-PDF-1:** The Applicant will make a reasonable effort to attain All-diesel-powered equipment utilized on-site during the construction period that will meet, at a minimum, United States Environmental Protection Agency Tier 4 Final emission reduction technology for nonroad diesel engines; to utilize during the construction period.

Pages IV.A-34 and 35. The first paragraph under the heading Analysis of Project Impacts is revised as follows:

(1) Consistency with the 2016 and 2022 Air Quality Management Plan

(a) *2016 and 2022 Air Quality Management Plan Conflicts*

The primary air quality plan that pertains to the Project and Project Site is SCAQMD's 2016 and 2022 AQMPs. Therefore, in accordance with SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the City used the criteria identified below to determine whether the Project would conflict with SCAQMD's 2016 and 2022 AQMPs. To respond to these criteria, Project consistency with SCAG policies and growth projections in the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and 2020-2045 RTP/SCS are also addressed.

Page IV.A-35. The third and fourth paragraphs are revised as follows:

Criterion 2) The evaluation of Criterion 2 considers whether the Project would exceed the assumptions utilized in preparing the AQMPs, which are mainly the population, housing, and employment growth projections included in SCAG's 2016-2040 and 2020-2045 RTP/SCS.

As the ~~current~~ 2016 AQMP is based on SCAG's 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and the 2022 AQMP is based on SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, the following discussion shows that the Project would be consistent with both the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS.

According to the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, SCAG projects that between the years 2012 and 2040, the region will add approximately 3.8 million residents, 1.5 million households, and 2.5 million jobs. The 2016-2040 RTP/SCS provides a projection of 4,609,400 persons; 1,690,300 households; and 2,169,100 jobs in the City by 2040. According to the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, SCAG projects that between the years 2016 and 2045, the region will add approximately 3.7 million residents, 1.6 million households, and 1.7 million jobs. The 2020-2045 RTP/SCS provides a projection of 4,771,300 persons; 1,793,000 households; and 2,135,900 jobs in the City by 2045....Despite the discretionary approvals that would be required to construct the Project, the Project would represent 0.05 percent of the 2012 through 2040 regional growth in employment, or 0.06 percent of the overall employment projected for the City in 2040, which does not represent unplanned growth. Additionally, the Project would represent 0.08 percent of the projected regional employment growth through 2045, or 0.5 percent of the overall employment projected for the City in 2045, which does not represent unplanned growth.

Page IV.A-36. The first paragraph and footnote 37 are revised as follows:

Additionally, the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS includes the following VMT statistics and goals for Los Angeles County specifically: 21.5 daily total VMT per capita for the 2012 base year

and a planned 18.4 daily total VMT per capita for the 2040 horizon year. The 2020-2045 RTP/SCS includes the following VMT statistics and goals for Los Angeles County specifically: 22.2 daily total VMT per capita for the 2016 base year and a planned 19.2 daily total VMT capita for the 2045 horizon year. As set forth in Section IV.L, Transportation, the Project's total daily VMT would be 7.2 work VMT per employee,³⁷ which is less than the 2016-2020 RTP/SCS and 2020-2045 RTP/SCS VMT statistics and goals for both the SCAG region and Los Angeles County both the RTP/SCS base year and horizon years (2012 and 2040 and 2016 and 2045, respectively).

Page IV.A-36. The second paragraph is revised as follows:

As a mixed-use development located on an urban infill site within 0.5 mile of a major transit station (the L Line [Gold] at the County of Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority [Metro] Little Tokyo/Arts District Station),³⁸ the Project would be consistent with the 2016-2040 and 2020-2045 RTP/SCS' initiatives to promoted walking, biking, and other forms of active transportation; to focus new growth around transit; to improve air quality and reduce GHG emissions and to preserve natural lands.

Page IV.A-36. The last paragraph is revised as follows:

The Project would incorporate Project Design Feature AQ-PDF-1, wherein the Applicant will make a reasonable effort to attain diesel-powered equipment that will meet United States Environmental Protection Agency Tier 4 Final emission reduction technology for nonroad diesel engines to utilize during the construction period, which ~~that~~ as shown in the analysis below, would reduce emissions of air pollutants or their precursors during construction ~~by using diesel equipment that is rated for Tier 4 emission reduction technology.~~

Page IV.A-38. Under the heading City of Los Angeles Air Quality Element Policies, the following text is revised:

The Project Site is located in an infill location in a live/work community, and ~~it~~ the Project would increase the floor area ratio of the on-site development land use density within an area that is served by public transit.

Page IV.A-39. The first, second and third paragraphs are revised as follows:

Regarding Threshold a, the Project would not conflict with the 2016 and/or the 2022 AQMPs or the Air Quality Element plans and policies. The determination of AQMP consistency is primarily concerned with the long-term influence of the Project on air quality in the Air Basin. As demonstrated in the following evaluations, the Project would not increase the frequency or severity of an existing air quality violation or cause or contribute to new violations for criteria pollutants. As the Project would not exceed any of the State

and federal standards, the Project would also not delay the timely attainment of air quality standards of the 2016 and 2022 AQMPs. In addition, the Project is consistent with current growth projections, which will be ~~are~~ used in the development of updates to the 2022 AQMP. **Thus, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMP or conflict with City policies, as discussed above, and impacts regarding Threshold a would be less than significant.**

(2) Mitigation Measures

Impacts related to conflicts with, or obstruction of implementation of the 2016 and 2022 AQMP and other applicable air quality plans would be less than significant without mitigation. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

(3) Level of Significance After Mitigation

Impacts related to conflicts with, or obstruction of implementation of the 2016 and/or 2022 AQMPs and other applicable air quality plans would be less than significant without mitigation. Therefore, no mitigation measures were required or included, and the impact level remains less than significant.

Page IV.A-39. The fourth paragraph is revised as follows:

Pursuant to the previously described SCAQMD methodology, individual construction projects that do not exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts would also not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the Air Basin is in nonattainment. According to the 2016 and 2022 AQMPs, the Air Basin region is designated as a nonattainment area for federal O₃, PM_{2.5}, and Pb standards,³⁹ and for State O₃, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} standards.

Page IV.A-40. In the discussion of Regional Emissions, the following text is revised:

The use of heavy-duty construction equipment on- and off-site, heavy-duty trucks that haul soils and construction materials to and from the Project Site, and construction worker vehicle trips would generate pollutant emissions during the construction period. As described above, in compliance with AQ-PDF-1, the Applicant will make a reasonable effort to attain nonroad all-diesel-powered on-site construction equipment that would incorporate Tier 4 Final emission reduction technology to utilize during construction. ~~as Project Design Feature AQ-PDF-1.~~ Additionally, Pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 403, the Project would apply water to exposed soils during grading to reduce dust emissions.

Page IV.A-41. Footnote c of Table IV.A-4, Construction Activity Daily Emissions, is revised:

° With required dust control (watering exposed soils twice daily) for compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 and use of equipment with Tier 4 Final emissions reduction technology on diesel equipment (Project Design Feature AQ-PDF-1). CalEEMod output sheets provided in Appendix B reports these amounts in the “mitigated” scenario, although regulatory compliance and project features are not considered mitigation under CEQA.

Page IV.A-41. In the discussion of Regional Emissions - Operations, the following text is revised:

Operational area, mobile, and energy emissions were calculated using CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2, for an assumed Project opening year of 2023 as shown in Table IV.A-5, Project Maximum Daily Operational Emissions. The Project Transportation Impact Study (Appendix L1 of this Draft EIR), estimates that the Project would generate 2,756 daily trips and 19,848 VMT, which were considered in the CalEEMod calculations of operational emissions of criteria pollutants. In addition to mobile sources of emissions, the Project would also generate criteria pollutant emissions from area sources and energy consumption, including off-site electrical generation. Operational emergency generator emissions were calculated using CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0 for the Project, as shown in Revised Table IV.A-5, Project Maximum Daily Operational Emissions. Based on the information provided~~As shown~~ in Revised Table IV.A-5, the Project’s maximum ~~Daily~~ Operational Emissions would not exceed the applicable SCAQMD CEQA significance thresholds.

Page IV.A-42. Table IV.A-5 is replaced with Revised Table IV.A-5, as follows:

Revised Table IV.A-5
Project Maximum Daily Operational Emissions

Source	Operational Emissions (pounds/day)					
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Summer						
Area	7.6	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	0.2	1.4	1.2	0.0	0.1	0.1
Mobile	4.1	16.5	50.2	0.2	15.5	4.2
<u>Emergency Generator</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>6.8</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.2</u>
Subtotal	<u>11.913.4</u>	<u>17.924.7</u>	<u>51.555.3</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>15.86</u>	<u>4.53</u>
Winter						
Area	7.6	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	0.2	1.4	1.2	0.0	0.1	0.1
Mobile	3.9	16.8	47.9	0.2	15.5	4.2
<u>Emergency Generator</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>6.8</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.2</u>
Subtotal	<u>11.713.2</u>	<u>18.225.0</u>	<u>49.253.0</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>15.86</u>	<u>4.53</u>
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55

Source	Operational Emissions (pounds/day)					
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Source for Area, Energy, and Mobile Emissions: Giroux & Associates and Envicom Corporation. 2022. Air Quality Impact Analysis, 4 th and Hewitt Project. April (Revised). (Appendix B.)						
Source for Emergency Generator Emissions: Appendix FEIR-B, Revised California Emissions Estimator Model.						

Page IV.A-44. In the discussion of Construction Activity Toxic Air Contaminants, the following text is revised:

Construction equipment exhaust, as from the operation of heavy-duty equipment, contains carcinogenic compounds, or TACs, within the diesel exhaust particulates. As described in Project Design Feature AQ-PDF-1, the Applicant will make a reasonable effort to attain diesel-powered equipment that will meet United States Environmental Protection Agency Tier 4 Final emission reduction technology for nonroad diesel engines to utilize during the construction period~~all diesel-powered equipment utilized on-site during the construction period will meet, at a minimum, Tier 4 emission reduction technology.~~

Page IV.A-45. Table IV.A-7, LST and Project Emissions – Operations (pounds/day), is replaced with Revised Table IV.A-7, as follows:

Revised Table IV.A-7

LST and Project Emissions – Operations (pounds/day)

Emissions Source	Maximum Daily Onsite Emissions ^a			
	NOx	CO	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Area	< 0.01	0.1	< 0.01	< 0.01
Energy (Natural Gas) ^b	1.4	1.2	0.1	0.1
Emergency Generator	<u>6.8</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.2</u>
On-Site Total	4.48.2	4.35.1	0.10.3	0.10.3
Operations LST^c	74	680	2	1
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No
Source for Area and Energy (Natural Gas) Emissions: Giroux & Associates and Envicom Corporation. 2022. Air Quality Impact Analysis, 4 th and Hewitt Project. April (Revised). (Appendix B).				
Source for Emergency Generator Emissions: Appendix FEIR-B, Revised California Emissions Estimator Model.				
^a Onsite emissions during any season.				
^b LST would not apply to emissions associated with offsite generation of electricity.				
^c SCAQMD LST 1.0 acre/25 meters Central LA.				

f) EIR Section IV.B, Cultural Resources

Page IV.B-43. Under the heading Operation, the following text is revised:

The Project's 18-story Office Building would add substantial height and ~~density~~ increase the floor area ratio (FAR) of these parcels that are currently occupied by one-story industrial buildings and surface parking lots.

Page IV.B-51. Under the heading Historical Resources, the following text is revised:

Despite the increased ~~density and scale~~ height and FAR of the Office Building, the Project would not result in additional obstructed views ~~between and~~ among contributing buildings in the immediate vicinity.

g) EIR Section IV.C, Energy

Page IV.C-24. Under the heading Transportation Fuel, the following text is revised:

As shown in Table IV.C-2, the Project would result in an increase in the demand for transportation fuels, which is associated with the Project's increase in on-site floor areal ~~land use density~~ and vehicle trips.

h) EIR Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Page IV.E-19. The following text is added:

(iii) 2022 Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan

The 2022 Scoping Plan Update is the most comprehensive and far-reaching Scoping Plan developed to date. It identifies a technologically feasible, cost-effective, and equity-focused path to achieve new targets for carbon neutrality by 2045 and to reduce anthropogenic GHG emissions to at least 85 percent below 1990 levels, while also assessing the progress California is making toward reducing its GHG emissions by at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030, as called for in SB 32 and laid out in the 2017 Scoping Plan. The 2030 target is an interim but important stepping stone along the critical path to the broader goal of deep decarbonization by 2045. The relatively longer path assessed in the 2022 Scoping Plan Update incorporates, coordinates, and leverages many existing and ongoing efforts to reduce GHGs and air pollution, while identifying new clean technologies and energy. Given the focus on carbon neutrality, the 2022 Scoping Plan Update also includes discussion for the first time of the natural and working lands sectors as sources for both sequestration and carbon storage, and as sources of emissions as a result of wildfires.

A summary of the GHG emissions reductions and targets set forth under the 2022 Scoping Plan Update is provided in **Revised Table IV.E-4**.

Revised Table IV.E-4
Estimated Statewide Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions in the
2022 Scoping Plan

<u>Emissions Scenario</u>	<u>GHG Emissions (MMTCO_{2e})</u>
<u>2019</u>	
<u>2019 State GHG Emissions</u>	<u>404</u>
<u>2030</u>	
<u>2030 BAU Forecast</u>	<u>312</u>
<u>2030 GHG Emissions without Carbon Removal and Capture</u>	<u>233</u>
<u>2030 GHG Emissions with Carbon Removal and Capture</u>	<u>226</u>
<u>2030 Emissions Target Set by AB 32 (i.e., 1990 level by 2030)</u>	<u>260</u>
<u>Reduction below Business-As-Usual necessary to achieve 1990 levels by 2030</u>	<u>52 (16.7%)^a</u>
<u>2045</u>	
<u>2045 BAU Forecast</u>	<u>266</u>
<u>2045 GHG Emissions without Carbon Removal and Capture</u>	<u>72</u>
<u>2045 GHG Emissions with Carbon Removal and Capture</u>	<u>(3)</u>
MMTCO _{2e} = million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents; parenthetical numbers represent negative values.	
^a 312 – 260 = 52. 52 / 312 = 16.7%	
Source: CARB. 2022. Final 2022 Climate Change Scoping Plan, November.	

The 2022 Scoping Plan Update reflects existing and recent direction in the Governor’s Executive Orders and State Statutes, which identify policies, strategies, and regulations in support of implementation of the Scoping Plan. Among these include Executive Order B-55-18 and AB 1279 (The California Climate Crisis Act), which identify the 2045 carbon neutrality and GHG reduction targets required for the Scoping Plan.

Revised Table IV.E-5 below provides a summary of major climate legislation and executive orders issued since the adoption of the 2017 Scoping Plan.

Revised Table IV.E-5
Major Climate Legislation and Executive Orders Enacted Since the
2017 Scoping Plan

<u>Bill/Executive Order</u>	<u>Summary</u>
<p><u>Assembly Bill 1279 (AB 1279)</u> <u>(Muratsuchi, Chapter 337, Statutes of 2022)</u> <i><u>The California Climate Crisis Act</u></i></p>	<p>AB 1279 establishes the policy of the State to achieve carbon neutrality as soon as possible, but no later than 2045; to maintain net negative GHG emissions thereafter; and to ensure that by 2045 statewide anthropogenic GHG emissions are reduced at least 85 percent below 1990 levels. The bill requires CARB to ensure that the Scoping Plan updates identify and recommend measures to achieve carbon neutrality, and to identify and implement policies and strategies that enable CO₂ removal solutions and carbon capture, utilization, and storage (CCUS) technologies.</p> <p>This bill is reflected directly in the 2022 Scoping Plan Update.</p>
<p><u>Senate Bill 905 (SB 905)</u> <u>(Caballero, Chapter 359, Statutes of 2022)</u> <i><u>Carbon Capture, Removal, Utilization, and Storage Program</u></i></p>	<p>SB 905 requires CARB to create the Carbon Capture, Removal, Utilization, and Storage Program to evaluate, demonstrate, and regulate CCUS and carbon dioxide removal (CDR) projects and technology.</p> <p>The bill requires CARB, on or before January 1, 2025, to adopt regulations creating a unified State permitting application for approval of CCUS and CDR projects. The bill also requires the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency to publish a framework for governing agreements for two or more tracts of land overlying the same geologic storage reservoir for the purposes of a carbon sequestration project.</p> <p>The 2022 Scoping Plan Update modeling reflects both CCUS and CDR contributions to achieve carbon neutrality.</p>
<p><u>Senate Bill 846 (SB 846) (Dodd, Chapter 239, Statutes of 2022)</u> <i><u>Diablo Canyon Powerplant: Extension of Operations</u></i></p>	<p>SB 846 extends the Diablo Canyon Power Plant's sunset date by up to five additional years for each of its two units and seeks to make the nuclear power plant eligible for federal loans. The bill requires that the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) not include and disallow a load-serving entity from including in their adopted</p>

<u>Bill/Executive Order</u>	<u>Summary</u>
	<p>resource plan, the energy, capacity, or any attribute from the Diablo Canyon power plant.</p> <p>The 2022 Scoping Plan Update explains the emissions impact of this legislation.</p>
<p><u>Senate Bill 1020 (SB 1020)</u> <u>(Laird, Chapter 361, Statutes of 2022)</u></p> <p><i><u>Clean Energy, Jobs, and Affordability Act of 2022</u></i></p>	<p>SB 1020 adds interim renewable energy and zero carbon energy retail sales of electricity targets to California end-use customers set at 90 percent in 2035 and 95 percent in 2040. It accelerates the timeline required to have 100 percent renewable energy and zero carbon energy procured to serve State agencies from the original target year of 2045 to 2035. This bill requires each State agency to individually achieve the 100 percent goal by 2035 with specified requirements. This bill requires the CPUC, California Energy Commission (CEC), and CARB, on or before December 1, 2023, and annually thereafter, to issue a joint reliability progress report that reviews system and local reliability.</p> <p>The bill also modifies the requirement for CARB to hold a portion of its Scoping Plan workshops in regions of the State with the most significant exposure to air pollutants by further specifying that this includes communities with minority populations or low-income communities in areas designated as being in extreme federal non-attainment.</p> <p>The 2022 Scoping Plan Update describes the implications of this legislation on emissions.</p>
<p><u>Senate Bill 1137 (SB 1137)</u> <u>(Gonzales, Chapter 365, Statutes of 2022)</u></p> <p><i><u>Oil & Gas Operations: Location Restrictions: Notice of Intention: Health protection zone: Sensitive receptors</u></i></p>	<p>SB 1137 prohibits the development of new oil and gas wells or infrastructure in health protection zones, as defined, except for purposes of public health and safety or other limited exceptions. The bill requires operators of existing oil and gas wells or infrastructure within health protection zones to undertake specified monitoring, public notice, and nuisance requirements. The bill requires CARB to consult and concur with the California Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM) on leak detection and repair plans for these facilities, adopt regulations as necessary to implement emission detection system standards, and collaborate with CalGEM on public access to emissions detection data.</p>

<u>Bill/Executive Order</u>	<u>Summary</u>
<p><u>Senate Bill 1075 (SB 1075)</u> <u>(Skinner, Chapter 363, Statutes of 2022)</u></p> <p><i><u>Hydrogen: Green</u></i> <i><u>Hydrogen: Emissions of Greenhouse Gases</u></i></p>	<p><u>SB 1075 requires CARB, by June 1, 2024, to prepare an evaluation that includes: policy recommendations regarding the use of hydrogen, and specifically the use of green hydrogen, in California; a description of strategies supporting hydrogen infrastructure, including identifying policies that promote the reduction of GHGs and short-lived climate pollutants; a description of other forms of hydrogen to achieve emission reductions; an analysis of curtailed electricity; an estimate of GHG and emission reductions that could be achieved through deployment of green hydrogen through a variety of scenarios; an analysis of the potential for opportunities to integrate hydrogen production and applications with drinking water supply treatment needs; policy recommendations for regulatory and permitting processes associated with transmitting and distributing hydrogen from production sites to end uses; an analysis of the life-cycle GHG emissions from various forms of hydrogen production; and an analysis of air pollution and other environmental impacts from hydrogen distribution and end uses.</u></p> <p><u>This bill would inform the production of hydrogen at the scale called for in the 2022 Scoping Plan Update.</u></p>
<p><u>Assembly Bill 1757 (AB 1757)</u> <u>(Garcia, Chapter 341, Statutes of 2022)</u></p> <p><i><u>California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: Climate Goal: Natural and Working Lands</u></i></p>	<p><u>AB 1757 requires the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA), in collaboration with CARB, other State agencies, and an expert advisory committee, to determine a range of targets for natural carbon sequestration, and for nature-based climate solutions, that reduce GHG emissions in 2030, 2038, and 2045 by January 1, 2024. These targets must support State goals to achieve carbon neutrality and foster climate adaptation and resilience.</u></p> <p><u>This bill also requires CARB to develop standard methods for State agencies to consistently track GHG emissions and reductions, carbon sequestration, and additional benefits from natural and working lands over time. These methods will account for GHG emissions reductions of CO₂, methane, and nitrous oxide related to natural and working lands and the potential impacts of climate change on the ability to reduce GHG emissions and sequester carbon from natural and working lands, where feasible.</u></p>

<u>Bill/Executive Order</u>	<u>Summary</u>
	<p><u>This 2022 Scoping Plan Update describes the next steps and implications of this legislation for the natural and working lands sector.</u></p>
<p><u>Senate Bill 1206 (SB 1206) (Skinner, Chapter 884, Statutes of 2022)</u> <i><u>Hydrofluorocarbon gases: sale or distribution</u></i></p>	<p><u>SB 1206 mandates a stepped sales prohibition on newly produced high- global warming potential (GWP) HFCs to transition California’s economy toward recycled and reclaimed HFCs for servicing existing HFC-based equipment. Additionally, SB 1206 also requires CARB to develop regulations to increase the adoption of very low-, i.e., GWP < 10, and no-GWP technologies in sectors that currently rely on higher-GWP HFCs.</u></p>
<p><u>Senate Bill 27 (SB 27) (Skinner, Chapter 237, Statutes of 2021)</u> <i><u>Carbon Sequestration: State Goals: Natural and Working Lands: Registry of Projects</u></i></p>	<p><u>SB 27 requires CNRA, in coordination with other state agencies, to establish the Natural and Working Lands Climate Smart Strategy by July 1, 2023. This bill also requires CARB to establish specified CO2 removal targets for 2030 and beyond as part of its Scoping Plan. Under SB 27, CNRA is to establish and maintain a registry to identify projects in the State that drive climate action on natural and working lands and are seeking funding.</u></p> <p><u>CNRA also must track carbon removal and GHG emission reduction benefits derived from projects funded through the registry.</u></p> <p><u>This bill is reflected directly in the 2022 Scoping Plan Update as CO2 removal targets for 2030 and 2045 in support of carbon neutrality.</u></p>
<p><u>Senate Bill 596 (SB 596) (Becker, Chapter 246, Statutes of 2021)</u> <i><u>Greenhouse Gases: Cement Sector: Net- zero Emissions Strategy</u></i></p>	<p><u>SB 596 requires CARB, by July 1, 2023, to develop a comprehensive strategy for the State’s cement sector to achieve net-zero-emissions of GHGs associated with cement used within the State as soon as possible, but no later than December 31, 2045. The bill establishes an interim target of 40 percent below the 2019 average GHG intensity of cement by December 31, 2035. Under SB 596, CARB must:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Define a metric for GHG intensity and establish a baseline from which to measure GHG intensity reductions.</u> <u>Evaluate the feasibility of the 2035 interim target (40 percent reduction in GHG intensity) by July 1, 2028.</u> <u>Coordinate and consult with other state agencies.</u>

<u>Bill/Executive Order</u>	<u>Summary</u>
	<p><u>Prioritize actions that leverage State and federal incentives.</u></p> <p><u>Evaluate measures to support market demand and financial incentives to encourage the production and use of cement with low GHG intensity.</u></p> <p><u>The 2022 Scoping Plan Update modeling is designed to achieve these outcomes.</u></p>
<u>Executive Order N-82-20</u>	<p><u>Governor Newsom signed Executive Order N-82-20 in October 2020 to combat the climate and biodiversity crises by setting a statewide goal to conserve at least 30 percent of California’s land and coastal waters by 2030. The Executive Order also instructed the CNRA, in consultation with other state agencies, to develop a Natural and Working Lands Climate Smart Strategy that serves as a framework to advance the State’s carbon neutrality goal and build climate resilience. In addition to setting a statewide conservation goal, the Executive Order directed CARB to update the target for natural and working lands in support of carbon neutrality as part of this Scoping Plan, and to take into consideration the NWL Climate Smart Strategy.</u></p> <p><u>CO2 Executive Order N-82-20 also calls on the CNRA, in consultation with other state agencies, to establish the California Biodiversity Collaborative (Collaborative). The Collaborative shall be made up of governmental partners, California Native American tribes, experts, business and community leaders, and other stakeholders from across the State. State agencies will consult the Collaborative on efforts to:</u></p> <p><u>Establish a baseline assessment of California’s biodiversity that builds upon existing data and can be updated over time.</u></p> <p><u>Analyze and project the impact of climate change and other stressors in California’s biodiversity.</u></p> <p><u>Inventory current biodiversity efforts across all sectors and highlight opportunities for additional action to preserve and enhance biodiversity.</u></p> <p><u>CNRA also is tasked with advancing efforts to conserve biodiversity through various actions, such as streamlining</u></p>

<u>Bill/Executive Order</u>	<u>Summary</u>
	<p>the State’s process to approve and facilitate projects related to environmental restoration and land management. The California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) is directed to advance efforts to conserve biodiversity through measures such as reinvigorating populations of pollinator insects, which restore biodiversity and improve agricultural production.</p> <p>The Natural and Working Lands Climate Smart Strategy informs the 2022 Scoping Plan Update.</p>
<u>Executive Order N-79-20</u>	<p>Governor Newsom signed Executive Order N-79-20 in September 2020 to establish targets for the transportation sector to support the State in its goal to achieve carbon neutrality by 2045. The targets established in this Executive Order are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>100 percent of in-State sales of new passenger cars and trucks will be zero-emission by 2035.</u> <u>100 percent of medium- and heavy-duty vehicles will be zero-emission by 2045 for all operations where feasible, and by 2035 for drayage trucks.</u> <u>100 percent of off-road vehicles and equipment will be zero-emission by 2035 where feasible.</u> <p>The Executive Order also tasked CARB to develop and propose regulations that require increasing volumes of zero- electric passenger vehicles, medium- and heavy-duty vehicles, drayage trucks, and off-road vehicles toward their corresponding targets of 100 percent zero-emission by 2035 or 2045, as listed above.</p> <p>The 2022 Scoping Plan Update modeling reflects achieving these targets.</p>
<u>Executive Order N-19-19</u>	<p>Governor Newsom signed Executive Order N-19-19 in September 2019 to direct State government to redouble its efforts to reduce GHG emissions and mitigate the impacts of climate change while building a sustainable, inclusive economy. This Executive Order instructs the Department of Finance to create a Climate Investment Framework that:</p>

<u>Bill/Executive Order</u>	<u>Summary</u>
	<p><u>Includes a proactive strategy for the State’s pension funds that reflects the increased risks to the economy and physical environment due to climate change.</u></p> <p><u>Provides a timeline and criteria to shift investments to companies and industry sectors with greater growth potential based on their focus of reducing carbon emissions and adapting to the impacts of climate change.</u></p> <p><u>Aligns with the fiduciary responsibilities of the California Public Employees’ Retirement System, California State Teachers’ Retirement System, and the University of California Retirement Program.</u></p> <p><u>Executive Order N-19-19 directs the State Transportation Agency to leverage more than \$5 billion in annual State transportation spending to help reverse the trend of increased fuel consumption and reduce GHG emissions associated with the transportation sector. It also calls on the Department of General Services to leverage its management and ownership of the State’s 19 million square feet in managed buildings, 51,000 vehicles, and other physical assets and goods to minimize State government’s carbon footprint. Finally, it tasks CARB with accelerating progress toward California’s goal of five million ZEV sales by 2030 by:</u></p> <p><u>Developing new criteria for clean vehicle incentive programs to encourage manufacturers to produce clean, affordable cars.</u></p> <p><u>Proposing new strategies to increase demand in the primary and secondary markets for ZEVs.</u></p> <p><u>Considering strengthening existing regulations or adopting new ones to achieve the necessary GHG reductions from within the transportation sector.</u></p> <p><u>The 2022 Scoping Plan Update modeling reflects efforts to accelerate ZEV deployment.</u></p>
<p><u>Senate Bill 576 (SB 576)</u> <u>(Umberg, Chapter 374, Statutes of 2019)</u></p> <p><u>Coastal Resources: Climate Ready Program and Coastal</u></p>	<p><u>Sea level rise, combined with storm-driven waves, poses a direct risk to the State’s coastal resources, including public and private real property and infrastructure. Rising marine waters threaten sensitive coastal areas, habitats, the survival of threatened and endangered species, beaches, other recreation areas, and urban</u></p>

<u>Bill/Executive Order</u>	<u>Summary</u>
<p><u>Climate Change Adaptation, Infrastructure and Readiness Program</u></p>	<p>waterfronts. SB 576 mandates that the Ocean Protection Council develop and implement a coastal climate adaptation, infrastructure, and readiness program to improve the climate change resiliency of California’s coastal communities, infrastructure, and habitat. This bill also instructs the State Coastal Conservancy to administer the Climate Ready Program, which addresses the impacts and potential impacts of climate change on resources within the conservancy’s jurisdiction.</p>
<p><u>Assembly Bill 65 (AB 65) (Petrie-Norris, Chapter 347, Statutes of 2019)</u></p> <p><u>Coastal Protection: Climate Adaption: Project</u> <u>Prioritization: Natural Infrastructure: Local General Plans</u></p>	<p>This bill requires the State Coastal Conservancy, when it allocates any funding appropriated pursuant to the California Drought, Water, Parks, Climate, Coastal Protection, and Outdoor Access For All Act of 2018, to prioritize projects that use natural infrastructure in coastal communities to help adapt to climate change. The bill requires the conservancy to provide information to the Office of Planning and Research on any projects funded pursuant to the above provision to be considered for inclusion into the clearinghouse for climate adaptation information. The bill authorizes the conservancy to provide technical assistance to coastal communities to better assist them with their projects that use natural infrastructure.</p>
<p><u>Executive Order B-55-18</u></p>	<p>Governor Brown signed Executive Order B-55-18 in September 2018 to establish a statewide goal to achieve carbon neutrality as soon as possible, and no later than 2045, and to achieve and maintain net negative emissions thereafter. Policies and programs undertaken to achieve this goal shall:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><u>Seek to improve air quality and support the health and economic resiliency of urban and rural communities, particularly low-income and disadvantaged communities.</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><u>Be implemented in a manner that supports climate adaptation and biodiversity, including protection of the State’s water supply, water quality, and native plants and animals.</u></p> <p><u>This Executive Order also calls for CARB to:</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><u>Develop a framework for implementation and accounting that tracks progress toward this goal.</u></p>

<u>Bill/Executive Order</u>	<u>Summary</u>
	<p><u>Ensure future Scoping Plans identify and recommend measures to achieve the carbon neutrality goal.</u></p> <p><u>The 2022 Scoping Plan Update is designed to achieve carbon neutrality no later than 2045 and the modeling includes technology and fuel transitions to achieve that outcome.</u></p>
<p><u>Senate Bill 100 (SB 100)</u> <u>(De León, Chapter 312, Statutes of 2018)</u></p> <p><i><u>California Renewables Portfolio Standard Program: emissions of greenhouse gases</u></i></p>	<p><u>Under SB 100, the CPUC, CEC, and CARB shall use programs under existing laws to achieve 100 percent clean electricity. The statute requires these agencies to issue a joint policy report on SB 100 every four years. The first of these reports was issued in 2021.</u></p> <p><u>The 2022 Scoping Plan Update reflects the SB 100 Core Scenario resource mix with a few minor updates.</u></p>
<p><u>Assembly Bill 2127 (AB 2127)</u> <u>(Ting, Chapter 365, Statutes of 2018)</u></p> <p><i><u>Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure: Assessment</u></i></p>	<p><u>This bill requires the CEC, working with CARB and the CPUC, to prepare and biennially update a statewide assessment of the electric vehicle charging infrastructure needed to support the levels of electric vehicle adoption required for the State to meet its goals of putting at least 5 million zero-emission vehicles on California roads by 2030 and of reducing emissions of GHGs to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The bill requires the CEC to regularly seek data and input from stakeholders relating to electric vehicle charging infrastructure.</u></p> <p><u>This bill supports the deployment of ZEVs as modeled in the 2022 Scoping Plan Update.</u></p>
<p><u>Senate Bill 30 (SB 30) (Lara, Chapter 614, Statutes of 2018)</u></p> <p><i><u>Insurance: Climate Change</u></i></p>	<p><u>This bill requires the Insurance Commissioner to convene a working group to identify, assess, and recommend risk transfer market mechanisms that, among other things, promote investment in natural infrastructure to reduce the risks of climate change related to catastrophic events, create incentives for investment in natural infrastructure to reduce risks to communities, and provide mitigation incentives for private investment in natural lands to lessen exposure and reduce climate risks to public safety, property, utilities, and infrastructure. The bill requires the policies recommended to address specified questions.</u></p>

Bill/Executive Order	Summary
<p><u>Assembly Bill 2061 (AB 2061)</u> <u>(Frazier, Chapter 580, Statutes of 2018)</u></p> <p><i><u>Near-zero-emission and Zero-emission Vehicles</u></i></p>	<p>Existing State and federal law sets specified limits on the total gross weight imposed on the highway by a vehicle with any group of two or more consecutive axles. Under existing federal law, the maximum gross vehicle weight of that vehicle may not exceed 82,000 pounds. AB 2061 authorizes a near-zero- emission vehicle or a zero-emission vehicle to exceed the weight limits on the power unit by up to 2,000 pounds.</p> <p>This bill supports the deployment of cleaner trucks as modeled in this 2022 Scoping Plan Update.</p>

The 2022 Scoping Plan Scenario identifies the need to accelerate AB 32’s 2030 target, from 40 percent to 48 percent below 1990 levels. Cap-and-Trade regulation continues to play a large factor in the reduction of near-term emissions for meeting the 2030 reduction target. Every sector of the economy will need to begin to transition in this decade to meet these GHG reduction goals and achieve carbon neutrality no later than 2045. The 2022 Scoping Plan Update approaches decarbonization from two perspectives, managing a phasedown of existing energy sources and technologies, as well as increasing, developing, and deploying alternative clean energy sources and technology. The Scoping Plan Scenario is summarized in Table 2-1 starting on page 72 of the Scoping Plan. It includes references to relevant statutes and Executive Orders, although it is not comprehensive of all existing new authorities for directing or supporting the actions described. Table 2-1 identifies actions related to a variety of sectors such as: smart growth and reductions in VMT; light-duty vehicles (LDV) and ZEVs; truck ZEVs; reduce fossil energy, emissions, and GHGs for aviation ocean-going vessels, port operations, freight and passenger rail, oil and gas extraction; and petroleum refining; improvements in electricity generation; electrical appliances in new and existing residential and commercial buildings; electrification and emission reductions across industries such as the for food products, construction equipment, chemicals and allied products, pulp and paper, stone/clay/glass/cement, other industrial manufacturing, and agriculture; retiring of combined heat and power facilities; low carbon fuels for transportation, business, and industry; improvements in non-combustion methane emissions, and introduction of low GWP refrigerants.

Achieving the targets described in the 2022 Scoping Plan Update will require continued commitment to and successful implementation of existing policies and programs, and identification of new policy tools and technical solutions to go further, faster. California’s Legislature and State agencies will continue to collaborate to achieve the State’s climate, clean air, equity, and broader economic and environmental protection goals. It will be

necessary to maintain and strengthen this collaborative effort, and to draw upon the assistance of the federal government, regional and local governments, tribes, communities, academic institutions, and the private sector to achieve the State's near-term and longer-term emission reduction goals and a more equitable future for all Californians. The Scoping Plan acknowledges that the path forward is not dependent on one agency, one state, or even one country. However, the State can lead by engaging Californians and demonstrating how actions at the State, regional, and local levels of governments, as well as action at community and individual levels, can contribute to addressing the challenge.

Aligning local jurisdiction action with State-level priorities to tackle climate change and the outcomes called for in the 2022 Scoping Plan Update is identified as critical to achieving the statutory targets for 2030 and 2045. The 2022 Scoping Plan Update discusses the role of local governments in meeting the State's GHG reductions goals. Local governments have the primary authority to plan, zone, approve, and permit how and where land is developed to accommodate population growth, economic growth, and the changing needs of their jurisdictions. They also make critical decisions on how and when to deploy transportation infrastructure, and can choose to support transit, walking, bicycling, and neighborhoods that do not force people into cars. Local governments also have the option to adopt building ordinances that exceed statewide building code requirements, and play a critical role in facilitating the rollout of ZEV infrastructure. As a result, local government decisions play a critical role in supporting state-level measures to contain the growth of GHG emissions associated with the transportation system and the built environment – the two largest GHG emissions sectors over which local governments have authority. The City has taken the initiative in combating climate change by developing programs and regulations such as the Green New Deal and Green Building Code. Each of these is discussed further below.

Page IV.E-32. The following text is revised :

(d) *City of Los Angeles General Plan*

The City does not have a General Plan Element specific to climate change and GHG emissions, but several goals, objectives, or policies in the Air Quality Element, Housing Element, Plan for Healthy LA, and Mobility Plan 2035 encourage the reduction of emissions. ~~and it's General Plan does not have any stated goals, objectives, or policies specifically addressing climate change and GHG emissions.~~

Page IV.E-33. The following text is added:

(f) City of Los Angeles All-Electric Buildings

Chapter IX of the LAMC also requires that all new buildings be all-electric buildings, with some exceptions. Equipment typically powered by natural gas, such as space heating, water heating, cooking appliances, and clothes drying, would need to be powered by electricity for new construction. Exceptions are made for commercial restaurants, laboratory, and research and development uses. The LAMC is consistent with 2022 Title 24 goals of encouraging all-electric development, which requires new residential uses to be electric-ready (wiring installed for all-electric appliances). Buildings in Los Angeles account for 43 percent of GHG emissions – more than any other sector in the City. These LAMC requirements ensure that new buildings being constructed are built to leverage the increasingly clean electric grid, which is anticipated to be carbon-free by 2035, rather than relying on fossil fuels.

(g) Mobility Plan 2035

In August 2015, the City Council adopted Mobility Plan 2035 (Mobility Plan), which serves as the City’s General Plan circulation element. The City Council has adopted several amendments to the Mobility Plan since its initial adoption, including the most recent amendment on September 7, 2016. The Mobility Plan incorporates “complete streets” principles and lays the policy foundation for how the City’s residents interact with their streets. While the Mobility Plan 2035 mainly relates to transportation, certain components would serve to reduce VMT and mobile source GHG emissions. One component of the Mobility Plan is a GHG emission tracking program to establish compliance with SB 375, AB 32, and the region’s SCS.

Page IV.E-37. The following text is added:

(a) 2022 Scoping Plan Update

Appendix D, Local Actions, of the 2022 Scoping Plan Update includes “recommendations intended to build momentum for local government actions that align with the State’s climate goals, with a focus on local GHG reduction strategies (commonly referred to as climate action planning) and approval of new land use development projects, including through environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).”¹

The State encourages local governments to adopt a CEQA-qualified CAP addressing the three priority areas (transportation electrification, VMT reduction, and building decarbonization). However, the State recognizes that almost 50 percent of jurisdictions do not have an adopted CAP, because they are costly and require technical expertise.

¹ CARB. 2022. 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality (Appendix D, Page 4). November 16.

staffing, funding, among other reasons. Additionally, CAPs need to be monitored and updated as State targets change and new data is available. Jurisdictions that wish to take meaningful climate action (such as preparing a non-CEQA-qualified CAP or as individual measures) aligned with the State’s climate goals in the absence of a CEQA-qualified CAP are advised to look to the three priority areas when developing local climate plans, measures, policies, and actions: transportation electrification, VMT reduction, and building decarbonization. “By prioritizing climate action in these three priority areas, local governments can address the largest sources of GHGs within their jurisdiction.”²

The State also recognizes in Appendix D, Local Actions, of the Scoping Plan that each community or local area has distinctive situations, and local jurisdictions must balance the urgent need for housing while demonstrating that a Project is in alignment with the State’s Climate Goals. The State calls for the climate crisis and the housing crisis to be confronted simultaneously. Jurisdictions should avoid creating targets that are impossible to meet as a basis to determine significance. Ultimately, targets that make it more difficult to achieve statewide goals by prohibiting or complicating projects that are needed to support the State’s climate goals, like infill development, low-income housing, or solar arrays, are not consistent with the State’s goals. The State also recognizes the lead agencies’ discretion to develop evidence-based approaches for determining whether a project would have a potentially significant impact on GHG emissions.

Page IV.E-40. At the beginning of the page, the following acronym is defined as follows:

...City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)...

Pages IV.E-42 through IV.E-46. The text (second and third paragraphs) on Page IV.E-42 through the end of the table on Page IV.E-46 is revised as follows:

(a) ~~Project Consistency~~Conflicts with Applicable Plans and Policies

As discussed above, in the absence of any adopted quantitative threshold, the significance of the Project’s GHG emissions is evaluated consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b)(2) by considering whether the Project ~~complies~~conflicts with applicable plans, policies, regulations and requirements adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

The analyses below demonstrate that the Project would not conflict with applicable statewide, regional, and local GHG emission reduction plans, including the AB 32 Scoping Plan and subsequent updates, ~~the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS,~~ the LAGBC, and L.A.’s Green New Deal.

² CARB. 2022. 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality (Appendix D, Page 9). November 16.

(i) *Assembly Bill 32 Scoping Plan*

AB 32 and the resulting 2008 Scoping Plan required California, by the year 2020, to reduce its statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels. Further, the Scoping Plan Update of 2017 identifies how the State can reach its 2030 climate target to reduce GHG emissions by 40 percent from 1990 levels and substantially advance toward the 2050 climate goal to reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels. As shown by the policy consistency analysis below in Table IV.E-4, Project Consistency with the 2008 AB 32 Scoping Plan Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Measures, the Project would reduce GHG emissions in a manner that would not conflict with, nor impede the implementation of, AB 32 and the 2008 Scoping Plan policies.

Table IV.E-4

**Project Consistency with the 2008 AB 32 Scoping Plan
Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Measures**

Strategy	Project Consistency
<p><u>California Cap-and-Trade Program</u> Implement a broad-based California Cap-and-Trade Program to provide a firm limit on emissions. Link the California Cap and Trade Program other Western Climate Initiative Partner programs to create a regional market system to achieve greater environmental and economic benefits for California. Ensure California's program meets all applicable AB 32 requirements for market-based mechanisms.</p>	<p>Not Applicable. The statewide Cap-and-Trade Program does not apply directly to the Project. The goal of the program is to reduce GHG emissions from major sources (covered entities), such as electricity generation and large stationary sources (including refineries, cement production facilities, oil and gas production facilities, glass manufacturing facilities, and food processing plants), rather than from private commercial development such as the Project.</p>
<p><u>California Light-Duty Vehicle GHG Standards</u> Implement the adopted Pavley Standards and the planned second phase of the program. Align ZEV, alternative, and renewable fuel and vehicle technology programs with long-term climate change goals.</p>	<p>Not Applicable. The development and implementation of statewide Pavley Standards is not the responsibility of individual development or the Project. However, the Project would provide EV charging, which would promote the use of ZEVs in general.</p>
<p><u>Energy Efficiency</u> Maximize energy efficiency building and appliance standards, and pursue additional efficiency efforts, including new technologies and new policy and implementation mechanisms. Pursue comparable investment in energy efficiency from all retail providers of electricity in California.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project is designed to the LEED Silver standard (GHG PDF 1), to reduce energy consumption and comply with the performance standards of CALGreen and the LAGBC. For example, the Project would utilize Energy Star rated products and appliances, high-efficiency wall and/or roof insulation, and/or high-efficiency lighting (such as LED lighting instead of incandescent).</p>

Strategy	Project Consistency
<p><u>RPS</u> Achieve a 33 percent renewable energy mix statewide.</p>	<p>Not Applicable. The Project would utilize energy supplied by the LADWP, which has adopted policies to achieve a 33 percent renewable energy mix by 2020. As of calendar year 2019, LADWP reports a 34 percent of its power resources were from renewable energy sources.</p>
<p><u>LCFS</u> Develop and adopt the LCFS, which would reduce the carbon intensity of California's transportation fuels by at least ten percent by 2020.</p>	<p>Not Applicable. The LCFS would reduce the carbon intensity of transportation fuels that are consumed in California. However, it is not the responsibility of the Project to develop, adopt, or update the LCFS program.</p>
<p><u>Regional Transportation-Related GHG Targets</u> Develop regional GHG emissions reduction targets for passenger vehicles.</p>	<p>Not Applicable. The regional GHG targets program are to be developed by regional councils of governments, such as SCAG, and as such, does not directly apply to the Project. However, as the Project Site is located in a TPA near several public transit stations and bus stops, the Project would be consistent with the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS's smart growth initiatives.</p>
<p><u>Vehicle Efficiency Measures</u> Implement light-duty vehicle efficiency measures.</p>	<p>Not Applicable. The implementation of vehicle efficiency measures is the responsibility of State agencies and does not directly apply to the Project.</p>
<p><u>Goods Movement</u> Implement adopted regulations for the use of shore power for ships at berth. Improve efficiency in goods movement activities.</p>	<p>Not Applicable. The implementation of vehicle efficiency measures is the responsibility of State agencies and does not directly apply to the Project, which does not include any goods movement activities.</p>
<p><u>Million Solar Roofs Program</u> Install 3,000 megawatts (MW) of solar electric capacity under California's existing solar programs.</p>	<p>Not Applicable. The Project does not propose to install solar roofs or participate in this statewide effort; however, space to accommodate solar panels on the Office Building rooftop is provided.</p>
<p><u>Medium/Heavy-Duty Vehicles</u> Adopt medium and heavy-duty vehicle efficiency measures.</p>	<p>Not Applicable. The implementation of vehicle efficiency measures is the responsibility of State agencies and does not directly apply to the Project.</p>
<p><u>Industrial Emissions</u> Require assessment of large industrial sources to determine whether individual sources within a facility can cost-effectively reduce GHG emissions and provide other pollution reduction co-benefits. Reduce GHG emissions from fugitive emissions from oil and gas extraction and gas transmission. Adopt and implement regulations to control fugitive methane emissions and reduce flaring at refineries.</p>	<p>Not Applicable. The Project does not include industrial land uses and therefore would not generate emissions from industrial facilities.</p>
<p><u>High Speed Rail</u> Support implementation of a high speed rail system.</p>	<p>Not Applicable. It is the responsibility of State agencies, such as the California High Speed Rail Authority, to support implementation of the high speed rail system. This measure does not directly</p>

Strategy	Project Consistency
	apply to the Project.
<p><u>Green Building Strategy</u> Expand the use of green building practices to reduce the carbon footprint of California's new and existing inventory of buildings.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project would comply with CALGreen building standards and would include sustainability features, such as a cool roof, EV charging stations, and low flow water features. The Project is designed to the LEED Silver standard (GHG-PDF-1), to reduce energy consumption and comply with the performance standards of the LAGBC.</p>
<p><u>High GWP Gases</u> Adopt measures to reduce high GWPs.</p>	<p>Not Applicable. State agencies are responsible for implementing GWP reduction measures. This measure does not directly apply to the Project.</p>
<p><u>Recycling and Waste</u> Reduce methane emissions at landfills. Increase waste diversion, composting and other beneficial uses of organic materials, and mandate commercial recycling. Move toward zero waste.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project is subject to the City's current waste diversion program, which requires that construction waste be reduced by at least 50 percent and that at least 75 percent of operational waste be diverted through reduction, recycling, and composting efforts.</p>
<p><u>Sustainable Forests</u> Preserve forest sequestration and encourage the use of forest biomass for sustainable energy generation.</p>	<p>Not Applicable. The Resources Agency and its departments are the primary agencies responsible for implementing this measure. This measure does not directly apply to the Project.</p>
<p><u>Water</u> Continue efficiency programs and use cleaner energy sources to move and treat water.</p>	<p>No Conflict. The Project would implement WS-PDF-1, which would include low flow plumbing features and fittings, as well as water efficient landscaping to reduce GHG emissions associated with water conveyance and wastewater processing.</p>
<p><u>Agriculture</u> In the near term, encourage investment in manure digesters and at the five-year Scoping Plan update, determine if the program should be made mandatory by 2020.</p>	<p>Not Applicable. The Project does not contain agricultural land or resources and therefore this measure is not directly applicable.</p>
<p>Source: CARB. 2008. Climate Change Scoping Plan: A Framework for Change. December.</p>	

(ii) — 2017 Scoping Plan Update

The 2017 Scoping Plan updated the 2008 Scoping Plan in response to SB 32, to identify how the State can reach its 2030 target to reduce GHG emissions by 40 percent from 1990 levels and substantially advance toward the 2050 climate goal to reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels. As shown by the policy consistency analysis below in Table IV.E-5, Project Consistency with the 2017 Scoping Plan, the Project would reduce GHG emissions in a manner that would not conflict with, nor impede the implementation of, the 2017 Scoping Plan policies.

Table IV.E-5

Project Consistency with the 2017 Scoping Plan

Policy	Primary Objective	Consistency
SB 350	Reduce GHG emissions in the electricity sector through the implementation of the 50 percent RPS, doubling of energy savings, and other actions as appropriate to achieve GHG emissions reductions planning targets in the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) process.	Not Applicable. The LADWP would be the electricity provider for the Project and would be responsible for meeting the applicable RPS standards. Nonetheless, the Project supports this policy and objective since it would be designed to the LEED Silver standard (see GHG-PDF-1), and would meet or exceed the mandatory performance standards of CALGreen and the LAGBC. Thus, the Project would reduce energy use and the associated GHG emissions, and therefore, would not conflict with this policy.
LGFS	Transition to cleaner/less polluting fuels that have a lower carbon footprint.	Not Applicable. The LGFS would reduce the carbon intensity of transportation fuels that are consumed in California. However, it is not the responsibility of the Project to develop, adopt, or update the LGFS program.
Mobile Source Strategy (Cleaner Technology and Fuels [CTF] Scenario)	Reduce GHGs and other pollutants from the transportation sector through transition to zero emission and LEVs, cleaner transit systems and reduction of vehicle miles traveled.	No Conflict. It is not the responsibility of the Project to introduce ZEVs or LEVs. However, the Project would provide EV charging, which would promote the use of EVs in general. Additionally, the Project Site represents an urban/compact infill location within a TPA, with nearby transit facilities, pedestrian sidewalks, and bike lanes, which would reduce VMT.
SB 1383	Approve and Implement Short-Lived Climate Pollutant strategy to reduce highly potent GHGs	Not Applicable. The Project would not be responsible for implementing a Short-Lived Climate Pollutant strategy to reduce highly potent GHGs.
California Sustainable Freight Action Plan	Improve freight efficiency, transition to zero emission technologies, and increase competitiveness of California's freight system.	Not Applicable. The Project would not be responsible for improving freight efficiency. The Project would consist of office space and commercial/restaurant space, which would not include freight transportation or logistics centers.
Post-2020 Cap-and-Trade Program	Reduce GHGs across largest GHG emissions sources	Not Applicable. The Project would not be responsible for implementing a cap-and-trade program for large GHG emissions sources.
Source: CARB. 2017. California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. November.		

As discussed above, jurisdictions that want to take meaningful climate action (such as preparing a non-CEQA-qualified CAP or as individual measures) aligned with the State’s climate goals in the absence of a CEQA-qualified CAP should also look to the three priority areas (transportation electrification, VMT reduction, and building decarbonization). To assist local jurisdictions, the 2022 Scoping Plan Update presents a non-exhaustive list of impactful GHG reduction strategies that can be implemented by local governments within the three priority areas (Priority GHG Reduction Strategies for Local Government Climate Action Priority Areas). A detailed assessment of goals, plans, and policies implemented by the City, which would support the GHG reduction strategies in the three priority areas, is provided below. In addition, further details are provided regarding the correlation between these reduction strategies and applicable actions included in Table 2-1 (page 72) of the Scoping Plan (Actions for the Scoping Plan Scenario).

Transportation Electrification

The priority GHG reduction strategies for local government climate action related to transportation electrification are discussed below and would support the 2022 Scoping Plan Update action that 100 percent of all new passenger vehicles be zero-emission by 2035 (see Table 2-1 of the 2022 Scoping Plan Update).

- **Convert local government fleets to zero-emission vehicles (ZEV).**

The CARB approved the Advanced Clean Cars II rule, which codifies Executive Order N-79-20 and requires 100 percent of new cars and light trucks sold in California be zero-emission vehicles by 2035. The State has also adopted AB 2127, which requires the CEC to analyze and examine charging needs to support California’s EVs in 2030. This report would help decision-makers allocate resources to install new EV chargers where they are needed most.

The City of LA Green New Deal (Sustainable City pLAn 2019) identifies a number of measures to reduce VMT and associated GHG emissions. Such measures that would support the local reduction strategy include converting all City fleet vehicles to zero emission where technically feasible by 2028. Starting in 2021, all vehicle procurement followed a “zero emission first” policy for City fleets. The Green New Deal also establishes a target to increase the percentage of zero emission vehicles to 25 percent by 2025, 80 percent by 2035, and 100 percent by 2050. In order to achieve this goal, the City would build 20 Fast Charging Plazas throughout the City. The City would also install 28,000 publicly available chargers by 2028 to encourage adoption of ZEVs.

The City’s goals of converting the municipal fleet to zero emissions and installation of EV chargers throughout the City would be consistent with the Scoping Plan goals of

transitioning to EVs. Although this measure mainly applies to City fleets, the Project would not conflict with these goals by installing EV chargers in 10 percent of the total proposed parking spaces, as well as by installing EV-wiring in 30 percent of the total proposed parking spaces. Installation of additional EV chargers and EV-wiring would encourage adoption of EVs.

- **Create a jurisdiction-specific ZEV ecosystem to support deployment of ZEVs statewide (such as building standards that exceed State building codes, permit streamlining, infrastructure siting, consumer education, preferential parking policies, and ZEV readiness plans).**

The State has adopted AB 1236 and AB 970, which require cities to adopt streamlined permitting procedures for EV charging stations. As a result, the City updated Section IX of the LAMC, which requires most new construction to designate 30 percent of new parking spaces as capable of supporting future electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE). This would exceed the CALGreen 2022 requirements of 20 percent of new parking spaces as EV capable. The ordinance also requires new construction to install EVSE at 10 percent of total parking spaces. This requirement also exceeds the CALGreen 2022 requirements of installing EVSE for 25 percent of EV capable parking spaces, which is approximately five percent of total parking spaces. The City has also implemented programs to increase the amount of EV charging on City streets, EV carshare, and incentive programs for apartments to be retrofitted with EV chargers.

The City's goals of installing EV chargers throughout the City would be consistent with the Scoping Plan goals of transitioning to EVs. In addition, the Project would comply with Ordinance No. 186,485 by providing as least 30 percent of the total parking spaces required by the LAMC to be capable of supporting future EVSE and installing EV chargers in percent of the total LAMC-required parking spaces, which would exceed the CALGreen 2022 requirement.

VMT Reduction

The priority GHG reduction strategies for local government climate action related to VMT reduction are discussed below and would support the Scoping Plan action to reduce VMT per capita 25 percent below 2019 levels by 2030 and 30 percent below 2019 levels by 2045.

- **Reduce or eliminate minimum parking standards in new developments.**
- **Implement parking pricing or transportation demand management pricing strategies.**

The City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035, which is the Transportation Element of the City's General Plan, contains measures and programs related to VMT reduction throughout the City. With regard to parking standards, the implementation of Mobility Plan Programs and AB 2097 reduce or eliminate parking requirements for certain types of developments near transit (within half a mile). These reduction strategies and TDM programs would serve to reduce minimum parking standards and reduce vehicle trips.

The Project would not conflict with the 2022 Scoping Plan action to reduce VMT per capita 25 percent below 2019 levels by 2030 and 30 percent below 2019 levels by 2045, because the Project would implement Project Design Feature TRANS-PDF-2, whereby the Applicant will provide its fair share of seed funding for the Arts District portion of a Downtown/Arts District Transportation Management Organization (TMO), as well as a transportation demand management (TDM) plan pursuant to TRANS-PDF-3, which will promote non-auto travel and reduce the use of single-occupant vehicle trips through the implementation of certain strategies, such as incorporating bicycle and pedestrian features, providing services to match employees together to establish carpools, providing incentives to encourage alternative travel modes, and providing a transportation information center/kiosks where employees and visitors can obtain information regarding commute programs and obtain real-time transit data. Both of these Project Design Features would support the intent of this strategy to reduce VMT. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the City's ability to implement parking pricing or transportation demand management pricing strategies.

- **Implement Complete Streets policies and investments, consistent with general plan circulation element requirements.**

The City of Los Angeles Mobility Plan 2035 established a "Complete Streets" planning framework, which resulted in the City of Los Angeles Complete Streets Design Guide in 2015, consistent with California's Complete Streets Act of 2008. A supplemental update to the Complete Streets Design Guide was adopted in 2020.

The Complete Streets Design Guide provides a number of measures to increase public access to electric shuttles, car sharing and walking. The Design Guide establishes guidelines for establishing on-street parking for car sharing. The City has also established BlueLA, which is a car sharing network consisting of more than 100 electric vehicles located throughout the City. In addition, under the Green New Deal, the City would install 28,000 publicly available chargers by 2028 and introduce 135 new electric DASH buses.

This reduction strategy mainly applies to City traffic circulation. However, the Project would not conflict with Complete Streets policies, because 1) the Project Site is located in close proximity to existing residential units, as well as commercial sources of employment, including shops, restaurants, warehouses, and auto repair-related

businesses, which promotes walkability; 2) the Project would allow for accessible and reliable modes of travel for employees and customers of the proposed uses as an inherent aspect of the Project Site's proximity to transit facilities (the Metro L [Gold] Line and Little Tokyo/Arts District Station, which are located 0.5 mile to the north); 3) the Project includes 72 long-term and 40 short-term bicycle parking spaces, shower facilities, and a bike repair area to promote bicycle use; and 4) the Project would enhance safe pedestrian travel at the Project Site by providing public sidewalks adjacent to the Project Site on Colyton Street and South Hewitt Street where none currently exist, and by providing a pedestrian passageway through the proposed Office Building between Colyton Street and South Hewitt Street. In addition, implementation of Project Design Feature TRANS-PDF-3 would provide pedestrian network improvements to encourage alternative modes of transportation. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with implementation of Complete Streets policies.

- **Increase access to public transit by increasing density of development near transit, improving transit service by increasing service frequency, creating bus priority lanes, reducing or eliminating fares, microtransit, etc.**
- **Increase public access to clean mobility options by planning for and investing in electric shuttles, bike share, car share, and walking.**
- **Amend zoning or development codes to enable mixed-use, walkable, transit-oriented, and compact infill development (such as increasing the allowable density of a neighborhood).**
- **Preserve natural and working lands by implementing land use policies that guide development toward infill areas and do not convert "greenfield" land to urban uses (e.g., green belts, strategic conservation easements).**

These reduction strategies are supported through implementation of SB 375, which requires integration of planning processes for transportation, land-use, and housing, and generally encourages jobs/housing proximity, promotes transit-oriented development (TOD), and encourages high-density residential/commercial development along transit corridors. To implement SB 375 and reduce GHG emissions by correlating land use and transportation planning, SCAG adopted the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS, also referred to as Connect SoCal. The 2020-2045 RTP/SCS' "Core Vision" prioritizes the maintenance and management of the region's transportation network; expanding mobility choices by co-locating housing, jobs, and transit; and increasing investment in transit and complete streets. Please refer to the section below for additional discussion of consistency with the

2020-2045 RTP/SCS, as well as Appendix I, Land Use Policy Consistency Tables, of the Draft EIR (refer to Table IV.H-1, Project Conflicts with Applicable Goals of 2020-2045 RTP/SCS).

On a local level, the City has developed the Complete Streets Design Guide, which provides a number of reduction strategies to increase public access to electric shuttles, car sharing and walking, continues to build out networks in the Mobility Plan for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users, has implemented an EV car sharing network, and is working towards increasing publicly available chargers and introducing new electric DASH buses.

While these reduction strategies mainly apply to traffic circulation infrastructure within the City, the Project would support these reduction strategies, because the Project represents an infill development within an existing urbanized area that would concentrate new development consistent with the overall growth pattern encouraged in the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. The Project's convenient access to public transit and opportunities for walking and biking would result in a reduction of vehicle trips, VMT, and GHG emissions. Specifically, the Project Site is located in a transit-rich neighborhood serviced by Metro and LADOT bus lines and the L Line. In addition, the Project Site's proximity to a variety of commercial uses and services would encourage employees of the Project Site to walk to nearby designations, thereby reducing VMT and GHG emissions. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with these reduction strategies.

Building Decarbonization

The priority GHG reduction strategies for local government climate action related to electrification are discussed below and would support the Scoping Plan actions regarding meeting increased demand for electrification without new fossil gas-fire resources and all electric appliances beginning in 2026 (residential) and 2029 (commercial) (see Table 2-1 of the Scoping Plan).

- **Adopt all-electric new construction reach codes for residential and commercial uses.**

California's transition away from fossil fuel-based energy sources will bring the Project's GHG emissions associated with building energy use down to nearly zero as the State's electric supply becomes 100 percent carbon free. California has committed to achieving this goal by 2045 through SB 100, the 100 Percent Clean Energy Act of 2018. SB 100 strengthened the State's RPS by requiring that 60 percent of all electricity provided to retail users in California come from renewable sources by 2030 and that 100 percent come from carbon-free sources by 2045. The land use sector will benefit from RPS, because the electricity used in buildings will be increasingly carbon-free, but

implementation does not depend (directly, at least) on how buildings are designed and built.

The City has updated the LAMC with requirements for all new buildings, with some exceptions, to be all-electric, which will reduce GHG emissions related to natural gas combustion. Space heating, water heating, and cooking for non-restaurant uses would be required to be powered by electricity. In future years, the LADWP will be required to increase the amount of renewable energy in the power mix to comply with SB 100 requirements. The combination of the all-electric LAMC regulations and increasing availability of renewable energy will serve to reduce GHG emissions from sources traditionally powered by natural gas.

The Project would be required to comply with the City's LAMC and would not include natural gas uses in retail and office uses. The restaurant uses are exempt from the LAMC provisions, but if constructed, would consist of a small portion of the total square footage. Therefore, the Project would be consistent and not conflict with the LAMC.

- **Adopt policies and incentive programs to implement energy efficiency retrofits for existing buildings, such as weatherization, lighting upgrades, and replacing energy-intensive appliances and equipment with more efficient systems (such as Energy Star-rated equipment and equipment controllers).**
- **Adopt policies and incentive programs to electrify all appliances and equipment in existing buildings such as appliance rebates, existing building reach codes, or time of sale electrification ordinances.**

These reduction strategies would support the Scoping Plan action regarding electrification of appliances in existing buildings (see Table 2-1 of the Scoping Plan). The City and LADWP have established rebate programs to promote the use of energy-efficient products and home upgrades. Under the LADWP's Consumer Rebate Program (CRP), residential customers would receive rebates for energy-efficient upgrades, such as Cool Roofs, Energy Star Windows, HVAC upgrades, pool pumps, and insulation upgrades. Such upgrades would serve to reduce wasteful energy and water usage and associated GHG emissions.

The majority of the Project would be comprised of new construction to which these strategies would not apply; however, the Project would comply with such strategies, as required, for the existing 7,800-square-foot building formerly occupied by the A+D Museum, which would remain on the Project Site and be part of the Project. The Project would also implement Project Design Feature GHG-PDF-1, which would design HVAC equipment to have low GHG emission rates and incorporate energy saving technologies

and appliances. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with and not conflict with policies to implement energy efficiency retrofits.

- **Facilitate deployment of renewable energy production and distribution and energy storage on privately owned land uses (e.g., permit streamlining, information sharing).**

The implementation of this strategy is the responsibility of the City and other local governments and does not directly apply to the Project. However, the Project would include space on the Office Building rooftop to accommodate solar panels.

- **Deploy renewable energy production and energy storage directly in new public projects and on existing public facilities (e.g., solar photovoltaic systems on rooftops of municipal buildings and on canopies in public parking lots, battery storage systems in municipal buildings).**

The implementation of this strategy is the responsibility of the City and other local governments and does not directly apply to the Project. The Project is not a public project, nor does it involve a public facility or public land.

Page IV.E-53. The following text is revised in the first paragraph under Construction Emissions:

The GHG emissions associated with construction of the Project were calculated for each year of construction using CalEEMod. The Project data inputs used in the model, as well as the detailed model results, are provided in Appendix F of this Draft EIR. This calculation of the Project's construction emissions is based on a construction period of ~~28~~approximately 30 months, beginning in 2022~~1~~.

i) EIR Section IV.F, Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Page IV.F-1. Under the heading Introduction, the following text and footnote are added:

This section analyzes the Project's potential hazards and hazardous materials impacts that could occur during Project construction and operation. In addition, this section analyzes the Project's incremental contribution to cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts from the Related Projects~~past, present, and probable future projects.~~ The analysis is largely based on the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA)² and Phase II Subsurface Investigation³ prepared for the Project by Citadel Environmental Services, Inc., and included as Appendices G1 and G2, respectively, of this Draft EIR. In addition, Citadel Environmental Services, Inc. prepared a Site Review on April 12, 2023, documenting that, based on a visual survey of the Project Site on May 14, 2023, the uses

and surface conditions appeared consistent with those observed during the Phase I ESA investigation and Phase II Subsurface Investigation.⁴

⁴ Citadel Environmental Services, Inc. 2023. Site Review – March 14, 2023, 405-411 Hewitt Street, 900, 910 and 926 E. 4th Street, and 412 Colyton Street. April 12.

Page IV.F-28. In the discussion of Project Impacts, Operations, the following text is revised:

The Project consists of the development of restaurant and office uses and associated parking. During operations of the Project, common hazardous materials, such as cleaning solvents used for janitorial purposes, oils used in cooking and grill and oven cleaners, materials used for maintenance (such as lubricants or thinners), and materials used for landscaping (including fertilizers, pesticides, or chemicals for weed control) would be stored and used on-site. In addition, two fuel storage tanks would be located in the Office Building to power an emergency generator, in the event of electrical power failure. One, 600-gallon diesel fuel tank would be located on the roof, and one, 2,000-gallon fuel tank would be located in a ground floor fuel storage room. However, as with materials used during construction, such potentially hazardous materials that are transported, stored, or used on-site for daily upkeep and subsequently disposed would be handled in accordance with the manufacturers' specifications for each material and in compliance with applicable local, State, and federal regulations, including the Business Plan Act, HSC, and CalARP, among others. **Therefore, the operation of the Project in compliance with these regulations would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant.**

j) EIR Section IV.H, Land Use and Planning

Page IV.H-11. The following text is revised as follows:

(iii) Parking Requirements

On September 22, 2022, California Governor Gavin Newsom signed Assembly Bill (AB) 2097, which added Government Code Section 65863.2. AB 2097 prohibits a public agency from imposing or enforcing any minimum automobile parking requirement on any residential, commercial, or other development project that is within 0.5 mile of a major transit stop, with minor exceptions. While the City cannot impose an automobile parking requirement on the Project pursuant to AB 2097, the Project did not opt out of the LAMC-recommended parking standards. LAMC Section 12.21 A.4 sets forth parking requirements for various land uses. The Project Site is located within the former East Los Angeles State Enterprise Zone (SEZ), as designated in the City's Zoning Information and

Mapping Access System, which permits a lower parking ratio for commercial office, business, retail, restaurant, bar and related uses, trade schools, or research and development buildings, which increases the buildable area of the parcel. On July 11, 2013, California Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. signed legislation that resulted in the repeal of the Enterprise Zone Act and the dissolution of Enterprise Zones. However, the City Council adopted an action on December 18, 2013 that approved the continuation of the reduced parking provision for former Enterprise Zone areas. The Project would provide two parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross commercial floor area as permitted within the SEZ.

Page IV.H-12. Under the heading River Improvement Overlay (RIO) and following the first paragraph, the following text is included to provide additional details regarding the RIO District Development Regulations that apply to the Project Site:

The Project Site is located within the RIO District, and as codified in LAMC Section 13.17 and Ordinance 183,145, the Development Regulations that are applicable to the Project Site (which is located in the Outer Core and not in the Inner Core, as it is located approximately 0.5 mile from the River) include the following:

1. Landscaping shall conform to the following regulations: 75 percent of any Project's newly landscaped area shall be planted with any combination of the following: native trees, plants and shrubs, or species defined as Watershed Wise, or species listed in the Los Angeles County River Master Plan Landscaping Guidelines and Plant Palettes. This requirement is for new landscaping only and does not apply to existing landscaping.
2. Screening/Fencing.
 - (a) Loading areas and off-street parking facilities of three spaces or more, either on a surface lot or in a structure, shall be screened from the abutting public right-of-way and the River. However, such screening shall not obstruct the view of a driver entering or leaving the loading area or parking facility, or the view from the street of entrances and exits to a loading area or parking facility, and shall consist of one or a combination of the following:
 - (i) A strip at least 5 feet in width of densely planted shrubs or trees which are at least 2 feet high at the time of planting and are of a type that may be expected to form, within three years after time of planting, a continuous, unbroken, year round visual screen; or
 - (ii) A wall, barrier or fence of uniform appearance. Such wall, barrier or fence may be opaque or perforated, provided that not more than 50 percent of the

face is open. The wall, barrier or fence shall, when located in either the rear or side yards, be at least 4 feet and not more than 6 feet in height.

- (b) Electrical transformers, mechanical equipment, water meters and other equipment shall be screened from public view. The screening may be opaque or perforated, provided that not more than 50 percent of the face is open. The screen shall be at least 6 inches taller than the equipment and not more than 2 feet taller than the equipment.
- (c) Exterior trash enclosures shall:
 - (i) be designed to complement the primary building with a wall height that exceeds the disposal unit it is designed to contain by at least 18 inches;
 - (ii) have a solid roof to deter birds and block views from adjacent properties;
 - (iii) have solid metal doors that accommodate a lock and remain closed when not in use; and
 - (iv) not be constructed of chain link or wood.
- (d) With the exception of single-family homes, all projects facing a street that crosses the river or terminates at the river or a river frontage road shall have all fences within the front or side yards visible from said street consistent with the fence designs identified in the Los Angeles County River Master Plan Landscape Guidelines.

3. Exterior Site Lighting.

- (a) All site and building mounted lighting shall be designed such that it produces a maximum initial luminance value no greater than 0.20 horizontal and vertical foot candles at the site boundary, and no greater than 0.01 horizontal foot candles 15 feet beyond the site. No more than 5.0 percent of the total initial designed lumens shall be emitted at an angle of 90 degrees or higher from nadir (straight down).
- (b) All low pressure sodium, high pressure sodium, metal halide, fluorescent, quartz, incandescent greater than 60 watts, mercury vapor, and halogen fixtures shall be fully shielded in such a manner as to not exceed the limitations in Subdivision 3(a), above.

Page IV.H-28. Under the heading River Improvement Overlay and prior to the impact conclusion, the following text is revised to evaluate potential Project impacts related to the RIO District Development Regulations specifically:

The Project would similarly not conflict with the RIO District Development Regulations, as described in detail below.

- Per the Project Landscape Plans, the Project would provide landscaping that is comprised of 75 percent native species, WatershedWise species, and/or species listed in the Los Angeles County River Master Plan Landscaping Guidelines and Plant Palettes. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the RIO District Development Regulation contained in LAMC Section 13.17 F.1.
- The entrance and exit ramps to the Project parking structure would be located on East 4th Street, and the loading dock would be located on South Hewitt Street. The aboveground parking areas would be screened from the right-of-way by a combination of board form concrete, non-operable windows, and metal screening. Five street trees on East 4th Street and five street trees on South Hewitt Street, which would be a minimum of two feet in height at the time of planting, would provide additional screening and would exceed the five-foot landscaping strip requirement. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the RIO District Development Regulation contained in LAMC Section 13.17 F.2.a.
- The Project's electrical and mechanical equipment would be located interior to the Office Building or on the roof behind metal screening. Therefore, such equipment would be screened from public view and the Project would not conflict with the RIO District Development Regulation contained in LAMC Section 13.17 F.2.b.
- Trash enclosures would be located interior to the Office Building in the loading area (which is enclosed behind bifold doors); therefore, the Project would not conflict with the RIO District Development Regulation contained in LAMC Section 13.17 F.2.c.
- The Project Site does not include fencing; therefore, the Project would not conflict with the RIO District Development Regulation contained in LAMC Section 13.17 F.2.d.
- Exterior Project Site lighting would be designed to comply with the requirements of the LAMC, including the RIO District Development Regulations. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the RIO District Development Regulation contained in LAMC Section 13.17 F.3.

Page IV.H-29. The following text is revised as follows:

Per Section 12.21 A.16 of the Planning and Zoning Code, new or existing automobile parking spaces ~~required by code~~, for all land uses, may be replaced by bicycle parking, at a ratio of one automobile parking space for every four bicycle parking spaces provided. Accordingly, vehicle parking for the Project would be located on three subterranean levels and on the 2nd through 5th floors, and bicycle parking would be located on the ground floor. ~~In compliance with The~~ Project would meet the recommendations of LAMC Sections

12.21 A.4.(d) and 12.21 A.4.(x), the SEZ, and the City of Los Angeles Bicycle Parking Ordinance, ~~the Project would include by providing 660 vehicle parking spaces and 112 bicycle parking spaces. As the Project is designed to exceed the number of LAMG-required vehicular and bicycle parking spaces, the Project would comply with LAMG parking requirements.~~

Page IV.H-31. Under the heading Conclusion, the following text is revised:

With regard to industrial land uses, although the Project would change the land use designation of the Project Site from Heavy Industrial to Regional Center Commercial, it would not replace existing industrial land uses with non-industrial uses, and it would also promote the ILUP goal to increase employment in the Project area, as it would increase the FAR of commercial and office uses density.

k) EIR Section IV.K.2, Public Services – Police Protection Services

Pages IV.K.2-12 and IV.K.2-13. The following text is revised:

POL-PDF-1: Prior to issuance of a demolition permit, the Project ~~shall~~will:

- Provide security fencing around the perimeter of the Project Site during the construction phase; and
- Provide on-site security personnel whose duties ~~shall~~will include construction site entrance and exit monitoring.

Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the Project ~~shall~~will:

- Provide on-site security personnel whose duties ~~shall~~will include Office Building (including parking levels) video surveillance monitoring and fire/life/safety system monitoring; and
- Provide adequate security lighting of parking areas, elevators, lobbies, and pathways for pedestrian orientation and to reduce areas of concealment.

The Applicant ~~shall~~will consult with the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) to ensure that available and feasible crime prevention features have been incorporated during the construction period and into the Project design and receive LAPD's approval.

POL-PDF-2: Emergency Procedures Plan. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the Applicant or its successor ~~shall~~will develop an Emergency Procedures Plan that addresses emergency concerns and practices and provides a diagram that illustrates each portion of the property, including access routes. The plan ~~shall~~will be

submitted to the Los Angeles Police Department Central Area Commanding Officer for review and approval.

I) EIR Section IV.L, Transportation

Pages IV.L-30 through IV.L-32. Under the heading Transportation, the following text is revised:

TRANS-PDF-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan. The Applicant will prepare and submit a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan to the City for review and approval. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will include temporary street closure information, a detour plan, haul routes, and an equipment staging plan. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will formalize how construction ~~shall~~will be carried out and identify specific actions that will be required to reduce effects on the surrounding community. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will be based on the nature and timing of the specific construction activities and other projects in the vicinity of the Project Site, and ~~shall~~will include, but not be limited to, the following elements, as appropriate:

- Advanced notification of adjacent property owners and occupants, as well as nearby schools, of upcoming construction activities, including durations and daily hours of construction.
- Prohibition of construction worker parking on adjacent residential streets.
- Prohibition of construction-related vehicle parking on surrounding public streets.
- Temporary pedestrian and vehicular traffic controls during all construction activities adjacent to East 4th Street, Colyton Street, and South Hewitt Street to ensure traffic safety on public rights-of-way. These controls shall include, but are not limited to, flag people trained in pedestrian and student safety.
- Temporary traffic control during all construction activities adjacent to public rights-of-way to improve traffic flow on public roadways (e.g., flag men).
- Scheduling of construction activities to reduce the effect on traffic flow on surrounding arterial streets.
- Safety precautions for pedestrians and bicyclists through such measures as alternate routing and protection barriers as appropriate, including along all identified Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) pedestrian routes to nearby schools.
- Scheduling of construction-related deliveries, haul trips, etc., so as to occur outside the commuter peak hours to the extent feasible, and so as to not impede school

drop-off and pick-up activities and students using LAUSD's identified pedestrian routes to nearby schools.

- Coordination with public transit agencies to provide advanced notifications of stop relocations and durations.
- Advanced notification of temporary parking removals and duration of removals.
- Provision of detour plans to address temporary road closures during construction.

TRANS-PDF-2: Transportation Management Organization. The Applicant will provide its fair share of seed funding for the Arts District portion of a Downtown/Arts District Transportation Management Organization (TMO), following approval of the Project, by providing funding for TMO operations and marketing efforts. The Applicant will commit its fair share required in the first year to cover the cost of launching the Arts District portion of a Downtown/Arts District TMO and ~~shall~~will continue to commit to nine additional years (10 years in total), as a charter member with annual dues.

Page IV.L-36. The following text under the heading Los Angeles Municipal Code, Sections 12.21 A 4 and 12.21 A.16, is revised as follows:

The aforementioned off-street automobile parking ratios were applied to these components to determine the off-street automobile parking LAMC requirement for the Project. The Project proposes 112 bicycle parking spaces to be located on the ground floor. The Project is required to provide 688 automobile parking spaces, but with the provision of 112 bicycle parking spaces per Section 12.21 A.4 of the LAMC, the Project could replace up to 28 LAMC-required automobile parking spaces with bicycle parking spaces. The LAMC parking requirement of 660 vehicle parking spaces would therefore be accommodated on-site. Vehicle parking would be provided on three subterranean levels and on the 2nd through 5th floors of the Office Building. A portion of the spaces provided on the 2nd through 5th floors would be comprised of mechanical double stackers.

Page IV.L-43. The following text under Construction is revised:

The Project is anticipated to be constructed in phases over a period of ~~28~~approximately 30 months, beginning in 2022 and reaching completion in 2025.

m) EIR Section IV.N.1, Utilities and Service Systems – Solid Waste

Page IV.N.1-14. Footnote a of Table IV.N.1-4, Project Construction and Demolition Solid Waste Generation, is revised as follows:

^a Construction is anticipated to begin in 2022 and be completed in 2025, ~~with a 28-month duration~~. Assuming 20 work days per month, 600 work days are assumed for the calculation of daily construction waste generation.

n) EIR Chapter V, Other CEQA Considerations

Pages V-4 and V-5. Under the heading Reasons Why the Project is being Proposed, Notwithstanding Significant Unavoidable Impacts, the following text is revised:

The reason why the Project is proposed notwithstanding the identified significant and unavoidable impacts is rooted in the underlying purpose of the Project, which is to provide a ~~high density~~, mixed-use, transit- and pedestrian-oriented commercial development (with office and restaurant uses) on an urban infill site that increases the floor area ratio (FAR) and creates job opportunities and supports the Arts District's other commercial businesses as well as residences. As listed in Chapter II, Project Description, the specific objectives for the Project are to:

1. Redevelop low-intensity parcels in the Arts District with a mix of ~~high density~~ commercial land uses at an increased FAR that provides an increased variety of job opportunities, thereby maximizing the creation of permanent jobs and economic investment in the City of Los Angeles (City) and the Arts District.”
2. Introduce a range of high quality ~~and high density~~ commercial spaces at the appropriate scale and intensity that would supply the increasing demand for office, incubator space, and innovative campus uses in the Arts District; contribute to the demand for office space; and provide neighborhood resources for the growing residential neighborhood within the Arts District.

Page V-6. Under the heading Reasons Why the Project is being Proposed, Notwithstanding Significant Unavoidable Impacts, the following text is revised:

The Project would develop restaurant and office uses on an urban infill site, thereby increasing the ~~density~~ FAR of land uses while increasing job opportunities and providing commercial amenities to residents and visitors of the area (through the provision of new restaurant spaces, office spaces, and the retention of the existing 7,800-square-foot building formerly occupied by the Architecture and Design [A+D] Museum).

Page V-10. Under the heading Direct Growth by Economic Means, the following text is revised:

Development of the Project would therefore increase ~~density~~ the FAR at the Project Site and would create additional employment opportunities in the Community Plan area.

o) EIR Chapter VI, Alternatives

Page VI-23. Under the heading Overview of the Project and Project Objectives, the following text is revised:

1. Redevelop low-intensity parcels in the Arts District with a mix of ~~high-density~~ commercial land uses at an increased FAR that provides an increased variety of job opportunities, thereby maximizing the creation of permanent jobs and economic investment in the City of Los Angeles and the Arts District.
2. Introduce a range of high quality ~~and high-density~~ commercial spaces at the appropriate scale and intensity that would supply the increasing demand for office, incubator space, and innovative campus uses in the Arts District; contribute to the demand for office space; and provide neighborhood resources for the growing residential neighborhood within the Arts District.

Page VI-26. Under the heading Historic Resources – Operation, the following text is revised:

As Alternative 1 would not change the character or developed density ~~floor area~~ of the development on the Project Site, it would not impair the integrity of the potential Downtown Industrial Historic District as a whole to the degree that it would no longer be eligible for listing under the National or California Registers or for local landmark designation programs.

Page VI-41. Under the heading Comparison to Project Objectives, the following text is revised:

Alternative 1 would not redevelop the urban infill Project Site and provide a ~~high-density,~~ mixed-use, commercial office project that increases the on-site FAR and job opportunities in proximity to public transit and other commercial and residential land uses.

Page VI-42. Under the headings Alternative 2: Current Zoning and Land Use Designation Alternative, and Description of the Alternative, the following text is revised:

In accordance with the allowable land uses and zoning specifications described above, Alternative 2 would develop 8,149 square feet of new restaurant space and 70,039 square feet of new office space, and would retain the existing 7,800-square-foot, bow truss building formerly occupied by the A+D Museum. Alternative 2 would also provide 178 parking spaces. Parking would be provided above grade in two levels. The proposed

structure for Alternative 2 would reach a maximum height of 108.5 feet, including five ~~occupied~~ stories (two of which are the parking levels) above grade, with a FAR of 1.5:1.

Page VI-42. Under the heading Air Quality Plan Consistency, the following text is revised:

As such, Alternative 2 represents approximately 78 percent less development than the Project, and the construction duration of Alternative 2 would be 22 months, as compared to ~~28~~approximately 30 months for the Project.

Page VI-43. Under the heading Regional Emissions – Construction, the following text is revised:

Therefore, the duration of construction activities and associated use of equipment and vehicle trips would be less than those required to construct the Project (22 months for Alternative 2, as compared to ~~28~~approximately 30 months for the Project).

Page VI-45. Under the heading Toxic Air Contaminants – Operation, the following text is revised:

However, as Alternative 2 would ~~develop a reduced density version of~~substantially reduced the on-site development as compared to the Project (by 78 percent), it is reasonable to assume that fewer delivery trucks trips would be associated with Alternative 2 as compared to the Project, due to an overall reduction in vehicle trips and VMT.

Page VI-47. Under the heading Historical Resources – Operation, the following text is revised:

Both structures would add substantial height and ~~density~~increase the FAR of the parcels currently occupied by one-story buildings and surface parking lots.

Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact on historic resources during operations, and due to its reduced height and ~~density~~FAR that would be more consistent with the scale of development in the potential Historic District as compared to the Project, its impact would be less than the Project's less-than-significant impact.

Page VI-48. Under the heading Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources – Construction, the following text is revised:

As such, Alternative 2 represents approximately 78 percent less development than the Project, with a shorter construction schedule of 22 months, as compared to ~~28~~approximately 30 months for the Project.

Page VI-49. Under the heading Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources – Operation, the following text is revised:

Such impacts would be less than the Project's less-than-significant impact due to the reduced ~~density~~amount of development on the Project Site.

Page VI-53. Under the heading GHG Emissions, the following text is revised:

Similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would construct a mixed-use ~~development~~project that increases ~~density~~the amount of development on the Project Site.

Pages VI-53 and VI-54. Under the heading GHG Emissions, the following text is revised:

Since Alternative 2 would be five stories in height and have an increase in floor area of 71,158 square feet, compared to 18 stories and an increase in floor area of 329,095 square feet with the Project (78 percent less development), construction activities under Alternative 2 would be less than those required to construct the Project, which would shorten the construction duration of Alternative 2 to 22 months, compared to ~~28~~approximately 30 months for the Project.

Page VI-54. Under the heading Conflicts with GHG Reduction Plans, the following text is revised:

As discussed above, Alternative 2 would construct a mixed-use ~~development~~project that increases the amount of development~~density~~ on the Project Site and provides retail/restaurant and office uses that create job opportunities within a TPA similar to the Project.

Pages VI-69 and VI-70. Under the heading Groundborne Vibration – Construction (Off-road Construction Activity), the following text is revised:

The adjacent buildings are of such an age that they may be considered sensitive to the structural effects of vibration. Vibration annoyance was not considered, based on the commercial and industrial nature of the land uses. Due to the reduced amount of development that would occur with Alternative 2 as compared to the Project (78 percent less development), as well as the substantially reduced amount of grading (the export of 5,205 cubic yards of soils as compared to 75,200 cubic yards of soils), the overall amount and duration of construction activities would be reduced with Alternative 2. However, as previously explained, the same equipment would still be utilized to demolish existing site uses; to prepare and level the site for new construction; and to collect, remove, and to transport demolished materials and surface soils from the site. Therefore, the maximum vibration levels produced by construction equipment during construction of the Project would still occur during construction of Alternative 2, only over a reduced duration. As the closest vibration-sensitive receptors to the Project Site may experience significant vibration that exceeds the building damage threshold of 0.12 inches/second PPV, like the Project, the Alternative 2 impact would be significant.

Page VI-71. Under the heading Groundborne Vibration – Construction (On-road Construction Vehicles), the following text is revised:

Delivery truck and haul trucks would travel to and from the Project Site throughout the construction period, and in addition to noise, these vehicles may generate vibration for receptors along their haul routes. The haul route for Alternative 2 would be the same as for the Project. The ~~All~~ nearest sensitive uses ~~to the Project Site and~~ along the construction haul route, ~~other than South Hewitt Street,~~ are typically at least 25 feet from the center of the nearest travel lane, taking into consideration sidewalks, setbacks, and/or on-street parking. Along East 4th Place for example, the only sensitive use is Art Share LA, which minimally has a 25-foot setback from the center of the nearest through traffic lane. Structures along the haul route may experience groundborne vibration levels of approximately 0.022 inches/second PPV, below the fragile building damage threshold criterion of 0.12 inches/second PPV, and a nuisance vibration level of 72 VdB, which would not exceed the human annoyance threshold of 72 VdB. Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration that could result in building damage ~~or exceed human annoyance levels.~~ The Alternative 2 vibration impacts to nearby vibration-sensitive receptors with respect to building damage ~~and human annoyance~~ from trucks traveling along the anticipated haul routes would be less than significant and less than the Project's less-than-significant impact due to an overall reduction in haul trucks and trips, as Alternative 2 would not require substantial grading and soil export (5,205 cubic yards of grading as compared to the Project's 75,200 cubic yards).

~~As discussed above,~~ The estimated groundborne nuisance vibration from on-road trucks would not exceed the 72 VdB significance criteria for the nearest vibration-sensitive uses to the Project Site. However, along the full extent of the haul route for Alternative 2, there may be vibration-sensitive receptors within 25 feet of the center of the of the nearest travel lane at which vibration would exceed the 72 VdB significance criteria for residential uses and would potentially exceed the 75 VdB significance criteria for institutional land uses. In addition, roadways along the haul route may not be smooth. Therefore, it is conservatively concluded that, like the Project, Alternative 2's on-road haul traffic could result in the exposure of persons to excessive groundborne vibration that exceed human annoyance levels. Vibration impacts with respect to human annoyance resulting from construction trucks traveling along the anticipated haul routes would be significant and unavoidable for Alternative 2, and less than the Project's significant and unavoidable ~~less-than-significant~~ impact due to an overall reduction in haul trucks and trips, as Alternative 2 would not require substantial grading and soil export (5,205 cubic yards of grading as compared to the Project's 75,200 cubic yards).

Page VI-74. Under the heading New or Physically Altered Facilities, Performance Objectives – Construction, the following text is revised:

Therefore, impacts on fire protection services during construction of Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less than the Project's less-than-significant impacts, due to the reduction in the amount density of development that would be constructed (e.g., reduced construction schedule, fewer construction workers and equipment on-site, and fewer haul trips).

Page VI-74. Under the heading New or Physically Altered Facilities, Performance Objectives – Operation, the following text is revised:

Similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would be subject to City-established fire flow requirements, which vary from 2,000 gallons per minute in low-density residential areas, to 12,000 gallons per minute in high density-commercial or industrial areas.

Page VI-76. Under the heading New or Physically Altered Facilities, Performance Objectives – Operation, the following text is revised:

Therefore, the impacts of Alternative 2 to fire protection services would be less than significant and less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project, due to the reduced density amount of development.

Page VI-76. Under the heading New or Physically Altered Facilities, Performance Objectives –Construction, the following text is revised:

Construction-related impacts of Alternative 2 to police protection services would be less than significant and less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project, due to the reduction in the density amount of development that would be constructed (e.g., reduced construction schedule, fewer construction workers and equipment on-site, and fewer haul trips).

Page VI-78. The following text in the second paragraph is revised:

Thus, impacts of Alternative 2 to police protection services during operation would be less than significant and less than the Project's less-than-significant impact, due to the reduced density amount of development and fewer employees.

Page VI-92. Under the heading Comparison to Project Objectives, the following text is revised:

However, Alternative 2 would not redevelop the urban infill Project Site and provide a high density, mixed-use, commercial office project at an increased FAR that increases job opportunities in proximity to public transit and other commercial and residential land uses to the same extent as the Project, because reducing the density amount of development by 78 percent would provide substantially fewer jobs.

Page VI-93. Under the heading Comparison to Project Objectives, the following text is revised:

1. Redevelop low-intensity parcels in the Arts District with a mix of ~~high-density~~ commercial land uses at an increased FAR that provides an increased variety of job opportunities, thereby maximizing the creation of permanent jobs and economic investment in the City of Los Angeles and the Arts District.
2. Introduce a range of high quality ~~and high-density~~ commercial spaces at the appropriate scale and intensity that would supply the increasing demand for office, incubator space, and innovative campus uses in the Arts District; contribute to the demand for office space; and provide neighborhood resources for the growing residential neighborhood within the Arts District.

Page VI-93. Under the heading Summary of Comparison to Project Objectives, the following text is revised:

Based on the preceding evaluation, Alternative 2 – Current Zoning and Land Use Designation Alternative, would not achieve the basic Project objectives to the same extent as the Project, as it would not increase ~~density~~ the on-site FAR to the same degree and create as many jobs in the Arts District.

The ~~reduced density~~ reduction in development with of Alternative 2 by 78 percent would provide 282 jobs as compared to 1,282 jobs with the Project.

Page VI-94. Under the heading Summary of Comparison to Project Objectives, the following text is revised:

However, due to the reduced ~~density~~ amount of development and reduced job creation, Alternative 2 would not fulfill the goals of the 2020-2045 SCAG RTP/SCS or State and City goals for TPAs to the same extent as the Project would, since it would not place as much job-creating office space on an urban infill site served by transit, which would encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation and reduce VMT. Although the duration of construction of Alternative 2 would be reduced in comparison to the Project (22 months rather than ~~28~~ approximately 30 months), Alternative 2 would also not avoid the temporary, construction period significant and unavoidable noise and vibration impacts of the Project related to Project-level and cumulative off-road construction noise, Project-level and cumulative composite construction noise, Project-level vibration (building damage) from off-road construction, and Project-level and cumulative vibration (human annoyance) from on-road construction vehicles.

Page VI-95. Under the headings Alternative 3: Downtown Community Plan Alternative, and Description of the Alternative, the following text is revised:

In accordance with the allowable land uses and zoning specifications described above from the draft Downtown Community Plan, Alternative 3 would develop 8,149 square feet of new retail/restaurant space, and 70,039 square feet of new residential space comprised of 44 live/work units. Alternative 3 would provide 89 parking spaces within two above grade levels. Alternative 3 includes no subterranean development. The proposed structure for Alternative 3 would reach a maximum height of 96 feet, including five ~~occupied~~ stories (one of which would be the parking level) above grade, with a FAR of 1.5:1.

Pages VI-95 and VI-96. Under the heading Air Quality Plan Consistency, the following text is revised:

As such, Alternative 3 represents approximately 78 percent less development than the Project, which would reduce the construction duration for Alternative 3 to 22 months, as compared to ~~28~~ approximately 30 months for Project.

Page VI-96. Under the heading Regional Emissions – Construction, the following text is revised:

Therefore, the duration of the use of construction activities and associated use of construction equipment and vehicle trips would be less than those required to construct the Project (22 months for Alternative 3, as compared to ~~28~~ approximately 30 months for the Project).

Page VI-98. Under the heading Toxic Air Contaminants – Operation, the following text is revised:

However, as Alternative 3 would develop the same amount of new commercial space as the Project (retail/restaurant space with Alternative 3, and restaurant space with the Project), but 44 residential units as compared to the Project's 327,976 square feet of office space, it is reasonable to assume that fewer delivery trucks trips would be associated with Alternative 3 as compared to the Project, due to an overall reduction in the density amount of development and related vehicle trips, as previously described.

Page VI-100. Under the heading Historic Resources – Operation, the following text is revised:

By comparison, the Project would construct a 297-foot tall, 18-story, Office Building with 329,095 square feet of net new restaurant and office uses. Both structures would add substantial height and developed density floor area to parcels currently occupied by one-story industrial buildings and surface parking lots.

Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact on historic resources during operations, and due to its reduced height and ~~density~~ FAR that would be more consistent with the scale of development in the potential Historic District as compared to the Project, its impact would be less than the Project's less-than-significant impact.

Page VI-102. Under the heading Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources – Construction, the following text is revised:

As such, Alternative 3 represents approximately 78 percent less development than the Project with a shorter construction schedule of 22 months, as compared to ~~28~~approximately 30 months for the Project.

Page VI-103. Under the heading Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources – Operation, the following text is revised:

Such impacts would be less than the Project's less-than-significant impact due to the reduced ~~density~~ amount of development on the Project Site.

Page VI-107. Under the heading GHG Emissions, the following text is revised:

As Alternative 3 would be five stories in height and have a net increase in floor area of 71,158 square feet, as compared to 18 stories and a net increase in floor area of 329,095 square feet with the Project (and 78 percent less total development), construction activities for Alternative 3 would be less than those required to construct the Project, which would shorten the construction duration of Alternative 3 to 22 months, compared to ~~28~~approximately 30 months for the Project.

Pages VI-122 and VI-123. Under the heading Groundborne Vibration – Construction (Off-road Construction Activity), the following text is revised:

The adjacent buildings are of such an age that they may be considered sensitive to the structural effects of vibration. Vibration annoyance was not considered, based on the commercial and industrial nature of the land uses. Due to the reduced amount of development that would occur with Alternative 3 as compared to the Project (78 percent less development), as well as the substantially reduced amount of grading (the export of 5,205 cubic yards of soils as compared to 75,200 cubic yards of soils), the overall amount and duration of construction activities would be reduced with Alternative 3. However, as previously explained, the same equipment would still be utilized to demolish existing site uses; to prepare and level the site for new construction; and to collect, remove, and to transport demolished materials and surface soils from the site. Therefore, the maximum vibration levels produced by construction equipment during construction of the Project would still occur during construction of Alternative 3, only over a reduced duration. As the closest vibration-sensitive receptors to the Project Site may experience significant

vibration that exceeds the building damage threshold of 0.12 inches/second PPV, the Project impact would be significant. ~~and~~ ~~the~~ ~~Project's~~ ~~proposed~~ ~~Mitigation~~ ~~Measures~~ NOI-MM-2, NOI-MM-3, and NOI-MM-4 would implement a pre-construction survey, shoring plan, and comprehensive structural monitoring program, respectively, for adjacent sensitive buildings at 418 Colyton Street, 424 Colyton Street, and 427 South Hewitt Street, to reduce the potential for vibration damage at these fragile structures.

Pages VI-123 and VI-124. Under the heading Groundborne Vibration – Construction (On-road Construction Vehicles), the following text is revised:

Delivery truck and haul trucks would travel to and from the Project Site throughout the construction period, and in addition to noise, these vehicles may generate vibration for receptors along their haul routes. The haul route for Alternative 3 would be the same as for the Project. The All nearest sensitive uses to the Project Site and along the construction haul route, other than South Hewitt Street, are typically at least 25 feet from the center of the nearest travel lane, taking into consideration sidewalks, setbacks, and/or on-street parking. Along East 4th Place for example, the only sensitive use is Art Share LA, which minimally has a 25-foot setback from the center of the nearest through traffic lane. Structures along the haul route may experience groundborne vibration levels of approximately 0.022 inches/second PPV, below the fragile building damage threshold criterion of 0.12 inches/second PPV and a nuisance vibration level of 72 VdB, which would not exceed the human annoyance threshold of 72 VdB. Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration that could result in building damage ~~or exceed human annoyance levels~~. Vibration impacts to nearby vibration-sensitive receptors with respect to building damage ~~and human annoyance~~ from trucks traveling along the anticipated haul routes would be less than significant from Alternative 3 and less than the Project's less-than-significant impacts due to an overall reduction in haul trucks and trips, as Alternative 3 would not require substantial grading and soil export (5,205 cubic yards of grading as compared to the Project's 75,200 cubic yards).

~~As discussed above,~~ The estimated groundborne nuisance vibration from on-road trucks would not exceed the 72 VdB significance criteria for the nearest vibration-sensitive uses to the Project Site. However, along the full extent of the haul route for Alternative 3, there may be vibration-sensitive receptors within 25 feet of the center of the of the nearest travel lane at which vibration would exceed the 72 VdB significance criteria for residential uses and would potentially exceed the 75 VdB significance criteria for institutional land uses. In addition, roadways along the haul route may not be smooth. Therefore, it is conservatively concluded that, similar to the Project, on-road haul traffic for Alternative 3 could result in the exposure of persons to excessive groundborne vibration that exceed human annoyance levels. Vibration impacts with respect to human annoyance resulting from construction trucks traveling along the anticipated haul routes would be significant

and unavoidable for Alternative 3 and less than the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts due to an overall reduction in haul trucks and trips, as Alternative 3 would not require substantial grading and soil export (5,205 cubic yards of grading as compared to the Project's 75,200 cubic yards).

Page VI-127. Under the heading New or Physically Altered Facilities, Performance Objectives – Construction, the following text is revised:

Therefore, impacts on fire protection services during construction of Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project, due to the reduction in the ~~density of development~~ floor area that would be constructed (e.g., reduced construction schedule, fewer construction workers and equipment on-site, and fewer haul trips).

Page VI-127. Under the heading New or Physically Altered Facilities, Performance Objectives – Operation, the following text is revised:

Similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would be subject to City-established fire flow requirements, which vary from 2,000 gallons per minute in low-density residential areas, to 12,000 gallons per minute in ~~high-density~~ commercial or industrial areas.

Page VI-128. Under the heading New or Physically Altered Facilities, Performance Objectives – Operation, the following text is revised:

Therefore, based on these preceding factors, the impacts of Alternative 3 to fire protection services during operation would be less than significant and less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project, due to the reduced developed density ~~of development~~ floor area.

Page VI-129. Under the heading New or Physically Altered Facilities, Performance Objectives – Construction, the following text is revised:

Construction-related impacts of Alternative 3 to police protection services would be less than significant and less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project, due to the reduction in the ~~density of development~~ floor area that would be constructed (e.g., reduced construction schedule, fewer construction workers and equipment on-site, and fewer haul trips).

Pages VI-130 to VI-131. The following text is revised:

Thus, impacts of Alternative 3 to police protection services during operation would be less than significant and less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project, due to the reduced developed density of development floor area and on-site population.

Page VI-146. Under the heading Comparison to Project Objectives, the following text is revised:

Since Alternative 3 would develop primarily residential uses and not office uses, it would not redevelop the urban infill Project Site and provide a ~~high density, mixed-use, commercial office project~~ at an increased FAR that increases job opportunities in proximity to public transit and other commercial and residential land uses to the same extent as the Project.

1. Redevelop low-intensity parcels in the Arts District with a mix of ~~high density commercial land uses~~ at an increased FAR that provides an increased variety of job opportunities, thereby maximizing the creation of permanent jobs and economic investment in the City of Los Angeles and the Arts District.
2. Introduce a range of high quality ~~and high density commercial spaces~~ at the appropriate scale and intensity that would supply the increasing demand for office, incubator space, and innovative campus uses in the Arts District; contribute to the demand for office space; and provide neighborhood resources for the growing residential neighborhood within the Arts District.

Pages VI-147 and VI-148. Under the heading Summary Comparison to Project Impacts, the following text is revised:

Due to the reduced ~~density of development floor area~~ and substantially reduced job creation, Alternative 3 would not fulfill the other goals of the 2020-2045 SCAG RTP/SCS or State and its goals for TPAs to the same extent as the Project would, since it would not place job-creating office space on an urban infill site served by transit, which would encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation and reduce VMT. In addition, Alternative 3 would not include a pedestrian passageway connecting Colyton and South Hewitt Streets, nor would it include a courtyard along Colyton Street, which would provide improved pedestrian accessibility and safety, as well as public open space. Furthermore, although the duration of construction of Alternative 3 would be reduced in comparison to the Project (22 months rather than ~~28~~ approximately 30 months), Alternative 3 would also not avoid the temporary, construction period significant and unavoidable noise and vibration impacts of the Project related to Project-level and cumulative off-road construction noise, Project-level and cumulative composite construction noise, Project-

level vibration (building damage) from off-road construction, and Project-level and cumulative vibration (human annoyance) from on-road construction vehicles.

Page VI-148. Under the heading Identification of the Environmentally Superior Alternative, the following text is revised:

Alternative 2 ~~represents~~ includes reduced density development with a floor area that is in accordance with the existing zoning designation and FAR allowed within the Project Site.

Page VI-149. Under the heading Identification of the Environmentally Superior Alternative, the following text is revised:

However, Alternative 2 is selected as the Environmentally Superior Alternative, because unlike Alternative 3, which would develop a primarily residential use rather than office uses, Alternative 2 would still develop office and retail/restaurant uses, and as such, would achieve the intent of the Project objectives, though to a substantially lesser extent than the Project due to its reduced floor area and creation of fewer jobs than the Project density.

p) EIR Appendix I, Land Use Policy Consistency Tables

Page Appendix I-10. In Table IV.H-2, Project Conflicts with Applicable Framework Element Objectives and Policies, within the consistency analysis of Land Use Chapter Policy 3.2.4, the following text is revised:

The Project would increase the height and ~~density~~ floor area ratio (FAR) of the uses on the Project Site, which is consistent with more recently constructed and planned infill developments in the Arts District that include increased height and ~~density~~ FARs, as compared to the land uses they replaced.

Page Appendix I-22. The first row on this page of Table IV.H-3, Project Conflicts with Mobility Plan 2035 Policies, is revised as follows:

In addition, the Project would provide sidewalks along its Colyton and South Hewitt Street frontages and proposes short- and long-term bicycle facilities, a bike repair area, and shower facilities to support bicyclists. The Project also provides above- and below-ground parking per LAMC requirements. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with this policy.

Page Appendix I-31, In Table IV.H-4, Project Conflicts with Applicable Central City North Community Plan Policies, consistency analysis of Design Policies for Individual Projects for 2. Height and Building Design, the following text is revised:

The Project would increase the ~~density and height~~ and FAR currently on-site, and the ground floor commercial uses would be accessible from the street and from a landscaped pedestrian courtyard on Colyton Street and a passageway that connects Colyton and South Hewitt Streets.

III. Revisions, Clarifications, and Corrections to the Draft EIR

C. Effect of Corrections and Revisions

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15088.5, requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that has been made available for public review, but not yet certified, be recirculated whenever significant new information has been added to the EIR. The entire document need not be circulated if revisions are limited to specific portions of the document. The relevant portions of the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088.5, read as follows:

- (a) *A lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review under Section 15087 but before certification. As used in this section, the term “information” can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement. “Significant new information” requiring recirculation include, for example, a disclosure showing that:*
- (1) *A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.*
 - (2) *A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.*
 - (3) *A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.*
 - (4) *The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. (Mountain Lion Coalition v. Fish and Game Com. (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d 1043)*

(b) Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.

The additions and corrections contained in this chapter and the information contained in Chapter II, Responses to Comments, of this Final EIR clarify, amplify, or refine information in the Draft EIR; however, they do not make changes that would qualify as “significant new information” as defined above. In addition, Chapter II, Responses to Comments, of this Final EIR, fully considers and responds to all written comments received on the Draft EIR. As demonstrated therein, the Project would not result in any significant impacts that are not disclosed in the Draft EIR and none of these comments provided substantial evidence that the Project would result in changed circumstances, significant new information, considerably different mitigation measures, or new or more severe significant impacts than were discussed in the Draft EIR. The additions and corrections to the Draft EIR provide minor revisions, augment the analysis of the Draft EIR and would not result in new significant environmental impacts or increase any impact already identified in the Draft EIR. Thus, none of the conditions in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088.5 are met, and recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required.

The additions and corrections presented in this Final EIR reflect a clarification to Chapter II, Project Description, to specify the number and type of bicycle spaces that would be provided by the Project, as well as to list the ancillary uses and amenities that would occupy the ground floor of the Office Building; a correction to the Environmental Setting, Chapter III of the Draft EIR, to clarify that 7,800-square-foot structure on Colyton Street is the building formerly occupied by the Architecture and Design (A+D) Museum; a correction to a minor omission in the Project Description, Chapter II, and Transportation, Section IV.L, of the Draft EIR, to convey that double stackers would be utilized to provide a portion of the subterranean parking spaces; a correction to the Introduction and Executive Summary, Chapter I, and Air Quality, Section IV.A, of the Draft EIR, to clarify that the use of Tier 4 Final construction equipment as Project Design Feature AQ-PDF-1 is not required in the order for the Project to avoid significant air quality impacts; a clarification to the Table of Contents and Air Quality section of the Draft EIR, to specify that the emissions reported in Table IV.A-5 are the maximum daily operational emissions, rather than daily operational emissions; a correction to a minor omission in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR to convey that an emergency generator would be utilized in the Office Building but that this stationary source of emissions would result in less than significant air quality impacts; a clarification to Chapter IV.A, Air Quality, to specify the sensitive receptors that are located within 200 feet of the Project Site; a clarification to Chapter IV.F, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, to identify that the Office Building would include two fuel storage tanks to power an emergency generator in the event of an electrical power failure; and a correction to the Alternatives discussion, Chapter V of the

Draft EIR, to clarify that the proposed structure for Alternative 2 would include five stories, two of which would be parking levels.

In addition, several chapters and sections of the Draft EIR (Chapter I, Introduction and Executive Summary; Chapter II, Project Description; Section IV.A, Air Quality; Section IV.B, Cultural Resources; Section IV.C, Energy; Section IV.H, Land Use and Planning; Chapter V, Other CEQA Considerations; Chapter VI, Alternatives; and Appendix I, Land Use Policy Consistency Tables) have been revised to omit the terms “density” or “high-density” when referring to the Project’s commercial and office spaces (as well as other non-residential projects or surrounding land uses), as these terms are used by the Department of City Planning in reference to residential land uses and dwelling units. In the place of “density” or “high-density,” the Draft EIR has been revised to describe the increase in floor area, floor area ratio, or FAR, or the increase in the amount of development, that would occur on the Project Site as a result of the Project and the proposed commercial and office spaces.

Chapter VI, Alternatives, has also been revised to clarify that, like the Project, Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 would each result in significant and unavoidable groundborne vibration impacts (related to human annoyance) during the construction period as a result of on-road construction vehicles; however, while this impact would not occur at the sensitive receptors located in closest proximity to the Project Site, it may occur at sensitive receptors located elsewhere along the haul route. In addition, the Draft EIR has been revised to clarify that these significant and unavoidable groundborne vibration impacts during the construction period as a result of on-road construction vehicles would be similar with Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 as with the Project, due to the same construction equipment being utilized, but that the impacts would be less with Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 by comparison, due to the reduction of development and reduced during of construction activity.

Following public circulation of the Draft EIR in May 2022, the SCAQMD adopted the 2022 AQMP, and the CARB adopted the 2022 Scoping Plan Update, in December 2022. Therefore, the Draft EIR has been revised to incorporate relevant information from the 2022 AQMP and 2022 Scoping Plan Update. As documented in Chapter III, Section b of the Final EIR, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2022 AQMP or 2022 Scoping Plan Update.

The text of several Project Design Features, namely AQ-PDF-1, POL-PDF-1, POL-PDF-2, TRANS-PDF-1, and TRANS PDF-2 has been revised throughout the Draft EIR to replace the term “shall” with “will,” consistent with the City’s standard practice that project design features utilize the term “will” whereas “shall” is reserved for mitigation measure language.

In addition to the direct revisions that have been made to the Draft EIR and that are noted in Chapter III, Section b, of the Final EIR, a discussion regarding the construction schedule of the Project is provided here as well to address the potential effects of changes to the construction schedule. As described in Chapter II, Project Description, construction was anticipated to begin in 2022 and conclude in 2025 at the time that the Draft EIR was circulated for public review. However, the emissions that were modeled with CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 and reported in Appendix B, Air Quality Impact Analysis, to the Draft EIR are based on an earlier construction schedule beginning in 2021 and concluding in 2023, which was envisioned when the air quality analysis and related modeling were prepared early in the Draft EIR preparation process. Construction equipment and vehicles in general generate a similar amount or fewer emissions over time as increasingly stringent federal, State, and local regulations are implemented to reduce pollutants in the atmosphere. Therefore, the Project's emissions associated with construction activities beginning farther into the future (2022 into 2025) would be similar to, or less than, those reported for 2021 into 2023. On this basis, the modeling was not updated to revise the construction schedule nor to utilize the 2020 Version of CalEEMod for the Draft EIR.

Due to the duration necessary to respond to public comments on the Draft EIR, it is no longer feasible for the Project to begin construction in 2022 and conclude in 2025. However, the Draft EIR narratives have not been revised to change the construction years specifically (for example, to state that construction would occur from 2023 to 2026 or from 2024 to 2027). The anticipated years of Project construction and buildout are provided largely for informational purposes and do not substantially influence the outcomes of a CEQA analysis, with the exceptions of the air quality and GHG analyses, which are based on the CalEEMod output that does account for the specific years of construction and durations of individual construction phases, as described above. As the timeline for public hearings, certification of the Final EIR, approval of the Project, and the acquisition of permits are uncertain, further revision to the narratives throughout the Draft EIR that convey the years over which construction would occur would introduce unnecessary speculation.

As noted above in Chapter III, Section b, several sections of the Draft EIR conveyed that the overall duration of construction would occur over 28 months. However, the air quality and GHG emissions analyses of the Draft EIR assumed a construction duration of approximately 30 months (two months and two weeks), as conveyed in the CalEEMod output sheets provided in Appendix B (Air Quality Impact Analysis) and Appendix F (Greenhouse Gas Emissions Estimates) to the Draft EIR. The noise analysis of the Draft EIR also relied on these CalEEMod output sheets for construction phasing information. As such, the construction duration (where stated to be 28 months) has been revised in the Draft EIR to state approximately 30 months, as noted in Chapter III, Section b, of the Final EIR. This revision does not affect the air quality, GHG, or noise analyses, which

were already based on the 30-month duration, and the remaining sections of the Draft EIR, and the impact determinations therein, would not be affected by this revision.

While the majority of the Draft EIR air quality impact conclusions continue to reflect the emissions that were modeled with CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 and that are reported in Appendix B, Air Quality Impact Analysis, to the Draft EIR, additional modeling was prepared during preparation of the Final EIR in order to respond to public comments that were received on the Draft EIR. To document the operational emissions associated with the routine monthly maintenance of an emergency generator, CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0 was utilized (and is included in Final EIR Appendix FEIR-B), as it was the publicly available and SCAQMD-approved version of the model at the time that this additional analysis was prepared in July 2022. As documented in Chapter III, Section b, of the Final EIR, Table IV.A-5, Project Maximum Daily Operational Emissions, and Table IV.A-7, LST and Project Emissions – Operations (pounds /day) the Draft EIR have been revised to include the emissions that would result from the routine monthly maintenance of the emergency generator. As the emergency generator is a specific piece of stationary equipment, Tables IV.A-5 and IV.A-7 are only revised to add the emissions of the emergency generator as estimated by the CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0 output, while the area, energy, and mobile emissions sources that are listed remain those that were estimated by CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 for the Draft EIR. As conveyed in Chapter II and Chapter III, Section b, of the Final EIR, even with the addition of the emergency generator, the Project's operational air quality impacts would be less than significant.

These additions and corrections would not result in new significant impacts or increase the severity of environmental impacts previously disclosed in the Draft EIR. In addition, as part of Chapter II, Responses to Comments, of the Final EIR, and for informational purposes, a construction Health Risk Assessment (refer to Appendix FEIR-C) was prepared but concludes that the Project would result in less than significant health risk impacts. This supplemental information does not warrant revision to the Draft EIR.