V. Alternatives

V. Alternatives

1. Introduction

The identification and analysis of alternatives to a project is a fundamental aspect of the environmental review process under CEQA. Specifically, Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21001 states, in part, that the environmental review process is intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects. In addition, PRC Section 21002.1(a) states, in part, that the purpose of an environmental impact report is to identify the significant effects on the environment of a project, identify alternatives to the project, and indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided.

Direction regarding the consideration and discussion of project alternatives in an EIR is provided in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) as follows:

> *An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decisionmaking and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible.*

The CEQA Guidelines indicate that the selection of project alternatives be based primarily on the ability to avoid or substantially lessen significant impacts relative to the proposed project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly. The CEQA Guidelines further direct that the range of alternatives be guided by a "rule of reason," such that only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice are addressed. In selecting project alternatives for analysis, potential alternatives must be feasible. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1) states that:

Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries […], and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site […]

Beyond these factors, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires the analysis of a "no project" alternative and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2) requires an evaluation of alternative location(s) for the project, if feasible. Based on the alternatives analysis, an environmentally superior alternative is to be designated. If the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project/No Build Alternative, then the EIR shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

2. Overview of Alternatives to the Project

As indicated above, the intent of the alternatives is to avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of a project while still feasibly obtaining most of the basic Project objectives. Based on the analyses in Section IV, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this Draft EIR, implementation of the Project would result in significant impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated with respect to on-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative); on-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level only); off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level and cumulative); and off-site operational noise (Project-level and cumulative—Office Option).

Accordingly, the following alternatives to the Project have been selected for evaluation based on the significant environmental impacts of the Project, the objectives established for the Project (listed in Section II, Project Description, of this Draft EIR), the feasibility of the alternatives considered, and the existing zoning designation on the Project Site. Because the Project includes both a Residential Option and Office Option, alternatives to both the Project's Residential Option and Office Option are analyzed below. For purposes of this analysis, the Residential Option Alternatives are compared to the Project's Residential Option and the Office Option Alternatives are compared to the Office Option:

- Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative
- Residential Option Alternative 2: Reduced Density and FAR (25%) Alternative
- Residential Option Alternative 3: Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning and Hollywood Community Plan Update Alternative

- Office Option Alternative 2: Reduced Density and FAR (25%) Alternative
- Office Option Alternative 3: Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning Alternative
- Office Option Alternative 4: Development in Accordance with Hollywood Community Plan Update Alternative

3. Alternatives Considered and Rejected

As set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), an EIR should identify any Alternatives that were considered for analysis but rejected as infeasible and briefly explain the reasons for their rejection. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), among the factors that may be used to eliminate an Alternative from detailed consideration is the Alternative's failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, the alternative's infeasibility, or the alternative's inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. Alternatives to the Project that have been considered and rejected as infeasible include the following:

- **Alternative to eliminate significant noise and vibration impacts:** As discussed in Section IV.H, Noise, of this Draft EIR, the Project would result significant Project-level and cumulative impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated with respect to on-site noise during construction and on-site vibration during construction (pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance). In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.G, Noise, of this Draft EIR, cumulative impacts with respect to off-site construction noise would also be significant and unavoidable. The following approaches were considered to substantially reduce or avoid these impacts. This analysis is based in part on the Alternatives Noise Calculations prepared for the Project by AES in October 2021 and included as Appendix V of this Draft EIR:
  - Approach (a)—Extended Construction Duration: An approach that extends the construction period, thus reducing the amount of daily construction activity that would occur under the Project was reviewed and rejected as infeasible for the following reasons:
    - Construction noise levels are dependent on the number of construction equipment (on-site equipment or off-site construction trucks). It is anticipated the number of on-site construction equipment and off-site construction trips would be reduced under this approach. Typically, a reduction of 50 percent in the number of construction equipment or construction traffic (haul and delivery trucks) trips would be required to

reduce the construction-related noise levels by 3 dBA (just perceptible).[1] For example, a 50-percent reduction in the number of construction trucks during the site grading phase, from 32 to 16 truck trips per hour, would reduce the truck noise along the anticipated haul routes by approximately 3 dBA as compared to the Project. However, when accounting for the ambient noise level (i.e., the Project plus ambient noise levels due to off-site construction trucks) the actual noise levels resulting from a 50-percent reduction in construction trucks would only be reduced by 0.5 dBA along Vine Street and Sunset Boulevard. With respect to on-site construction, reducing the on-site construction equipment during the site demolition phase from 6 pieces to 3 pieces of equipment (50-percent reduction) would reduce the construction noise at the off-site receptors by 0.7 dBA L_{eq} at receptor location R1, 1.0 dBA at receptor location R2, 1.2 dBA at receptor location R3, and 1.4 dBA L_{eq} at receptor locations R4 and R5 (as compared to the Project). The estimated construction noise levels with a 50-percent reduction in the number of pieces of construction equipment would still exceed the significance threshold by up to 22.0 dBA L_{eq} at receptor location R1, 36.3 dBA at receptor location R2, and 17.3 dBA L_{eq} at receptor location R3 during the site demolition phase. Furthermore, due to the proximity of the off-site noise sensitive receptors (e.g., receptor location R2 is adjacent to the Project Site), it would not be practical to reduce the construction noise levels to below the significance threshold as a single piece of equipment would result in noise levels above the significance threshold. For example, a single excavator operating at the eastern property line would generate noise level up to 91 dBA L_{eq} at receptor R2, which would exceed the significance threshold by 30.2 dBA L_{eq}. Therefore, the construction noise levels under this approach would be less than the Project (depending on the amount of the reduction) but would still exceed the significance threshold. In addition, this approach would be inefficient and would increase the number of days that sensitive receptors would be impacted by construction activities, thereby prolonging the duration of the significant impact. As such, the on-site construction noise impacts under this approach would be less than the Project but would remain significant.

- Construction noise levels can be reduced with a smaller number of on-site construction equipment pieces and with a buffer zone between the sensitive receptors and the construction equipment. However, due to the proximity of the sensitive receptors (i.e., directly north, south, and east of the Project Site), existing development that would require demolition and

[1] *A 3-dBA reduction would not necessarily avoid the significant impact. Rather, a 3-dBA reduction is the minimum reduction required to be audible to the human ear; reducing the number of pieces of construction equipment and volume of construction traffic by 50 percent is required to achieve an audible reduction in on- and off-site construction noise, respectively. In other words, reducing peak day construction activities by 50 percent would result in a barely audible reduction in construction noise.*

grading up to the property line, and insufficient distance to create a meaningful buffer zone, it would not be practical to mitigate the on-site construction noise impacts of the Project.

- The on-site construction vibration impacts (human annoyance) would be significant, similar to the Project, as the vibration impact analysis is based on the peak vibration level generated by individual construction equipment, and the approach would utilize similar construction equipment (e.g., drill rig and large bulldozer).

– Approach (b)—Central Location of Development: An approach where the proposed development is moved closer to the center of the Project Site, thus pulling back the proposed development and associated construction activities from the off-site sensitive receptors, was reviewed and rejected as infeasible for the following reasons:

- Construction noise levels can be reduced by providing an additional buffer zone between the receptor and the construction equipment. Noise levels from construction equipment would attenuate approximately 6 dBA per doubling of distance from the noise source (construction equipment) to the receptor over acoustically "hard" sites (e.g., asphalt and concrete surfaces) and 7.5 dBA per doubling of distance from the noise source to the receptor over acoustically "soft" sites (e.g., soft dirt, grass or scattered bushes and trees). The construction noise levels associated with the building phases for the proposed development placed closer to the center of the site would be lower than the Project. However, the noise level reduction, depending on the setback from the property line, would be limited due to the size of the Project Site and due to existing on-site improvements that would still require demolition and grading up to the property line. In addition, noise levels during site demolition, site grading, and paving would be similar to the Project, as construction activities for these phases would be up to the property line, similar to the Project. As such, the on-site construction noise impacts under this approach would remain significant similar to the Project.

– Approach (c)—Reduced Development: An approach that reduces the amount of development that would occur under the Project to the extent that the significant construction-related noise and vibration impacts of the Project would be avoided or substantially reduced was also considered and rejected as infeasible:

- As discussed above, construction noise levels can be reduced with a smaller number of on-site construction equipment pieces and with a buffer zone between the sensitive receptors and the construction equipment. However, due to the close proximity of the sensitive receptors (i.e., directly adjacent to the east and across the street from the Project Site), existing development that would require demolition and grading up to the property

line, and a site that does not have the space to create a meaningful buffer zone, it would not be practical to mitigate the on-site construction noise impacts of the Project.

- The on-site construction vibration impacts (human annoyance) would be significant similar to the Project, as the vibration impact analysis is based on the peak vibration level generated by individual construction equipment pieces that would still be required to operate near the property line.

- As indicated above, none of the above approaches would substantially reduce or avoid the significant construction-related noise and vibration (human annoyance) impacts of the Project. Furthermore, Approaches (a) through (c) would not achieve the Project's underlying purpose and objectives to the same extent as the Project. Specifically, these approaches would provide fewer residential units and jobs near transit.[2] Approach (a) would extend the construction period, which would result in impacts that would affect sensitive receptors for a longer period of time, making this approach infeasible. Approach (b) would place the proposed uses far from adjacent sidewalks and, thus, would not provide active ground floor uses or pedestrian-friendly building design elements adjacent to the sidewalks and public right-of-way. Approach (c) would not enhance the pedestrian realm near the Project Site to the same extent as the Project and would meet the underlying objective to a lesser extent than the Project. Therefore, an alternative that includes one or more of these approaches has been rejected from further consideration in this Draft EIR.

- **Alternative Project Site:** The results of a search to find an alternative site on which the Project could be built determined that suitable similar locations are not available to meet the underlying purpose and objectives of the Project to redevelop a site in proximity to other existing community-serving uses. Further, it is not expected that the Applicant can reasonably acquire, control, or have access to an alternative site of similar size. Therefore, an alternative site is not considered feasible as it is not expected that the Applicant can reasonably acquire, control or have access to a suitable alternative site that would provide for the uses and square footage proposed by the Project. In addition, a suitable alternative site would not be likely to avoid the significant impacts of the Project because it would also be located within an urban area near noise sensitive receptors. Thus, in accordance with Section 15126.6(f) of the State CEQA Guidelines, this alternative was rejected from further consideration.

---

[2] *The underlying purpose of the Project referred to here is to revitalize the infill Project Site by developing an integrated high-density mixed-use development that provides new multi-family housing opportunities (including Very Low Income housing units), neighborhood serving commercial retail/restaurant uses, and a grocery store, or alternatively, a mixed-used development with office space, restaurant uses, and potential multi-family housing opportunities, all of which serve the community and promote walkability.*

4. Analysis Format

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), each alternative is evaluated in sufficient detail to determine whether the overall environmental impacts would be less, similar, or greater than the corresponding impacts of the Project. Furthermore, each alternative is evaluated to determine whether the Project objectives identified in Section II, Project Description, of this Draft EIR would be substantially attained by the alternative.[3] The evaluation of each of the alternatives follows the process described below:

a. The net environmental impacts of the alternative are determined for each environmental issue area analyzed in Section IV, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this Draft EIR assuming that the alternative would implement the same project design features and mitigation measures identified in Section IV, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this Draft EIR.

b. Post-mitigation significant and non-significant environmental impacts of the alternative and the Project are compared for each environmental issue area as follows:

   - Less: Where the net impact of the alternative would be clearly less adverse or more beneficial than the impact of the Project, the comparative impact is said to be "less."

   - Greater: Where the net impact of the alternative would clearly be more adverse or less beneficial than the Project, the comparative impact is said to be "greater."

   - Similar: Where the impact of the alternative and Project would be roughly equivalent, the comparative impact is said to be "similar."

c. The comparative analysis of the impacts is followed by a general discussion of whether the underlying purpose and basic Project objectives are feasibly and substantially attained by the alternative.

Table V-1 on page V-8 provides a summary matrix that compares the impacts associated with the Project with the impacts of each of the analyzed alternatives. As noted above, the Residential Option Alternatives are compared to the Project's Residential Option, and the Office Option Alternatives are compared to the Office Option. Nevertheless, unless specified below, "Project" refers to both the Residential Option and Office Option.

[3] *CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c).*

Table V-1
Comparison of Impacts Associated with the Project and Impacts of the Alternatives

Environmental Issue	Project Impact	Alternative 1 No Project/No Build Alternative	Residential Option Alternative 2 Reduced Density and FAR (25%) Alternative	Residential Option Alternative 3 Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning and Hollywood Community Plan Update Alternative	Office Option Alternative 2 Reduced Density and FAR (25%) Alternative	Office Option Alternative 3 Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning Alternative	Office Option Alternative 4 Development in Accordance with the Hollywood Community Plan Update Alternative
A. AIR QUALITY							
Construction							
Regional and Localized Emissions	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Toxic Air Contaminants	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Operation							
Regional and Localized Emissions	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Toxic Air Contaminants	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
B. CULTURAL RESOURCES							
Historic Resources	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Archaeological Resources	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Human Remains	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
C. ENERGY							
Energy	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
D. GEOLOGY AND SOILS							
Geologic Hazards	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Paleontological Resources	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
E. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS							
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
F. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY							
Hydrology	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Water Quality	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)

Table V-1 (Continued)
Comparison of Impacts Associated with the Project and Impacts of the Alternatives

Environmental Issue	Project Impact	Alternative 1 No Project/No Build Alternative	Residential Option Alternative 2 Reduced Density and FAR (25%) Alternative	Residential Option Alternative 3 Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning and Hollywood Community Plan Update Alternative	Office Option Alternative 2 Reduced Density and FAR (25%) Alternative	Office Option Alternative 3 Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning Alternative	Office Option Alternative 4 Development in Accordance with the Hollywood Community Plan Update Alternative
G. LAND USE							
Physical Division of a Community	Less Than Significant	Similar[4] (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Conflict with Land Use Plans	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
H. NOISE							
Construction							
On-Site Noise	**Significant and Unavoidable[5]**	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)
Off-Site Noise	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
On-Site Vibration (Building Damage)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant with Mitigation)	Similar (Less Than Significant with Mitigation)	Similar (Less Than Significant with Mitigation)	Similar (Less Than Significant with Mitigation)	Similar (Less Than Significant with Mitigation)
On-Site Vibration (Human Annoyance)	**Significant and Unavoidable**	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)
Off-Site Vibration (Building Damage)	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Off-Site Vibration (Human Annoyance)	**Significant and Unavoidable[6]**	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)
Operation							
On-Site Noise	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Off-Site Noise	Less Than Significant (Residential Option) **Significant and Unavoidable[7] (Office Option)**	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)

[4] *While Alternative 1 would have no impact regarding physical division of an established community, as compared to the Project's less than significant impact, it is concluded here that the impact of Alternative 1 would be "similar" to rather than "less" than the Project as neither Alternative 1 nor the Project would divide an established community.*

[5] *As discussed in Section IV.H, Noise, of this Draft EIR, cumulative noise impacts from on-site construction activities would also be significant and unavoidable.*

[6] *As discussed in Section IV.H, Noise, of this Draft EIR, cumulative vibration impacts from off-site construction (related to human annoyance) would also be significant and unavoidable.*

Table V-1 (Continued)
Comparison of Impacts Associated with the Project and Impacts of the Alternatives

Environmental Issue	Project Impact	Alternative 1 No Project/No Build Alternative	Residential Option Alternative 2 Reduced Density and FAR (25%) Alternative	Residential Option Alternative 3 Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning and Hollywood Community Plan Update Alternative	Office Option Alternative 2 Reduced Density and FAR (25%) Alternative	Office Option Alternative 3 Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning Alternative	Office Option Alternative 4 Development in Accordance with the Hollywood Community Plan Update Alternative
I. PUBLIC SERVICES							
Fire Protection							
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Police Protection							
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Schools							
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Libraries							
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Parks and Recreation							
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
J. TRANSPORTATION							
Conflicts with Plans	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Vehicle Miles Traveled	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Greater (Less Than Significant)

[7] *As discussed in Section IV.H, Noise, of this Draft EIR, both Project-level and cumulative impacts under the Office Option would be significant and unavoidable.*

Table V-1 (Continued)
Comparison of Impacts Associated with the Project and Impacts of the Alternatives

Environmental Issue	Project Impact	Alternative 1 No Project/No Build Alternative	Residential Option Alternative 2 Reduced Density and FAR (25%) Alternative	Residential Option Alternative 3 Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning and Hollywood Community Plan Update Alternative	Office Option Alternative 2 Reduced Density and FAR (25%) Alternative	Office Option Alternative 3 Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning Alternative	Office Option Alternative 4 Development in Accordance with the Hollywood Community Plan Update Alternative
Hazardous Geometric Design Features[8]	Less Than Significant (Residential Option) Less Than Significant with Mitigation (Office Option)	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant with Mitigation)	Similar (Less Than Significant with Mitigation)	Similar (Less Than Significant with Mitigation)
Emergency Access	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
K. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES							
Tribal Cultural Resources	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
I. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS							
Water Supply and Infrastructure							
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Wastewater							
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Energy Infrastructure							
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)

Source: Eyestone Environmental, 2022.

[8] *Although the cumulative impact associated with freeway off-ramp safety would remain significant and unavoidable, with implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1, the Project's Office Option's contribution would not be cumulative considerable.*

V. Alternatives

A. Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative

1. Description of the Alternative

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the No Project/No Build Alternative for a development project on an identifiable property consists of the circumstance under which a proposed project does not proceed. Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines states that "in certain instances, the No Project Alternative means 'no build' wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained." Accordingly, for purposes of this analysis, Alternative 1, the No Project/No Build Alternative, assumes that neither Project option would be approved, and no new development would occur within the Project Site. Thus, the physical conditions of the Project Site would generally remain as they are today. Specifically, a 17,100-square-foot post-production facility, an 8,044-square-foot commercial building, six bungalows that comprise approximately 8,988 square feet of floor area, an eight-unit multi-family residential building comprised of approximately 7,700 square feet, surface parking, and ancillary buildings would remain. Because no new development is proposed, no new construction would occur. The No Project/No Build Alternative is compared to the "Project," which refers to both the Residential Option and Office Option, unless otherwise specified.

2. Environmental Impact Analysis

a. Air Quality

(1) Construction

The No Project/No Build Alternative would not alter the existing conditions within the Project Site or result in new construction. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not result in any construction emissions associated with construction worker and construction truck traffic, fugitive dust from demolition and excavation, or the use of heavy-duty construction equipment. Similarly, the No Project Alternative would not result in diesel particulate emissions during construction that could generate substantial toxic air contaminants (TACs). Therefore, no construction-related regional and localized air quality impacts or TAC impacts would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Operation

The No Project/No Build Alternative would not result in new development that could generate new operational emissions related to vehicular traffic or the consumption of electricity and natural gas beyond what is currently generated by the existing uses on-site. Therefore, no operational air quality impacts associated with regional and localized emissions or TAC would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

b. Cultural Resources

Under the No Project/No Build Alternative, no grading or earthwork activities would occur, and the on-site bungalows included as part of the Afton Square Historic District would remain. Therefore, there would be no potential for Alternative 1 to affect historical resources or uncover subsurface archaeological resources or human remains. As such, no impacts to historic resources, archaeological resources, or human remains would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

c. Energy

Construction activities would not occur under Alternative 1. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not generate a short-term demand for energy during construction, and construction-related impacts to energy would not occur. As such, the impact would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

Alternative 1 would not alter the existing land uses or site operations on the Project Site. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not increase the long-term energy demand on the Project Site, the wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy, or conflicts with plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency (e.g., Title 24 energy efficiency standards, 2019 CALGreen requirements, Los Angeles Building Code, etc.). Therefore, no impact would occur, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

d. Geology and Soils

(1) Geologic Hazards

No construction or earthwork would occur under Alternative 1. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not cause or accelerate geologic hazards related to fault rupture, strong seismic shaking, soil erosion, lateral spreading, subsidence, expansive soils, or other geologic conditions, including compressible soils and settlement, which would result in

substantial damage to structures or infrastructure, or expose people to substantial risk of injury. No impact with respect to geologic hazards would occur, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Paleontological Resources

No construction or earthwork would occur under Alternative 1. Therefore, there would be no potential for Alternative 1 to uncover subsurface paleontological resources. No impact with respect to paleontological resources would occur, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

e. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As there would be no new development or operations on-site, no new greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would occur under the No Project/No Build Alternative, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

f. Hydrology and Water Quality

Alternative 1 would not result in the development of new land uses, additional impervious surfaces, landscaped areas, or drainage improvements as existing uses would remain. Thus, Alternative 1 would not alter the amount of pervious surfaces on the Project Site, and no changes to existing drainage patterns, runoff volumes, or the amount and types of pollutants found in stormwater runoff would occur. At the same time, as indicated in Section IV.F, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Draft EIR, there are no on-site best management practices (BMPs) under existing conditions, but there would be under the Project, such that Project operations would result in improved water quality. This benefit would not occur under Alternative 1. Still, as the existing conditions would not change, there is no impact under Alternative 1. Therefore, no impact related to hydrology and water quality would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

g. Land Use

Under Alternative 1, there would be no changes to the physical or operational characteristics of the existing Project Site. Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 1 would not physically divide an established community. Further, as there would be no changes to the physical or operational characteristics of the existing Project Site, no impacts associated with conflicts with land use regulations and plans would occur, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

h. Noise

(1) Construction

No construction activities would occur under the No Project/No Build Alternative. Therefore, no construction-related noise would be generated on-site or off-site. As such, off-site construction noise impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project. In addition, Alternative 1 would avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with on-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative); on-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level only); and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level and cumulative).

(2) Operation

As no new development or uses would be introduced to the Project Site, no changes to existing site operations would occur. As such, no noise and vibration impacts associated with operation of the Project Site under Alternative 1 would occur, and impacts associated with on-site noise would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project. In addition, Alternative 1 would avoid the Project's Office Option's significant and unavoidable impacts associated with off-site noise (Project-level and cumulative).

i. Public Services

(1) Fire Protection

No development would occur under Alternative 1. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not result in additional demand for fire protection facilities and services beyond existing conditions. No impacts with respect to fire protection would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Police Protection

No development would occur under Alternative 1. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not result in additional demand for police protection facilities and services beyond existing conditions. No impacts with respect to police protection would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(3) Schools

No development would occur under Alternative 1. Therefore, there would be no increase in the population of school-aged children in the attendance boundaries of the schools within the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) that serve the Project Site and additional demand for schools beyond existing conditions. No impact would occur, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(4) Parks and Recreation

No development would occur under Alternative 1. Therefore, there would be no increase in demand for parks and recreational facilities in the Project Site vicinity beyond existing conditions. No impact would occur, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(5) Libraries

No development would occur under Alternative 1. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not increase the library service population or the demand for library facilities and services beyond existing conditions. No impacts to library services would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

j. Transportation

Since the No Project/No Build Alternative would not develop new or additional land uses on the Project Site, Alternative 1 would not generate any additional vehicle trips or alter existing access or circulation within the Project Site during operation. Therefore, no impacts would occur with respect to operational traffic, including conflicts with programs, plans, ordinances, or policies addressing the circulation system; vehicle miles traveled (VMT); hazardous geometric design features, including those related to freeway safety; and emergency access. Therefore, impacts under the No Project/No Build Alternative would be less when compared to the Project's impacts, which would be less than significant with mitigation.

k. Tribal Cultural Resources

Under the No Project/No Build Alternative, no grading or earthwork activities would occur. Therefore, there would be no potential for Alternative 1 to uncover subsurface tribal cultural resources. As such, no impacts to tribal cultural resources would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

I. Utilities and Service Systems

(1) Water Supply and Infrastructure

The No Project/No Build Alternative would not alter the existing uses on-site or result in new construction. Therefore, this alternative would not increase the Project Site's water consumption. Thus, no construction or operational-related impacts to water supply and infrastructure under Alternative 1 would occur, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Wastewater

The No Project/No Build Alternative would not alter the existing uses or result in new construction. Therefore, this alternative would not increase the Project Site's wastewater generation. Thus, no construction or operational-related impacts to wastewater conveyance and treatment infrastructure under Alternative 1 would occur, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(3) Energy Infrastructure

The No Project/No Build Alternative would not alter the existing uses or result in new construction. Therefore, this alternative would not increase the Project Site's electricity, natural gas, or petroleum-based fuel usage. Thus, no construction or operational-related impacts to energy infrastructure under Alternative 1 would occur, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

3. Comparison of Impacts

Alternative 1 would avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable environmental impacts, including on-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative); on-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level only); off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level and cumulative); and off-site operational noise (Project-level and cumulative—Office Option). Impacts associated with the remaining environmental topics would be less than those of the Project, which would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.

4. Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

No changes to existing land uses or operation of the Project Site would occur under Alternative 1. As such, Alternative 1 would not meet the underlying purpose of the Project

to revitalize the infill Project Site by developing an integrated high-density mixed-use development that provides new multi-family housing opportunities (including Very Low Income housing units), neighborhood serving commercial retail/restaurant uses, and a grocery store, or alternatively, a mixed-used development with office space, restaurant uses, and potential multi-family housing opportunities, all of which serve the community and promote walkability, or any of the Project objectives. Specifically, Alternative 1 would not meet any of the Project objectives for the Residential Option:

- Consistent with the policies set forth in the City's General Plan Housing Element, provide multi-family housing units to support the much-needed demand for housing including affordable housing.

- Locate residential and commercial in close proximity to transit stations, along transit corridors, and within high activity areas, which promotes sustainability and reduces VMT, with associated reductions in air quality and GHG emissions.

- Redevelop an under-utilized infill site while providing for the adaptive reuse of the historic bungalows on-site.

- Promote local and regional mobility objectives by providing a high-density mixed-use development comprising residential and neighborhood-serving commercial uses along the Vine Street commercial corner and in close proximity to public transportation.

- Consistent with the City's Walkability Checklist and Citywide Design Guidelines, create a street-level identity for the Project Site and improve the pedestrian experience through the introduction of active street adjacent uses, such as neighborhood-serving commercial uses.

- Create economic vitality in the community through the provision of construction jobs, and permanent full-time on-site jobs and the generation of revenues to the City in the form of additional sales, business license, and property taxes.

- Promote sustainable development by incorporating "Green" principles, including energy-efficient buildings, a pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly site design, water conservation features and waste reduction features.

Similarly, Alternative 1 would not meet any of the Project Objectives for the Office option:

- Locate commercial uses in close proximity to transit stations, along transit corridors, and within high-activity areas, which promotes sustainability and reduces VMT, with associated reductions in air quality and GHG emissions.

- Redevelop an underutilized infill site while providing for the adaptive reuse of the historic bungalows on-site.

- Promote local and regional mobility objectives by providing a high-density development comprising office and neighborhood-serving restaurant uses along the Vine Street commercial corner and in close proximity to public transportation.

- Consistent with the City's Walkability Checklist and Citywide Design Guidelines, create a street-level identity for the Project Site and improve the pedestrian experience through the introduction of active street adjacent uses, such as neighborhood-serving restaurant uses.

- To create economic vitality in the community through the creation of construction jobs, and permanent full-time on-site jobs and the generation of revenues to the City in the form of additional sales, business license, and property taxes.

- Promote sustainable development by incorporating "Green" principles, including energy-efficient buildings, a pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly site design, water conservation features, and waste reduction features.

V. Alternatives

B. Residential Option Alternative 2: Reduced Development and FAR (25%) Alternative

1. Description of the Alternative

Residential Option Alternative 2, the Reduced Development and FAR (25%) Residential Alternative, would reduce the density and floor area ratio (FAR) of the Project's Residential Option by 25 percent. Specifically, Residential Option Alternative 2 would involve the development of a high-rise, 24-story mixed-use building, consisting of 322 residential units, a 41,250-square-foot grocery store, 3,750 square feet of retail uses, and 6,741 square feet of restaurant uses. Similar to the Project, this new building would be located within the western portion of the Project Site, and the six historic bungalows on-site would be relocated to the eastern portion of the Project Site. In accordance with LAMC requirements, Residential Option Alternative 2 would provide 36,625 square feet of open space. To accommodate Residential Option Alternative 2, the existing low-rise commercial building, eight-unit multi-family building, and ancillary buildings adjacent to the bungalows would be removed.

Overall, Residential Option Alternative 2 would comprise approximately 363,316 square feet of floor area for a total floor area ratio (FAR) of 4.48:1, and the footprint would be smaller than that of the Project. Additionally, at a height of 273 feet, the new building would be shorter than the Project's Residential Option (i.e., 360 feet 4 inches). In accordance with LAMC requirements, Residential Option Alternative 2 would require and provide 517 vehicle parking spaces within three subterranean levels. Specifically, 426 vehicle parking spaces would be required and provided for residential uses, and 91 vehicle parking spaces would be required and provided for commercial uses. In accordance with LAMC requirements and City Ordinance No. 185,480, Residential Option Alternative 2 would require and provide a total of 224 bicycle parking spaces. Specifically, 172 bicycle parking spaces would be required and provided for residential uses, and 52 bicycle parking spaces would be required and provided for commercial uses.

With regard to construction activities and schedule, it is anticipated that the overall duration of construction would be reduced compared to the Project based on the proposed development under this alternative (e.g., smaller project, shorter tower, and one less subterranean level). Additionally, as with the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan and Truck Haul Route Program would be implemented during construction to

minimize potential conflicts between construction activity and through traffic. As with the Project, the Construction Traffic Management Plan and Truck Haul Route Program would be subject to LADOT review and approval.

This alternative would implement the same building design, signage, lighting, vehicular and pedestrian access, and sustainability features as those proposed for the Project.

2. Environmental Impact Analysis

a. Air Quality

(1) Construction

(a) Regional and Localized Air Emissions

Residential Option Alternative 2 would involve the same amount of demolition and grading as the Project's Residential Option but less excavation, soil export, and new construction. As with the Project, construction of this alternative would generate air emissions through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and haul truck and construction worker trips. While the overall amount of excavation, soil export, and building construction would be less than what is proposed under the Project's Residential Option over the entire duration of the construction period, the intensity of air emissions and fugitive dust from demolition, site preparation, grading, and other construction activities would be similar on days with maximum construction activities as the types and amounts of equipment used would be the same. As discussed in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, construction-related daily maximum regional construction emissions would not exceed any South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) daily significance thresholds, and the maximum localized daily Project-related construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD-recommended localized screening thresholds. Therefore, under Residential Option Alternative 2, air quality impacts from localized and regional construction emissions on peak construction days would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Toxic Air Contaminants

As with the Project, construction of Residential Option Alternative 2 would generate diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during grading and excavation activities. These activities represent the greatest potential for TAC emissions. As discussed in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts with regard to TAC emissions during construction. As the construction of Residential Option Alternative 2 would be of a shorter duration than that of the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would also not result in a substantial, long-

term (i.e., 70-year) source of TAC emissions. Impacts due to TAC emissions under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project during grading and excavation activities.

(2) Operation

(a) Regional and Localized Emissions

Similar to the Project, operational regional air pollutant emissions associated with Residential Option Alternative 2 would be generated by vehicle trips to the Project Site and the consumption of electricity and natural gas. Using the Los Angeles Department of Transportation's (LADOT) VMT Calculator, development of Residential Option Alternative 2 would result in 4,034 daily vehicle trips compared to 4,911 daily vehicle trips under the Project's Residential Option with the bungalows retained as residential.[9,10] As vehicular emissions depend on the number of trips, vehicular sources would result in a smaller increase in air emissions compared to the Project. In addition, because the overall square footage would be reduced when compared to the Project, demand for electricity and natural gas would be less than the Project. Therefore, impacts associated with regional operational emissions would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

With regard to on-site localized area source and stationary source emissions, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would not introduce any major new sources of air pollution within the Project Site. Therefore, similar to the Project, localized impacts from on-site emission sources associated with Residential Option Alternative 2 would also be less than significant. Such impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the overall reduction in building area.

(b) Toxic Air Contaminants

As set forth in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, the primary sources of potential TACs associated with Project operations would include diesel particulate matter (DPM) from delivery trucks. Under Residential Option Alternative 2, the overall increase in the number of deliveries and associated DPM emissions would be less than the Project due to a smaller floor area. Similar to the Project, the land uses proposed under Residential Option Alternative 2 are not considered land uses that generate substantial TAC emissions. Therefore, like the Project's Residential Option, Residential Option

---

[9] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[10] *The Project's Residential Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate 5,371 daily vehicle trips.*

Alternative 2 would not release substantial amounts of TACs, and impacts would be less than significant. Still, because of the reduction in floor area, truck deliveries, and associated DPM emissions under Residential Option Alternative 2, operational TACs impacts would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

b. Cultural Resources

(1) Historic Resources

As described above, the Project Site includes six bungalows that are included in the Afton Square Historic District. Similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would temporarily move the bungalows off-site during construction activity. The bungalows would be relocated to the Project Site and rehabilitated in accordance with a Preservation Plan and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to ensure they would retain their significance as contributors to the Historic District. Thus, the Historic District would continue to be eligible for listing in the National Register. Therefore, under Residential Option Alternative 2, impacts to historic resources would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Archaeological Resources

Similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would require excavation and grading for building foundations and subterranean parking. In the event that any archaeological resources are unexpectedly encountered during construction, work in the area would temporarily be halted while assessment of the find is conducted by a qualified archaeologist in accordance with the regulatory standards set forth in PRC Section 21083.2 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c) to ensure the appropriate treatment of any potential unique archaeological resources unexpectedly encountered during grading and excavation activities. Therefore, impacts related to archaeological resources under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(3) Human Remains

Similar to archaeological resources, the potential to uncover human remains under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be similar to the Project because both the Project and Residential Option Alternative 2 require excavation and grading for building foundations and subterranean parking. While the uncovering of human remains is not anticipated, if human remains are discovered during construction, such resources would be treated in accordance with State law, including CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, PRC Section 5097.98, and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. Therefore,

impacts related to human remains under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

c. Energy

Similar to the Project, as discussed in Section IV.C, Energy, of this Draft EIR, construction activities associated with Residential Option Alternative 2 would consume electricity to supply and convey water for dust control and, on a limited basis, may be used to power lighting, electronic equipment, and other construction activities necessitating electrical power. The energy consumed would be reduced compared to the Project due to the 25-percent reduction in the overall amount of construction and associated reduction in the duration of construction under this alternative. Furthermore, as with the Project, construction activities under Residential Option Alternative 2 would comply with all applicable requirements relating to energy use.

As with the Project, operation of Residential Option Alternative 2 would represent increased consumption of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum-based fuels compared to existing conditions. However, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would replace the existing low-rise commercial buildings and an eight-unit multi-family building within the eastern portion of the Project Site with new buildings meeting updated energy efficiency standards (e.g., Title 24 energy efficiency standards, 2019 CALGreen Code requirements, Los Angeles Green Building Code requirements, etc.). In addition, Residential Option Alternative 2 would result in less operational energy demand than the Project due to the 25-percent reduction in development. Furthermore, LADWP has confirmed that the electrical infrastructure in the Project area has adequate capacity to serve the Project; thus, adequate capacity would also be available to serve Residential Option Alternative 2. In terms of petroleum-based fuel usage, the number of daily trips generated by this alternative would be lower in comparison to the Project due to the lower net new floor area under this alternative. Lastly, as with the Project, the consumption of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum-based fuels under this alternative would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary because the development would represent urban infill within an urbanized area in close proximity to transit, which would contribute to an energy efficient land use pattern consistent with SCAG's 2020–2045 RTP/SCS growth forecast in Transit Priority Areas (TPAs), because operation of the proposed uses would comply standards, and because some older buildings would be replaced with new buildings developed to the latest energy efficiency standards.

Therefore, long-term energy use during construction and operation of Residential Option Alternative 2 would not occur in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner or conflict with plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project because of the overall reduction in energy use.

d. Geology and Soils

(1) Geologic Hazards

Under Residential Option Alternative 2, impacts related to site-specific geologic hazards, including fault rupture, strong seismic shaking, and site stability would be similar to those under the Project discussed in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR. This is because such impacts are a function of the Project Site's underlying geologic conditions rather than the types or amounts of land uses proposed. Residential Option Alternative 2 would be developed within the same location as the Project and would comply with the same regulatory requirements as the Project to ensure that the soils underlying the Project Site can adequately support the proposed development. As with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would be designed and constructed to conform to the current seismic design provisions of the California Building Code and the Los Angeles Building Code. Residential Option Alternative 2 would also comply with the same regulatory requirements as the Project, which require the preparation of a final design-level geotechnical engineering report to identify and minimize seismic risks. Therefore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the specific geologic conditions identified in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR. The impacts of Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Paleontological Resources

As discussed in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR, a records search conducted for the Project Site indicates there are no previously encountered fossil vertebrate localities located within the Project Site. Therefore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would not impact known paleontological resources. Similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would require excavation and grading for building foundations and subterranean parking, which would reach the native soils beneath the Project Site. Therefore, similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 has a relatively low potential to uncover subsurface paleontological resources during construction. In the event that paleontological resources are encountered during excavation and grading, Residential Option Alternative 2 would be subject to the same condition of approval as the Project to ensure that the resources are properly recovered and evaluated. Impacts would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

e. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GHG emissions from a development project are determined in large part by the number of daily trips generated and energy consumption from proposed land uses. As discussed above, Residential Option Alternative 2 would involve the same mix of land uses as the Project's Residential Option but would reduce the total amount of development on the Project Site by 25 percent. Therefore, under Residential Option Alternative 2, the total energy and water consumption would be reduced compared to the Project. Additionally, as discussed above in Subsection V.B.2.a.(2)(a), the number of daily vehicle trips generated by Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than the number of trips generated by the Project's Residential Option. Thus, the amount of GHG emissions generated by Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than the amount generated by the Project. As with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would incorporate project design features to reduce GHG emissions and would be designed to comply with the City's Green Building Ordinance, as applicable. With compliance with the City's Green Building Ordinance and the implementation of comparable sustainability features as the Project, it is anticipated that Residential Option Alternative 2 would be consistent with the GHG reduction goals and objectives included in adopted State, regional, and local regulatory plans as set forth in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR. Thus, impacts related to GHG emissions under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

f. Hydrology and Water Quality

(1) Hydrology

With respect to surface water hydrology, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would slightly increase the percentage of impervious surface area on the Project Site. However, similar to the Project, with implementation of drainage improvements, including the rerouting of and introduction of new storm drains on-site as needed, compliance with NPDES and City requirements, and implementation of BMPs during both construction and operation, stormwater flow rates would be affected only marginally. As with the Project, existing flow patterns and discharge points would be generally maintained under Residential Option Alternative 2.

With respect to groundwater hydrology, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would decrease the amount of impervious surface area on-site when compared to existing conditions. However, given that the subterranean parking structure, which is impervious, would be located underneath the pervious surfaces and this alternative would have a similar site plan, the groundwater recharge potential would remain similar to the Project because water infiltrating the surface would not reach the underlying groundwater. Additionally, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would

comply with the City's LID requirements through BMPs, such as a capture and reuse system. In addition, stormwater, which bypasses the BMP systems, would discharge to an approved discharge point in the public right-of-way and not result in infiltration of a large amount of rainfall that would affect groundwater hydrology, including the direction of groundwater flow. In addition, the subterranean levels would be designed such that they can withstand hydrostatic forces and incorporate comprehensive waterproofing systems in accordance with current industry standards and construction methods. As such, permanent dewatering operations are not expected, and the groundwater level is expected to return to the existing level at the Project Site after construction is complete. Furthermore, while there are supply wells within one mile of the Project Site, similar to the Project, compliance with regulatory requirements would not result in adverse impacts to wells. Lastly, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would not include new injection or supply wells.

Based on the above, impacts to surface and groundwater hydrology would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Water Quality

With respect to surface and groundwater quality, Residential Option Alternative 2 would introduce the same types of new land uses on-site as the Project, which would have the potential to generate pollutants that could affect surface water and groundwater. As with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would also decrease the percentage of impervious surface area on the Project Site. However, similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would comply with NPDES requirements and City regulations, including the implementation of BMPs and compliance with LID requirements through a capture and reuse system. Therefore, impacts to surface and groundwater quality would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

g. Land Use

(1) Physical Division of a Community

Residential Option Alternative 2 would introduce the same new land uses on-site as the Project. Accordingly, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would be compatible with the uses in the surrounding area and would complement existing and future mixed-use development in the Project area and land uses within the Hollywood Community Plan area. Projects that have been newly constructed or are currently proposed consist of mixed-use developments, new residential, hotel, office, and commercial retail uses. Similar to this alternative, many of the recent developments provide new multi-family residential units with ground floor or lower-level commercial and retail amenities in addition to new commercial and hotel uses. Thus, as with the Project,

this alternative would represent a continuation of those types of projects and be similar to existing uses in the Project vicinity. In addition, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would not physically divide the Afton Square Historic District.

Therefore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would be compatible with the surrounding land uses and would not substantially or adversely change the existing land use relationships between the Project Site and existing and approved off-site uses. As such, impacts associated with physical division of a community under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Conflict with Land Use Plans

Residential Option Alternative 2 would involve the same mix of land uses as the Project's Residential Option with an approximately 25-percent floor area reduction. Accordingly, the alternative's FAR and density would be reduced compared to the Project; specifically, the Project Site would have an FAR of 4.48:1 compared to the Project's FAR of 5.98:1. Nonetheless, Residential Option Alternative 2 would require the same discretionary approvals as the Project's Residential Option, and, with approval of the requested discretionary actions and implementation of design features comparable to those of the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 generally would be consistent with the overall intent of applicable goals, policies, and objectives in local and regional plans that govern development on the Project Site, including the City's General Plan, the Community Plan, and the LAMC. Thus, impacts related to land use consistency under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

h. Noise

(1) Construction

The types of construction activities under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be substantially similar to the Project, although the construction duration would be reduced due to the reduced development of Residential Option Alternative 2 (e.g., smaller project, shorter tower, and less excavation associated with one less subterranean level). As with the Project, construction of Residential Option Alternative 2 would generate noise from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, as well as from haul truck and construction worker trips. The overall duration of the construction period would be reduced compared to that of the Project due to the reduction in size. However, on- and off-site construction activities type and amount of construction equipment, construction traffic, and the associated on- and off-site construction noise and vibration levels would be expected to be similar to those of the Project during peak activity days (including off-site hauling), which

are used for determining significance. Accordingly, noise and vibration impacts due to on- and off-site construction activities and construction traffic under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the Project. Specifically, similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would result in: (1) less than significant impacts associated with off-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative) and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for building damage (both Project-level and cumulative); (2) less than significant impacts associated with on-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for building damage (Project-level only); and (3) significant and unavoidable impacts associated with on-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative), on-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project only), and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level and cumulative).

(2) Operation

Residential Option Alternative 2 would introduce operational noise sources similar to the Project, including (a) on-site stationary noise sources, involving outdoor building mechanical equipment, loading dock and trash compactors, parking, and activities within the proposed outdoor spaces; and (b) off-site mobile (roadway traffic) noise sources. However, it is anticipated that with the overall reduction in total floor area, the number of residential units, and parking spaces, and the associated reduction in the number of on-site residents, employees, and customers, building mechanical equipment pieces, loading docks, trash compactors, and on-site outdoor activity, the noise levels from building mechanical equipment, loading and trash compactors, and outdoor spaces would be reduced[11]. In addition, similar to the Project, on-site mechanical equipment used during operation of Residential Option Alternative 2 would comply with the regulations under LAMC Section 112.02, which prohibit noise from air conditioning, refrigeration, heating, pumping, and filtering equipment from exceeding the ambient noise levels on the premises of other occupied properties by more than 5 dBA. Under Residential Option Alternative 2, the loading dock and trash collection would be integrated into the northern portion of the building and the trash room would be located within the subterranean parking level, similar to the Project. Thus, noise impacts from loading dock and trash collection areas would be similar to the Project. Also similar to the Project, parking for Residential Option Alternative 2 would be provided within subterranean parking levels, which would be effectively shielded from off-site sensitive receptors. The overall area for outdoor spaces under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be reduced as compared to the Project, which would reduce the noise associated with the outdoor uses (i.e., people talking and amplified

[11] *While Residential Option Alternative 2 would also result in reduced parking noise within the proposed parking structure, the parking structure under both this alternative and the Project would be subterranean. Therefore, it is not anticipated that there would be much, if any, reduction in operational parking noise impacts at existing sensitive noise receptors under this alternative.*

sound). Therefore, operational on-site noise impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduction in total floor area.

With regard to off-site noise sources, as noted above, development of Residential Option Alternative 2 would result in 4,034 daily vehicle trips compared to 4,911 daily vehicle trips under the Project's Residential Option with the bungalows retained as residential.[12,13] Therefore, off-site noise associated with Project traffic would be less than the Project. Impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project's Residential Option.

i. Public Services

(1) Fire Protection

(a) Construction

As previously described, the types of construction activities required for Residential Option Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the Project. However, under Residential Option Alternative 2, the overall duration of construction would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduced amount of development and excavation. Similar to the Project, in compliance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Fire and Building Code requirements, construction managers and personnel would be trained in emergency response and fire safety operations. Additionally, construction of Residential Option Alternative 2 would occur in compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local requirements concerning the handling, disposal, use, storage, and management of hazardous materials. Thus, as with the Project, compliance with regulatory requirements would reduce the potential for construction activities of Residential Option Alternative 2 to expose people to the risk of fire or explosion related to hazardous materials.

Construction of Residential Option Alternative 2 could also potentially impact the provision of LAFD services in the vicinity of the Project Site as a result of construction impacts to the surrounding roadways associated with the movement of construction equipment, the hauling of soil and construction materials to and from the Project Site, and construction worker trips. However, construction-related traffic, including hauling activities and construction worker trips, would occur outside the typical weekday commuter A.M. and

---

[12] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[13] *The Project's Residential Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate 5,371 daily vehicle trips.*

P.M. peak periods to the extent feasible, thereby reducing the potential for traffic-related conflicts. In addition, as with the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction of Residential Option Alternative 2 to ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and near the Project Site during construction activities. Therefore, impacts on fire protection services during construction of Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduction in construction activities and duration.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.J.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, of this Draft EIR, the Project Site would continue to be served by Fire Station No. 27, the "first-in" station, as well as Fire Station Nos. 82 and 41. Residential Option Alternative 2 would result in less new development than the Project, thus resulting in a smaller service population and lower increase in demand for fire protection and emergency medical services than the Project. Specifically, Residential Option Alternative 2 would directly generate an estimated 726 residents and 199 employees for a total on-site population of 925 persons, as compared to the Project's Residential Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use, which would generate an estimated 977 residents and 230 new employees for a total on-site population of 1,207 persons.[14,15] In addition, similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would implement all applicable City Building Code and Fire Code requirements regarding structural design, building materials, site access, fire flow, storage and management of hazardous materials, alarm and communications systems, etc.

With respect to emergency access, similar to the Project, emergency access would be maintained, and traffic generated by Residential Option Alternative 2 would not impair the LAFD from responding to emergencies at the Project Site or the surrounding area. In addition, similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would implement all applicable City Building Code and Fire Code requirements regarding structural design, building materials, site access, fire flow, storage and management of hazardous materials, alarm and communications systems, etc. Therefore, as with the Project, compliance with applicable regulatory requirements, including LAFD's fire/life safety plan review and LAFD's fire/life safety inspection, would ensure that adequate fire prevention features would be provided to reduce the demand on LAFD facilities and equipment.

---

[14] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[15] *The Project's Residential Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate 967 residents and 266 employees for a total on-site population of 1,233 persons.*

Based on the above, operation of Residential Option Alternative 2 would not require the addition of a new or expanded fire station in order to maintain service. Therefore, as with the Project, operation of Residential Option Alternative 2 would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., fire stations), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Police Protection

(a) Construction

As previously described, the types of construction activities required for Residential Option Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the Project. However, under Residential Option Alternative 2, the overall duration of construction would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduced amount of development and excavation. Similar to the Project, the demand for police protection services during construction of Residential Option Alternative 2 would be offset by the removal of the existing uses on the Project Site. In addition, the daytime population at the Project Site during construction would be temporary in nature. Residential Option Alternative 2 would implement the same project design features as the Project, which include temporary security measures, such as fencing, lighting, and locked entry, to reduce the potential for theft and vandalism on the Project Site, thereby reducing the demand for police protection services.

With regard to emergency vehicle access, as with the Project, traffic generated during construction of Residential Option Alternative 2, including hauling activities and construction worker trips, would occur outside the typical weekday commuter A.M. and P.M. peak periods to extent feasible, reducing traffic-related conflicts. In addition, as with the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction of Residential Option Alternative 2 to ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and near the Project Site during construction. Therefore, impacts on police protection services during construction of Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduced construction activities and duration.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.I.2, Public Services—Police Protection, of this Draft EIR, and as with the Project, the Project Site under Residential Option Alternative 2 would continue to be served by Hollywood Community Police Station. Residential Option Alternative 2 would result in a 25-percent reduction in new development than the Project, thus resulting in a smaller service population, a lower net decrease in the existing officer-to-resident population ratio, and lower net increase in demand for police protection service

than the Project. Specifically, Residential Option Alternative 2 would directly generate an estimated 726 residents and 199 employees for a total on-site population of 925 persons, as compared to the Project's Residential Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use which would generate an estimated 977 residents and 230 new employees for a total on-site population of 1,207 persons.[16,17] Similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would implement Project Design Features POL-PDF-2 through POL-PDF-7, which require a standard set of security measures (e.g., closed circuit cameras, keycard entry, etc.) be incorporated into the proposed buildings; sufficient lighting and design of buildings, walkways, and parking areas, to ensure visibility/security; entry and exit points designed to be open and in view of surrounding sites; consultation with LAPD's crime prevention unit; and submitting a diagram of the Project Site to LAPD's Hollywood Division Commanding Officer that includes access routes and any additional information that might facilitate police response. As with the Project, these project design features would help reduce the increase in demand for police services under Residential Option Alternative 2. Lastly, because of the reduced amount of new development under this alternative, operational traffic and the potential for impacts to emergency response times would be reduced compared to those of the Project. Based on the above, operation of Residential Option Alternative 2, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., police stations), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(3) Schools

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would generate part-time and full-time jobs associated with its construction between the start of construction and full buildout. However, due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California and the operation of the market for construction labor, construction workers are not likely to relocate their households as a consequence of construction job opportunities. Therefore, construction employment generated by Residential Option Alternative 2 would not result in a notable increase in the resident population or a corresponding demand for schools from construction workers in the vicinity of the Project Site. Impacts on school

---

[16] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[17] *The Project's Residential Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate 967 residents and 266 employees for a total on-site population of 1,233 persons.*

facilities during construction of Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would include new development that would create a demand for LAUSD school facilities (e.g., Grant Elementary School, Joseph Le Conte Middle School, and Hollywood High School). However, the demand for LAUSD facilities under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than the Project as a result of the 25-percent reduction in development, including fewer residential units (i.e., 322 under this alternative versus a maximum of 429 under the Project). Furthermore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would be required to pay the applicable Senate Bill (SB) 50 development fees for schools, which per Government Code Section 65995, is considered by the State to represent full mitigation of the impact of new development on schools. Based on the above, operation of Residential Option Alternative 2, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., schools), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(4) Libraries

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would result in a temporary increase in construction workers on the Project Site. However, due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California and the operation of the market for construction labor, construction workers are not likely to relocate their households as a consequence of the construction job opportunities. Therefore, construction employment generated by Residential Option Alternative 2 would not result in a notable increase in the residential population or a corresponding demand for library services in the vicinity of the Project Site. Impacts to library facilities during construction under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

Residents are considered the primary users of library facilities within a given service area. As described above, Residential Option Alternative 2 would be developed with reduced residential and commercial uses when compared to the Project. As such, Residential Option Alternative 2 would have a reduced service population. Specifically, the 322 residential units developed under Residential Option Alternative 2 would generate approximately 726 residents compared to the 977 residents generated by the Project's

429 residential units. Furthermore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would generate tax revenues for the City's General Fund, which would help offset the increases in library demand. Based on the above, operation of Residential Option Alternative 2, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., libraries), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less than significant impacts of the Project.

(5) Parks and Recreation

(a) Construction

Construction of Residential Option Alternative 2 would result in a temporary increase in the number of construction workers at the Project Site. As described above, due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California, and the operation of the market for construction labor, the likelihood that construction workers would relocate their households as a consequence of working on Residential Option Alternative 2 is low. Therefore, the construction workers associated with Residential Option Alternative 2 would not result in a notable increase in the residential population of the Project area, or a corresponding permanent demand for parks and recreational facilities in the vicinity of the Project Site. As such, similar to the Project, construction of Residential Option Alternative 2 would not generate a demand for park or recreational facilities that cannot be adequately accommodated by existing or planned facilities and services or interfere with existing park usage. Therefore, impacts on parks and recreational facilities during construction of Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

Residents are considered the primary users of parks and recreation facilities. As with the Project's Residential Option, Residential Option Alternative 2 would include the development of new residential uses that would create a demand for Department of Recreation and Parks (RAP) parks and recreational facilities. However, this demand would be lower than under the Project due to the 25-percent reduction in the number of residential units. Furthermore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would meet City open space requirements through the provision of common open space (e.g., courtyards, pool, and fitness centers) and private open space (balconies) for its residents. Therefore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 residents would generally utilize on-site open space to meet their recreational needs. Additionally, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would be required to pay Quimby fees to the City that could be used to add or improve park facilities in the vicinity of the Project Site. Based on the above, as with the Project, operation of Residential Option Alternative 2 would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., parks), the construction of which could cause

significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

j. Transportation

Similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would generally support applicable transportation plans (Mobility Plan 2035, Plan for a Health Los Angeles, Vision Zero, etc.) and multimodal transportation options. As with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would include passenger drop-offs to minimize impacts to the public rights-of-way and enhance the user experience by integrating multi-modal transportation options and new sidewalks, street trees, pedestrian lighting, and bicycle parking in accordance with the LAMC. In accordance with the City's TDM ordinance, Residential Option Alternative 2 would also include certain TDM program elements (i.e., display transportation information, such as public transit routes and schedules, bicycle routes and facility information, and ridesharing promotional materials; and bicycle parking in conformance with the LAMC), which would reduce vehicle trips and support bicycle and pedestrian activity. As with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would also represent urban infill development near transit, which would encourage alternative transportation use. Therefore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system and impacts. The impacts of Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

With respect to VMT, Residential Option Alternative 2 would result in an average household VMT per capita of 5.6, which is below the Central APC threshold of 6.0 and the same as the Project's Residential Option.[18] The proposed retail components of Residential Option Alternative 2 are more than 50,000 square feet and were, therefore, analyzed to determine whether they may increase overall area VMT. Specifically, as noted above Residential Option Alternative 2 proposes a total of 51,741 square feet of retail and restaurant uses, which just exceeds the 50,000-square-foot threshold for local-serving retail and is 25 percent less than the 68,988 square feet of the retail and restaurant uses proposed by the Project's Residential Option with the bungalows converted to restaurant use. As discussed in Chapter 3.2 of the Project's Transportation Assessment included as Appendix R of this Draft EIR, the Project's Residential Option with the bungalows converted to restaurant was evaluated using the City's travel demand forecasting model. The City's model estimated a net decrease in daily miles on the roadway network when this scenario was added to the model. This decrease in VMT suggests that the addition of the

[18] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

proposed uses in the Project's Residential Option would shorten trips, and, thus, the retail impact on VMT would be less than significant. Given that Residential Option Alternative 2 proposes a 25-percent reduction in retail and restaurant uses, the retail impact on VMT would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.[19]

As with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would not introduce hazardous geometric design features, and all driveways would be designed to LADOT standards. Additionally, similar to the Project's Residential Option, Residential Option Alternative 2 would not add 25 or more trips to any freeway off-ramp in either peak hour and would not result in a freeway safety impact. Impacts would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project's Residential Option.[20]

Lastly, similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would not interfere with emergency access as this alternative would also implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan during construction to ensure emergency access during the construction period, would not close any existing public streets, and would provide emergency access in accordance with applicable requirements. The impacts of Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

k. Tribal Cultural Resources

Similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would require excavation and grading for building foundations and subterranean parking. While the uncovering of tribal cultural resources is not anticipated, if tribal cultural resources are discovered during construction, such resources would be treated in accordance with State law (i.e., CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(d), PRC Sections 21080.3.1(b), 21080.3.2(a), 21084.3, etc.). Accordingly, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

---

[19] *Retail VMT is analyzed by estimating the net change in retail VMT.*

[20] *The Project's Office Option results in a freeway safety impact that is mitigated with the implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1. Although the cumulative impact associated with freeway off-ramp safety would remain significant and unavoidable, with implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1, the Project's Office Option's contribution would not be cumulative considerable.*

I. Utilities and Service Systems

(1) Water Supply and Infrastructure

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, construction activities associated with Residential Option Alternative 2 would generate a short-term demand for water. This demand would be less than the Project due to the reduction in the amount of construction that would be required under Residential Option Alternative 2. As evaluated in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, the Project's temporary and intermittent demand for water during construction could be met by the City's available supplies during each year of construction. Also, as with the Project's Residential Option, the water demand during construction under this alternative would be offset by the amount of water currently used by existing on-site uses to be removed. Since the water demand for construction activities would be reduced, the temporary and intermittent demand for water during construction under Residential Option Alternative 2 would also be expected to be met by the City's available water supplies. Similarly, the existing LADWP water infrastructure would be adequate to provide the water flow necessary to serve Residential Option Alternative 2. Furthermore, as with the Project, the design and installation of new service connections under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be required to meet applicable City standards. Therefore, impacts on water supply and infrastructure associated with short-term construction activities would be less than significant under Residential Option Alternative 2 and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would result in an increase in long-term water demand. As discussed in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, a WSA was prepared by LADWP for the Project, as required by SB 610, which concludes that sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the Project. Because Residential Option Alternative 2 would include a 25-percent reduction in new development when compared to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would generate less operational water demand than the Project. Furthermore, as with the Project, in addition to complying with applicable water conservation requirements, Residential Option Alternative 2 would incorporate the additional water conservation measures, such as those set forth in Project Design Feature WAT-PDF-1. Therefore, as with the Project, LADWP would also have sufficient water supplies available to serve Residential Option Alternative 2 during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.

Regarding water infrastructure, as indicated in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, a conservative analysis for both fire suppression and domestic water flows has been completed by LADWP for the Project as summarized in the Utility Report included as Appendix F of this Draft EIR. As discussed therein, based on the Information of Fire Flow Availability Request (IFFAR), the Project has adequate fire flow available to comply with the standards specified in LAMC Section 57.507.3.1. Because Residential Option Alternative 2 would include a 25-percent reduction in net new floor area when compared to the Project and generate a lower operational water demand, adequate water infrastructure capacity also exists to serve Residential Option Alternative 2. Therefore, as with the Project, operation of Residential Option Alternative 2 would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Based on the above, the operational impacts of Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Wastewater

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, during construction of Residential Option Alternative 2, construction activities would not result in wastewater generation as construction workers would typically utilize portable restrooms, which would not contribute to wastewater flows to the City's wastewater system. Furthermore, as with the Project's Residential Option, the removal of the existing on-site uses under this alternative would result in a short-term decrease in wastewater discharges to the public sewer system from the Project Site during the construction period. As such, wastewater generation from construction activities associated with Residential Option Alternative 2 would not cause a measurable increase in wastewater flows. Therefore, construction of the Project would not substantially or incrementally exceed the future scheduled capacity of any one treatment plant by generating flows greater than those anticipated in One Water LA and the City of Los Angeles Integrated Resources Plan (IRP).

Additionally, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 may include construction activities associated with the installation of new or relocated sewer connections. Such activities would be confined to trenching in order to place the sewer lines below surface and would be limited to the on-site wastewater conveyance infrastructure and minor off-site work associated with connections to the City's sewer lines in the streets adjacent to the Project Site. Similar to the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during the construction of Residential Option

Alternative 2 to reduce impacts to pedestrian and traffic flow, including emergency vehicle access, which could occur due to temporary off-site utility work. However, the amount of required wastewater infrastructure improvements and associated construction activities under this alternative would potentially be less than under the Project owing to less development and less associated wastewater generation under this alternative. Therefore, construction-related impacts to the wastewater system under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduced duration of construction.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.L.2, Utilities and Service Systems—Wastewater, of the Draft EIR, and as with the Project, wastewater generated by Residential Option Alternative 2 would be conveyed by LASAN's existing wastewater conveyance system to the Hyperion Water Reclamation Plant (HWRP) for treatment. Because the existing sewer lines and the HWRP have adequate capacity to serve the Project, and Residential Option Alternative 2 would include a 25-percent reduction in development and generate proportionately less operational wastewater than the Project, the capacities of the sewer system and HWRP serving the Project Site would also be adequate to serve Residential Option Alternative 2. Furthermore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 2 would comply with applicable City wastewater infrastructure design and wastewater reduction requirements and implement water conservation measures above applicable requirements, such as those detailed in Project Design Feature WAT-PDF-1, which would also reduce wastewater generation. Lastly, as with the Project, additional detailed sewer gauging and evaluation, as required by LAMC Section 64.14, would be conducted to obtain final approval of sewer capacity and connection permits during the standard required permitting process under Residential Option Alternative 2. Therefore, as with the Project, operation of Residential Option Alternative 2 would not (1) require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; or (2) result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project, that it has inadequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. The impacts of Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(3) Energy Infrastructure

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, construction activities associated with Residential Option Alternative 2 would consume electricity to supply and convey water for dust control and, on a limited basis, may be used to power lighting, electronic equipment, and other construction activities necessitating electrical power. The energy consumed would be reduced

compared to the Project due to the reduction in the overall amount of construction and duration of construction. Therefore, impacts on energy infrastructure associated with short-term construction activities would be less than significant under Residential Option Alternative 2 and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As with the Project, operation of Residential Option Alternative 2 would generate an increased consumption of electricity and natural gas when compared to existing conditions. However, the consumption of electricity and natural gas under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than the Project because of the reduced amount of overall development area. Therefore, impacts to energy infrastructure under Residential Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

3. Comparison of Impacts

As evaluated above, Residential Option Alternative 2 would not eliminate the Project's Residential Option's significant and unavoidable impacts associated with on-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative); on-site construction vibration (Project-level only); and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level and cumulative). All other impacts would be less than or similar to the Project's Residential Option, which would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.

4. Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

Residential Option Alternative 2 would develop the same mix of uses as the Project's Residential Option but at a 25-percent reduced density and FAR. As such, Residential Option Alternative 2 would meet the Project's underlying purpose to revitalize the infill Project Site by developing an integrated high-density mixed-use development that provides new multi-family housing opportunities (including Very Low Income housing units), neighborhood serving commercial retail/restaurant uses, and a grocery store, or alternatively, a mixed-used development with office space, restaurant uses, and potential multi-family housing opportunities, all of which serve the community and promote walkability to a lesser extent than the Project's Residential Option. Specifically, Residential Option Alternative 2 would meet most of the Project's Residential Option's objectives but to a lesser extent than the Project, including the following:

- Consistent with the policies set forth in the City's General Plan Housing Element, provide multi-family housing units to support the much-needed demand for housing including affordable housing.

- Locate residential and commercial uses in close proximity to transit stations, along transit corridors, and within high activity areas, which promotes sustainability and reduces VMT, with associated reductions in air quality and GHG emissions.

- Redevelop an under-utilized infill site while providing for the adaptive reuse of the historic bungalows on-site.

- Promote local and regional mobility objectives by providing a high-density mixed-use development comprising residential and neighborhood-serving commercial uses along the Vine Street commercial corner and in close proximity to public transportation.

- Consistent with the City's Walkability Checklist and Citywide Design Guidelines, create a street-level identity for the Project Site and improve the pedestrian experience through the introduction of active street adjacent uses, such as neighborhood-serving commercial uses.

- Create economic vitality in the community through the provision of construction jobs, and permanent full-time on-site jobs and the generation of revenues to the City in the form of additional sales, business license, and property taxes.

Residential Option Alternative 2 would, however, meet the following objective to the same extent as the Project's Residential Option:

- Promote sustainable development by incorporating "Green" principles, including energy-efficient buildings, a pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly site design, water conservation features, and waste reduction features.

V. Alternatives

C. Residential Option Alternative 3: Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning and Hollywood Community Plan Update Alternative

1. Description of the Alternative

Residential Option Alternative 3 would be developed consistent with both the existing zoning designations for the Project Site (i.e., C4-2D-SN, (T)(Q) C2-2D, R4-2D, and R3-1XL) and the proposed zoning under the Hollywood Community Plan Update and would utilize the Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Affordable Housing Incentive Tier 3 Program. Where the zoning or Hollywood Community Plan Update is more restrictive than the other (e.g., with respect to density or FAR), the more restrictive standards have been applied. Specifically, Residential Option Alternative 3 would involve the development of a high-rise, 8-story mixed-use building, consisting of 422 residential units, 40,000 square feet of grocery store uses, and 3,000 square feet of retail or restaurant uses. In accordance with TOC Tier 3 guidelines, Residential Option Alternative 3 would designate 14 percent of the residential units (i.e., 60 units) as Very Low Income affordable units. This new building would be located within the western portion of the Project Site, which includes the eight lots zoned as C4-2D-SN, (T)(Q)C2-2D, and R4-2D. In addition, similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would relocate the six historic bungalows to the eastern portion of the Project Site. In accordance with LAMC requirements and allowances for TOC Tier 3 developments, Residential Option Alternative 3 would provide 32,833 square feet of open space. To accommodate Residential Option Alternative 3, the existing low-rise commercial building, eight-unit multi-family building, and ancillary buildings adjacent to the bungalows would be removed.

Overall, Residential Option Alternative 3 would comprise approximately 345,938 square feet of floor area with a 3.86:1 FAR, and the footprint of Residential Option Alternative 3 would be smaller than that of the Project. Additionally, at a height of 113 feet, the new building proposed by Residential Option Alternative 3 would be shorter than the Project's Residential Option (i.e., 360 feet 4 inches). In accordance with LAMC requirements, Residential Option Alternative 3 would require and provide 275 vehicle parking spaces within two subterranean levels. Specifically, 214 vehicle parking spaces would be required and provided for residential uses, and 61 vehicle parking spaces would be required and provided for commercial uses after accounting for a reduction in

accordance with TOC Tier 3 development standards. In accordance with LAMC requirements and City Ordinance No. 185,480, Residential Option Alternative 3 would require and provide a total of 244 bicycle parking spaces. Specifically, 201 bicycle parking spaces would be required and provided for residential uses, and 44 bicycle parking spaces would be required and provided for commercial uses.

With regard to construction activities and schedule, it is anticipated that the overall duration of construction would be reduced compared to the Project based on the proposed development under this alternative (e.g., smaller project, shorter tower, and two less subterranean levels). However, as with the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan and Truck Haul Route Program would be implemented during construction to minimize potential conflicts between construction activity and through traffic. As with the Project, the Construction Traffic Management Plan and Truck Haul Route Program would be subject to LADOT review and approval.

This alternative would implement the same building design, signage, lighting, vehicular and pedestrian access, and sustainability features as those proposed for the Project.

2. Environmental Impact Analysis

a. Air Quality

(1) Construction

(a) Regional and Localized Emissions

Residential Option Alternative 3 would involve the same amount of demolition and grading as the Project's Residential Option but less excavation, soil export, and new construction. As with the Project, construction of this alternative would generate air emissions through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and haul truck and construction worker trips. While the overall amount of excavation, soil export, and building construction would be less than what is proposed under the Project's Residential Option over the entire duration of the construction period, the intensity of air emissions and fugitive dust from demolition, site preparation, grading, and other construction activities would be similar on days with maximum construction activities as the types and amounts of construction equipment used would be the same. As discussed in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, construction-related daily maximum regional construction emissions would not exceed any SCAQMD daily significance thresholds, and the maximum localized daily Project-related construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD-recommended localized screening thresholds. Therefore, under Residential Option Alternative 3, air quality impacts from localized and regional construction emissions on

peak construction days would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Toxic Air Contaminants

As with the Project, construction of Residential Option Alternative 3 would generate diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during grading and excavation activities. These activities represent the greatest potential for TAC emissions. As discussed in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts with regard to TAC emissions during construction. As the construction of Residential Option Alternative 3 would be of a shorter duration than that of the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would also not result in a substantial, long-term (i.e., 70-year) source of TAC emissions. Impacts due to TAC emissions under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project during grading and excavation activities.

(2) Operation

(a) Regional and Localized Emissions

Similar to the Project, operational regional air pollutant emissions associated with Residential Option Alternative 3 would be generated by vehicle trips to the Project Site and the consumption of electricity and natural gas. Using the LADOT VMT Calculator, development of Residential Option Alternative 3 would result in 3,949 daily vehicle trips compared to 4,911 daily vehicle trips under the Project's Residential Option with the bungalows retained as residential.[21,22,23] As vehicular emissions depend on the number of trips, vehicular sources would result in a smaller increase in air emissions compared to the Project. In addition, because the overall square footage would be reduced when compared to the Project, demand for electricity and natural gas would be less than the Project. Therefore, impacts associated with regional operational emissions would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

---

[21] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[22] *The Project's Residential Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate 5,371 daily vehicle trips.*

[23] *Although Residential Option Alternative 2 has 100 fewer residential dwelling units than Residential Option Alternative 3, Residential Option Alternative 2 has approximately 9,000 sf more retail uses than Residential Option Alternative 3. As such, Residential Option Alternative 3 is generating more trips related to the residential dwelling units, but Residential Option Alternative 2 is generating more trips related to the retail uses, which generate more trips than residential uses.*

With regard to on-site localized area source and stationary source emissions, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would not introduce any major new sources of air pollution within the Project Site. Therefore, similar to the Project, localized impacts from on-site emission sources associated with Residential Option Alternative 3 would also be less than significant. Such impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the overall reduction in building area.

(b) Toxic Air Contaminants

As set forth in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, the primary sources of potential TACs associated with Project operations would include DPM from delivery trucks. Under Residential Option Alternative 3, the overall increase in the number of deliveries and associated DPM emissions would be slightly less than the Project due to less restaurant development under this alternative. Regardless, similar to the Project, the land uses proposed under Residential Option Alternative 3 are not considered land uses that generate substantial TAC emissions. Therefore, Residential Option Alternative 3 would not release substantial amounts of TACs, and operational TACs impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

b. Cultural Resources

(1) Historic Resources

As described above, the Project Site includes six bungalows that are included in the Afton Square Historic District. Similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would temporarily move the bungalows off-site during construction activity. The bungalows would be relocated to the Project Site and rehabilitated in accordance with a Preservation Plan and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to ensure they would retain their significance as contributors to the Historic District. Thus, the Historic District would continue to be eligible for listing in the National Register. Therefore, under Residential Option Alternative 3, impacts to historic resources would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Archaeological Resources

Similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would require excavation and grading for building foundations and subterranean parking. In the event that any archaeological resources are unexpectedly encountered during construction, work in the area would temporarily be halted while assessment of the find is conducted by a qualified archaeologist in accordance with the regulatory standards set forth in PRC Section 21083.2 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c) to ensure the appropriate treatment of any potential unique archaeological resources unexpectedly encountered during grading and excavation activities. Therefore, impacts related to archaeological resources under

Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(3) Human Remains

Similar to archeological resources, the potential to uncover human remains under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be similar to the Project because both the Project and Residential Option Alternative 3 would require excavation and grading for building foundations and subterranean parking. While the uncovering of human remains is not anticipated, if human remains are discovered during construction, such resources would be treated in accordance with State law, including CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, PRC Section 5097.98, and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. Therefore, impacts related to human remains under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

c. Energy

Similar to the Project, as discussed in Section IV.C, Energy, of this Draft EIR, construction activities associated with Residential Option Alternative 3 would consume electricity to supply and convey water for dust control and, on a limited basis, may be used to power lighting, electronic equipment, and other construction activities necessitating electrical power. The energy consumed would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduction in the overall amount of construction and associated reduction in the duration of construction under this alternative. Furthermore, as with the Project, construction activities under Residential Option Alternative 3 would comply with all applicable requirements relating to energy use.

As with the Project, operation of Residential Option Alternative 3 would generate an increased consumption of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum-based fuels compared to existing conditions. However, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would replace the existing low-rise commercial buildings and an eight-unit multi-family building within the eastern portion of the Project Site with new buildings meeting updated energy efficiency standards (e.g., Title 24 energy efficiency standards, 2019 CALGreen Code requirements, Los Angeles Green Building Code requirements, etc.). In addition, Residential Option Alternative 3 would result in less operational energy demand than the Project due to the reduction in development. Furthermore, LADWP has confirmed that the electrical infrastructure in the Project area has adequate capacity to serve the Project; thus, adequate capacity would also be available to serve Residential Option Alternative 3. In terms of petroleum-based fuel usage, the number of daily trips generated by this alternative would be lower in comparison to the Project due to the lower number of units and non-residential floor area under this alternative. Lastly, as with the Project, the consumption of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum-based fuels under this alternative

would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary because the development would represent urban infill within an urbanized area in close proximity to transit, which would contribute to an energy efficient land use pattern consistent with SCAG's 2020–2045 RTP/SCS growth forecast in TPAs, because operation of the proposed uses would comply with applicable energy efficiency standards, and because some older buildings would be replaced with new buildings developed to the latest energy efficiency standards.

Therefore, long-term energy use during construction and operation of Residential Option Alternative 3 would not occur in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner or conflict with plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project because of the overall reduction in energy use.

d. Geology and Soils

(1) Geologic Hazards

Under Residential Option Alternative 3, impacts related to site-specific geologic hazards, including fault rupture, strong seismic shaking, and site stability would be similar to those under the Project discussed in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR. This is because such impacts are a function of the Project Site's underlying geologic conditions rather than the types or amounts of land uses proposed. Residential Option Alternative 3 would be developed within the same location as the Project and would comply with the same regulatory requirements as the Project to ensure that the soils underlying the Project Site can adequately support the proposed development. As with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would be designed and constructed to conform to the current seismic design provisions of the California Building Code and the Los Angeles Building Code. Residential Option Alternative 3 would also comply with the same regulatory requirements as the Project, which require the preparation of a final design-level geotechnical engineering report to identify and minimize seismic risks. Therefore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the specific geologic conditions identified in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR. The impacts of Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Paleontological Resources

As discussed in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR, a records search conducted for the Project Site indicates there are no previously encountered fossil vertebrate localities located within the Project Site. Therefore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would not impact known paleontological resources.

Similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would require excavation and grading for building foundations and subterranean parking, which would reach the native soils beneath the Project Site. Therefore, similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 has a relatively low potential to uncover subsurface paleontological resources during construction. In the event that paleontological resources are encountered during excavation and grading, Residential Option Alternative 3 would be subject to the same condition of approval as the Project to ensure that the resources are properly recovered and evaluated. Impacts would be less than significant and less similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

e. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GHG emissions from a development project are determined in large part by the number of daily trips generated and energy consumption from proposed land uses. As discussed above, Residential Option Alternative 3 would involve the same mix of land uses as the Project's Residential Option but with a slight reduction in the overall amount of development. Therefore, under Residential Option Alternative 3, the total energy and water consumption would be reduced compared to the Project. Additionally, as discussed above in Subsection V.C.2.a.(2)(a), the number of daily vehicle trips generated by Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than the number of trips generated by the Project's Residential Option. Thus, the amount of GHG emissions generated by Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than the amount generated by the Project. As with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would incorporate project design features to reduce GHG emissions and would be designed to comply with the City's Green Building Ordinance, as applicable. With compliance with the City's Green Building Ordinance and the implementation of comparable sustainability features as the Project, it is anticipated that Residential Option Alternative 3 would be consistent with the GHG reduction goals and objectives included in adopted State, regional, and local regulatory plans as set forth in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR. Thus, impacts related to GHG emissions under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

f. Hydrology and Water Quality

(1) Hydrology

With respect to surface water hydrology, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would slightly increase the percentage of impervious surface area on the Project Site. However, similar to the Project, with implementation of drainage improvements, including the rerouting of and introduction of new storm drains on-site as needed, compliance with NPDES and City requirements, and implementation of BMPs during both construction and operation, stormwater flow rates would be affected only

marginally. As with the Project, existing flow patterns and discharge points would be generally maintained under Residential Option Alternative 3.

With respect to groundwater hydrology, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would decrease the amount of impervious surface area on-site when compared to existing conditions. However, given that the subterranean parking structure, which is impervious, would be located underneath the pervious surfaces and this alternative would have a similar site plan, the groundwater recharge potential would remain minimal similar to the Project because water infiltrating the surface would not reach the underlying groundwater. Additionally, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would comply with the City's LID requirements through BMPs, such as a capture and reuse system. In addition, stormwater, which bypasses the BMP systems, would discharge to an approved discharge point in the public right-of-way and not result in infiltration of a large amount of rainfall that would affect groundwater hydrology, including the direction of groundwater flow. In addition, the subterranean levels would be designed such that they can withstand hydrostatic forces and incorporate comprehensive waterproofing systems in accordance with current industry standards and construction methods. As such, permanent dewatering operations are not expected, and the groundwater level is expected to return to the existing level at the Project Site after construction is complete. Furthermore, while there are supply wells within one mile of the Project Site, similar to the Project, compliance with regulatory requirements would not result in adverse impacts to wells. Lastly, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would not include new injection or supply wells.

Based on the above, impacts to surface and groundwater hydrology would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Water Quality

With respect to surface and groundwater quality, Residential Option Alternative 3 would introduce the same types of new land uses on-site as the Project, which would have the potential to generate pollutants that could affect surface water and groundwater. As with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would also decrease the percentage of impervious surface area on the Project Site. However, similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would comply with NPDES requirements and City regulations, including the implementation of BMPs and compliance with LID requirements through a capture and reuse system. Therefore, impacts to surface and groundwater quality would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

g. Land Use

(1) Physical Division of a Community

Residential Option Alternative 3 would introduce the same new land uses on-site as the Project. Accordingly, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would be compatible with the uses in the surrounding area and would complement existing and future mixed-use development in the Project area and land uses within the Hollywood Community Plan area. Projects that have been newly constructed or are currently proposed consist of mixed-use developments, new residential, hotel, office, and commercial retail uses. Similar to this alternative, many of the recent developments provide new multi-family residential units with ground floor or lower-level commercial and retail amenities in addition to new commercial and hotel uses. Thus, as with the Project, this alternative would represent a continuation of those types of projects and be similar to existing uses in the Project vicinity. In addition, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would not physically divide the Afton Square Historic District.

Therefore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would be compatible with the surrounding land uses and would not substantially or adversely change the existing land use relationships between the Project Site and existing and approved off-site uses. As such, impacts associated with physical division of a community under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Conflict with Land Use Plans

Residential Option Alternative 3 would involve the same mix of land uses as the Project's Residential Option. However, this alternative's FAR and density would be reduced compared to the Project; specifically, the Project Site would have an FAR of 3.86:1 compared to the Project's FAR of 5.98:1. Unlike the Project's Residential Option, Residential Option Alternative 3 would not require a Vesting Zone and Height District Change, and Residential Option Alternative 3 would utilize the TOC Affordable Housing Incentive Tier 3 Program. All other discretionary approvals would be similar to the Project's Residential Option. With approval of the requested discretionary actions and implementation of design features comparable to those of the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would be generally consistent with the overall intent of applicable goals, policies, and objectives in local and regional plans that govern development on the Project Site, including the City's General Plan, the Community Plan, and the LAMC. Thus, impacts related to land use consistency under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

h. Noise

(1) Construction

The types of construction activities under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be substantially similar to the Project, although the construction duration would be reduced due to the reduced development of Residential Option Alternative 3 (e.g., smaller project, shorter tower, and less excavation associated with two less subterranean levels). As with the Project, construction of Residential Option Alternative 3 would generate noise from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, as well as from haul truck and construction worker trips. The overall duration of the construction period would be reduced compared to that of the Project due to the reduction in size. However, on- and off-site construction activities and amounts and types of construction equipment and the associated construction noise and vibration levels would be expected to be similar to those of the Project during peak activity days (including off-site hauling), which are used for determining significance. Accordingly, noise and vibration impacts due to on- and off-site construction activities under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be similar to those of the Project. Specifically, similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would result in: (1) less than significant impacts associated with off-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative) and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for building damage (both Project-level and cumulative); (2) less than significant impacts with mitigation associated with on-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for building damage (Project-level only); and (3) significant and unavoidable impacts associated with on-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative), on-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level only), and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level and cumulative).

(2) Operation

Residential Option Alternative 3 would introduce operational noise sources similar to the Project, including (a) on-site stationary noise sources, involving outdoor building mechanical equipment, loading dock and trash compactors, parking, and activities within the proposed outdoor spaces; and (b) off-site mobile (roadway traffic) noise sources. However, it is anticipated that with the overall reduction in total floor area, the number of residential units, and parking spaces, and the associated reduction in the number of on-site residents, employees and customers, building mechanical equipment pieces, loading docks, trash compactors, and on-site outdoor activity, the noise levels from building mechanical equipment, loading and trash compactors, and outdoor spaces would be reduced.[24] In addition, similar to the Project, on-site mechanical equipment used during

[24] *While Residential Option Alternative 3 would also result in reduced parking noise within the proposed parking structure, the parking structure under both this alternative and the Project would be subterranean.* *(Footnote continued on next page)*

operation of Residential Option Alternative 3 would comply with the regulations under LAMC Section 112.02, which prohibit noise from air conditioning, refrigeration, heating, pumping, and filtering equipment from exceeding the ambient noise levels on the premises of other occupied properties by more than 5 dBA. Under Residential Option Alternative 3, the loading dock and trash collection would be integrated into the northern portion of the building and the trash room would be located within the subterranean parking level, similar to the Project. Thus, noise impacts from loading dock and trash collection areas would be similar to the Project. Also similar to the Project, parking for Residential Option Alternative 3 would be provided within subterranean parking levels, which would be effectively shielded from off-site sensitive receptors. The overall area for outdoor spaces under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be reduced as compared to the Project, which would reduce the noise associated with the outdoor uses (i.e., people talking and amplified sound). Therefore, operational on-site noise impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduction in total units and floor area.

With regard to off-site noise sources, as noted above, development of Residential Option Alternative 3 would result in 3,949 daily vehicle trips compared to 4,911 daily vehicle trips under the Project's Residential Option with the bungalows retained as residential.[25,26] Therefore, off-site noise associated with Project traffic would be less than the Project. Impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project's Residential Option.

i. Public Services

(1) Fire Protection

(a) Construction

As previously described, the types of construction activities required for Residential Option Alternative 3 would be similar to those of the Project. However, under Residential Option Alternative 3, the overall duration of construction would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduced amount of development and excavation. Similar to the Project, in compliance with OSHA and Fire and Building Code requirements, construction managers and personnel would be trained in emergency response and fire safety

Therefore, it is not anticipated that there would be much, if any, reduction in operational parking noise impacts at existing sensitive noise receptors under this alternative.

[25] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[26] *The Project's Residential Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate 5,371 daily vehicle trips.*

operations. Additionally, construction of Residential Option Alternative 3 would occur in compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local requirements concerning the handling, disposal, use, storage, and management of hazardous materials. Thus, as with the Project, compliance with regulatory requirements would reduce the potential for construction activities of Residential Option Alternative 3 to expose people to the risk of fire or explosion related to hazardous materials.

Construction of Residential Option Alternative 3 could also potentially impact the provision of LAFD services in the vicinity of the Project Site as a result of construction impacts to the surrounding roadways associated with the movement of construction equipment, the hauling of soil and construction materials to and from the Project Site, and construction worker trips. However, construction-related traffic, including hauling activities and construction worker trips, would occur outside the typical weekday commuter A.M. and P.M. peak periods to the extent feasible, thereby reducing the potential for traffic-related conflicts. In addition, as with the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction of Residential Option Alternative 3 to ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and near the Project Site during construction activities. Therefore, impacts on fire protection services during construction of Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduction in construction activities and duration.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.J.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, of this Draft EIR, the Project Site would continue to be served by Fire Station No. 27, the "first-in" station, as well as Fire Station Nos. 82 and 41. Residential Option Alternative 3 would result in less new development than the Project, thus resulting in a proportionately smaller service population and lower increase in demand for fire protection and emergency medical services than the Project. Specifically, Residential Option Alternative 3 would directly generate an estimated 951 residents and 172 employees for a total on-site population of 1,123 persons, compared to the Project's Residential Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use which would generate 977 residents and 230 employees for a total on-site population of 1,207 persons.[27,28] In addition, similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would implement all applicable City Building Code and Fire Code

[27] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[28] *The Project's Residential Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate 967 residents and 266 employees for a total on-site population of 1,233 persons.*

requirements regarding structural design, building materials, site access, fire flow, storage and management of hazardous materials, alarm and communications systems, etc.

With respect to emergency access, similar to the Project, emergency access would be maintained, and traffic generated by Residential Option Alternative 3 would not impair the LAFD from responding to emergencies at the Project Site or the surrounding area. In addition, similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would implement all applicable City Building Code and Fire Code requirements regarding structural design, building materials, site access, fire flow, storage and management of hazardous materials, alarm and communications systems, etc. Therefore, as with the Project, compliance with applicable regulatory requirements, including LAFD's fire/life safety plan review and LAFD's fire/life safety inspection, would ensure that adequate fire prevention features would be provided to reduce the demand on LAFD facilities and equipment.

Based on the above, operation of Residential Option Alternative 3 would not require the addition of a new or expanded fire station in order to maintain service. Therefore, as with the Project, operation of Residential Option Alternative 3 would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., fire stations), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Police Protection

(a) Construction

As previously described, the types of construction activities required for Residential Option Alternative 3 would be similar to those of the Project. However, under Residential Option Alternative 3, the overall duration of construction would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduced amount of development and excavation. Similar to the Project, the demand for police protection services during construction of Residential Option Alternative 3 would be offset by the removal of the existing uses on the Project Site. In addition, the daytime population at the Project Site during construction would be temporary in nature. Residential Option Alternative 3 would implement the same project design features as the Project, which include temporary security measures, such as fencing, lighting, and locked entry, to reduce the potential for theft and vandalism on the Project Site, thereby reducing the demand for police protection services.

With regard to emergency vehicle access, as with the Project, traffic generated during construction of Residential Option Alternative 3, including hauling activities and construction worker trips, would occur outside the typical weekday commuter A.M. and P.M. peak periods to extent feasible, reducing traffic-related conflicts. In addition, as with the

Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction of Residential Option Alternative 3 to ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and near the Project Site during construction. Therefore, impacts on police protection services during construction of Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduced construction activities and duration.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.I.2, Public Services—Police Protection, of this Draft EIR, and as with the Project, the Project Site under Residential Option Alternative 3 would continue to be served by Hollywood Community Police Station. Residential Option Alternative 3 would result in less new development than the Project, thus resulting in a smaller service population, a lower net decrease in the existing officer-to-resident population ratio, and lower net increase in demand for police protection service than the Project. Specifically, Residential Option Alternative 3 would directly generate an estimated 951 residents and 172 employees for a total on-site population of 1,123 persons, compared to the Project's Residential Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use which would generate 977 residents and 230 employees for a total on-site population of 1,207 persons.[29,30] Similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would implement Project Design Features POL-PDF-2 through POL-PDF-7, which require a standard set of security measures (e.g., closed circuit cameras, keycard entry, etc.) be incorporated into the proposed buildings; sufficient lighting and design of buildings, walkways, and parking areas, to ensure visibility/security; entry and exit points designed to be open and in view of surrounding sites; consultation with LAPD's crime prevention unit; and submitting a diagram of the Project Site to LAPD's Hollywood Division Commanding Officer that includes access routes and any additional information that might facilitate police response. As with the Project, these project design features would help reduce the increase in demand for police services under Residential Option Alternative 3. Lastly, because of the reduced amount of new development under this alternative, operational traffic and the potential for impacts to emergency response times would be reduced compared to those of the Project. Based on the above, operation of Residential Option Alternative 3, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., police stations), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

---

[29] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[30] *The Project's Residential Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate 967 residents and 266 employees for a total on-site population of 1,233 persons.*

(3) Schools

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would generate part-time and full-time jobs associated with its construction between the start of construction and full buildout. However, due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California and the operation of the market for construction labor, construction workers are not likely to relocate their households as a consequence of construction job opportunities. Therefore, construction employment generated by Residential Option Alternative 3 would not result in a notable increase in the resident population or a corresponding demand for schools from construction workers in the vicinity of the Project Site. Impacts on school facilities during construction of Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would include new development that would create a demand for LAUSD school facilities (e.g., Grant Elementary School, Joseph Le Conte Middle School, and Hollywood High School). However, the demand for LAUSD facilities under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than the Project as a result of the reduction in development, including fewer residential units (i.e., 422 under this alternative versus a maximum of 429 under the Project). Furthermore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would be required to pay the applicable SB 50 development fees for schools, which per Government Code Section 65995, is considered by the State to represent full mitigation of the impact of new development on schools. Based on the above, operation of Residential Option Alternative 3, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., schools), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(4) Libraries

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would result in a temporary increase in construction workers on the Project Site. However, due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California and the operation of the market for construction labor, construction workers are not likely to relocate their households as a consequence of the construction job opportunities. Therefore, construction employment generated by Residential Option Alternative 3 would not result in a notable increase in the residential population or a corresponding demand for library services in the vicinity of the

Project Site. Impacts to library facilities during construction under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

Residents are considered the primary users of library facilities within a given service area. As described above, Residential Option Alternative 3 would be developed with reduced residential and commercial uses when compared to the Project. As such, Residential Option Alternative 2 would have a reduced service population. Specifically, the 422 residential units developed under Residential Option Alternative 3 would generate approximately 951 residents compared to the 977 residents generated by the Project's 429 residential units. Furthermore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would generate tax revenues for the City's General Fund, which would help offset the increases in library demand. Based on the above, operation of Residential Option Alternative 3, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., libraries), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(5) Parks and Recreation

(a) Construction

Construction of Residential Option Alternative 3 would result in a temporary increase in the number of construction workers at the Project Site. As described above, due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California, and the operation of the market for construction labor, the likelihood that construction workers would relocate their households as a consequence of working on Residential Option Alternative 3 is low. Therefore, the construction workers associated with Residential Option Alternative 3 would not result in a notable increase in the residential population of the Project area, or a corresponding permanent demand for parks and recreational facilities in the vicinity of the Project Site. As such, similar to the Project, construction of Residential Option Alternative 3 would not generate a demand for park or recreational facilities that cannot be adequately accommodated by existing or planned facilities and services or interfere with existing park usage. Therefore, impacts on parks and recreational facilities during construction of Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

Residents are considered the primary users of parks and recreation facilities. As with the Project's Residential Option, Residential Option Alternative 3 would include the

development of new residential uses that would create a demand for RAP parks and recreational facilities. However, this demand would be slightly lower than under the Project due to less net new floor area under Residential Option Alternative 3 (including seven fewer residential units). Furthermore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would meet City open space requirements through the provision of common open space (e.g., courtyards, pool, and fitness centers) and private open space (balconies) for its residents. Therefore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 residents would generally utilize on-site open space to meet their recreational needs. Additionally, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would be required to pay Quimby fees to the City that could be used to add or improve park facilities in the vicinity of the Project Site. Based on the above, operation of Residential Option Alternative 3, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., parks), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

j. Transportation

Similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would generally support applicable transportation plans (Mobility Plan 2035, Plan for a Health Los Angeles, Vision Zero, etc.) and multimodal transportation options. As with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would include passenger drop-offs to minimize impacts to the public right of way and enhance the user experience by integrating multi-modal transportation options, and new sidewalks, street trees, pedestrian lighting, and bicycle parking in accordance with the LAMC. In accordance with the City's TDM ordinance, Residential Option Alternative 3 would also include certain TDM program elements (i.e., display transportation information, such as public transit routes and schedules, bicycle routes and facility information, and ridesharing promotional materials, and bicycle parking in conformance with the LAMC), which would reduce vehicle trips and support bicycle and pedestrian activity. As with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would also represent urban infill development near transit, which would encourage alternative transportation use. Therefore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system and impacts. The impacts of Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

With respect to VMT, Residential Option Alternative 3 would result in an average household VMT per capita of 5.6 which is below the Central APC threshold of 6.0 and the

same as the Project's Residential Option.[31] The proposed retail components of Residential Option Alternative 3 are less than 50,000 square feet and, therefore, considered to be local-serving and were screened out from further retail VMT analysis. Impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the Project because the retail components would be local serving.

As with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would not introduce hazardous geometric design features, and all driveways would be designed to LADOT standards. Additionally, similar to the Project's Residential Option, Residential Option Alternative 3 would not add 25 or more trips to any freeway off-ramp in either peak hour and would not result in a freeway safety impact. Impacts would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project's Residential Option.[32]

Lastly, similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would not interfere with emergency access as this alternative would also implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan during construction to ensure emergency access during the construction period, would not close any existing public streets, and would provide emergency access in accordance with applicable requirements. The impacts of Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

k. Tribal Cultural Resources

Similar to the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 requires excavation and grading for building foundations and subterranean parking. While the uncovering of tribal cultural resources is not anticipated, if tribal cultural resources are discovered during construction, such resources would be treated in accordance with State law (i.e., CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(d), PRC Sections 21080.3.1(b), 21080.3.2(a), 21084.3, etc.). Accordingly, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

---

[31] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[32] *The Project's Office Option results in a freeway safety impact that is mitigated with the implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1. Although the cumulative impact associated with freeway off-ramp safety would remain significant and unavoidable, with implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1, the Project's Office Option's contribution would not be cumulative considerable.*

I. Utilities and Service Systems

(1) Water Supply and Infrastructure

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, construction activities associated with Residential Option Alternative 3 would generate a short-term demand for water. This demand would be less than the Project due to the reduction in the amount of construction that would be required under Residential Option Alternative 3. As evaluated in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, the Project's temporary and intermittent demand for water during construction could be met by the City's available supplies during each year of construction. Also, as with the Project's Residential Option, the water demand during construction under this alternative would be offset by the amount of water currently used by existing on-site uses to be removed. Since the water demand for construction activities would be reduced, the temporary and intermittent demand for water during construction under Residential Option Alternative 3 would also be expected to be met by the City's available water supplies. Similarly, the existing LADWP water infrastructure would be adequate to provide the water flow necessary to serve Residential Option Alternative 3. Furthermore, as with the Project, the design and installation of new service connections under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be required to meet applicable City standards. Therefore, impacts on water supply and infrastructure associated with short-term construction activities would be less than significant under Residential Option Alternative 3, and would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would result in an increase in long-term water demand. As discussed in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, a WSA was prepared by LADWP for the Project, as required by SB 610, which concludes that sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the Project. Because Residential Option Alternative 3 would include less new floor area and fewer residential units than the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would generate proportionately less operational water demand than the Project. Furthermore, as with the Project, in addition to complying with applicable water conservation requirements, Residential Option Alternative 3 would incorporate the additional water conservation measures, such as those set forth in Project Design Feature WAT-PDF-1. Therefore, as with the Project, LADWP would also have sufficient water supplies available to serve Residential Option Alternative 3 during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.

Regarding water infrastructure, as indicated in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, a conservative analysis for both fire suppression and domestic water flows has been completed by LADWP for the Project as summarized in the Utility Report included as Appendix F of this Draft EIR. As discussed therein, based on the IFFAR, the Project has adequate fire flow available to comply with the standards specified in LAMC Section 57.507.3.1. Because Residential Option Alternative 3 would include less net new floor area and fewer residential units than the Project and generate a proportionately lower operational water demand, adequate water infrastructure capacity also exists to serve Residential Option Alternative 3. Therefore, as with the Project, operation of Residential Option Alternative 3 would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Based on the above, the operational impacts of Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and proportionately less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Wastewater

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, during construction of Residential Option Alternative 3, construction activities would not result in wastewater generation as construction workers would typically utilize portable restrooms, which would not contribute to wastewater flows to the City's wastewater system. Furthermore, as with the Project's Residential Option, the removal of the existing on-site uses under this alternative would result in a short-term decrease in wastewater discharges to the public sewer system from the Project Site during the construction period. As such, wastewater generation from construction activities associated with Residential Option Alternative 3 would not cause a measurable increase in wastewater flows. Therefore, construction of the Project would not substantially or incrementally exceed the future scheduled capacity of any one treatment plant by generating flows greater than those anticipated in One Water LA and the City's IRP.

Additionally, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 may include construction activities associated with the installation of new or relocated sewer connections. Such activities would be confined to trenching in order to place the sewer lines below surface and would be limited to the on-site wastewater conveyance infrastructure and minor off-site work associated with connections to the City's sewer lines in the streets adjacent to the Project Site. Similar to the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during the construction of Residential Option Alternative 3 to reduce impacts to pedestrian and traffic flow, including emergency vehicle access, which could occur due to temporary off-site utility work. However, the amount of

required wastewater infrastructure improvements and associated construction activities under this alternative would potentially be less than under the Project owing to less development and less associated wastewater generation under this alternative. Therefore, construction-related impacts to the wastewater system under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduced duration of construction.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.L.2, Utilities and Service Systems—Wastewater, of the Draft EIR, and as with the Project, wastewater generated by Residential Option Alternative 3 would be conveyed by LASAN's existing wastewater conveyance system to the HWRP for treatment. Because the existing sewer lines and the HWRP have adequate capacity to serve the Project, and Residential Option Alternative 3 would include proportionately less development and generate proportionately less operational wastewater than the Project, the capacities of the sewer system and HWRP serving the Project Site would also be adequate to serve Residential Option Alternative 3. Furthermore, as with the Project, Residential Option Alternative 3 would comply with applicable City wastewater infrastructure design and wastewater reduction requirements and implement water conservation measures above applicable requirements, such as those detailed in Project Design Feature WAT-PDF-1 which would also reduce wastewater generation. Lastly, as with the Project, additional detailed sewer gauging and evaluation, as required by LAMC Section 64.14, would be conducted to obtain final approval of sewer capacity and connection permits during the standard required permitting process under Residential Option Alternative 3. Therefore, as with the Project, operation of Residential Option Alternative 3 would not (1) require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; or (2) result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project, that it has inadequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. The impacts of Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and proportionately less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(3) Energy Infrastructure

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, construction activities associated with Residential Option Alternative 3 would consume electricity to supply and convey water for dust control and, on a limited basis, may be used to power lighting, electronic equipment, and other construction activities necessitating electrical power. The energy consumed would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduction in the overall amount of construction and duration of construction. Therefore, impacts on energy infrastructure associated with short-

term construction activities would be less than significant under Residential Option Alternative 3 and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As with the Project, operation of Residential Option Alternative 3 would generate an increased consumption of electricity and natural gas when compared to existing conditions. However, the consumption of electricity and natural gas under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than the Project because of the reduced amount of overall development area. Therefore, impacts to energy infrastructure under Residential Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and slightly less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

3. Comparison of Impacts

As evaluated above, Residential Option Alternative 3 would not eliminate the Project's Residential Option's significant and unavoidable impacts associated with on-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative); on-site construction vibration (Project-level); and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level and cumulative). All other impacts would be less than or similar to the Project's Residential Option, which would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.

4. Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

Residential Option Alternative 3 would develop the same mix of uses as the Project's Residential Option but at a slightly reduced density to conform to existing zoning and the Hollywood Community Plan Update. As such, Residential Option Alternative 3 would meet the Project's underlying purpose to revitalize the infill Project Site by developing an integrated high-density mixed-use development that provides new multi-family housing opportunities (including Very Low Income housing units), neighborhood serving commercial retail/restaurant uses, and a grocery store, or alternatively, a mixed-used development with office space, restaurant uses, and potential multi-family housing opportunities, all of which serve the community and promote walkability to a lesser extent than the Project's Residential Option. Specifically, Residential Option Alternative 3 would meet most the Project's Residential Option's objectives but to a lesser extent than the Project, including the following:

- Consistent with the policies set forth in the City's General Plan Housing Element, provide multi-family housing units to support the much-needed demand for housing including affordable housing.

- Locate residential and commercial uses in close proximity to transit stations, along transit corridors, and within high activity areas, which promotes sustainability and reduces VMT, with associated reductions in air quality and GHG emissions.

- Redevelop an under-utilized infill site while providing for the adaptive reuse of the historic bungalows on-site.

- Promote local and regional mobility objectives by providing a high-density mixed-use development comprising residential and neighborhood-serving commercial uses along the Vine Street commercial corner and in close proximity to public transportation.

- Consistent with the City's Walkability Checklist and Citywide Design Guidelines, create a street-level identity for the Project Site and improve the pedestrian experience through the introduction of active street adjacent uses, such as neighborhood-serving commercial uses.

- Create economic vitality in the community through the provision of construction jobs, and permanent full-time on-site jobs and the generation of revenues to the City in the form of additional sales, business license, and property taxes.

Residential Option Alternative 3 would, however, meet the following objective to the same extent as the Project's Residential Option:

- Promote sustainable development by incorporating "Green" principles, including energy-efficient buildings, a pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly site design, water conservation features, and waste reduction features.

V. Alternatives

D. Office Option Alternative 2: Reduced Density and FAR (25%) Alternative

1. Description of the Alternative

Office Option Alternative 2, the Reduced Development and FAR (25%) Office Alternative, would reduce the density and FAR of the Project's Office Option by 25 percent. Specifically, Office Option Alternative 2 would involve the development of a high-rise, 14-story mixed-use building, consisting of approximately 347,153 square feet of office uses and 6,000 square feet of restaurant uses. The six bungalows comprising 8,988 square feet would be rehabilitated and adapted for reuse as nine residential units. Similar to the Project, this new building would be located within the western portion of the Project Site, and the six historic bungalows on-site would be relocated to the eastern portion of the Project Site. Office Option Alternative 2 would provide 2,100 square feet of open space. To accommodate Office Option Alternative 2, the existing low-rise commercial building, eight-unit multi-family building, and ancillary buildings adjacent to the bungalows would be removed.

Overall, Office Option Alternative 2 would comprise approximately 362,141 square feet of floor area for an FAR of 4.47:1 and the footprint would be smaller than that of the Project. Additionally, at a height of 250 feet, the new building would be shorter than the Project's Office Option (i.e., 303 feet). In accordance with LAMC requirements, Office Option Alternative 2 would require and provide 725 vehicle parking spaces within seven subterranean levels. Specifically, 18 vehicle parking spaces would be required and provided for residential uses, and 707 vehicle parking spaces would be required and provided for commercial uses. In accordance with LAMC requirements and City Ordinance No. 185,480, Office Option Alternative 2 would require and provide a total of 111 bicycle parking spaces for commercial uses.

With regard to construction activities and schedule, it is anticipated that the overall duration of construction would be reduced compared to the Project based on the proposed development under this alternative (e.g., smaller project, shorter tower, and one less subterranean level). Additionally, as with the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan and Truck Haul Route Program would be implemented during construction to minimize potential conflicts between construction activity and through traffic. As with the Project, the Construction Traffic Management Plan and Truck Haul Route Program would be subject to LADOT review and approval.

This alternative would implement the same building design, signage, lighting, vehicular and pedestrian access, and sustainability features as those proposed for the Project.

2. Environmental Impact Analysis

a. Air Quality

(1) Construction

(a) Regional and Localized Air Quality Impacts

Office Option Alternative 2 would involve the same amount of demolition and grading as the Project's Office Option but less excavation, soil export, and new construction. As with the Project, construction of this alternative would generate air emissions through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and haul truck and construction worker trips. While the overall amount of excavation, soil export, and building construction would be less than what is proposed under the Project's Office Option over the entire duration of the construction period, the intensity of air emissions and fugitive dust from demolition, site preparation, grading, and other construction activities would be similar on days with maximum construction activities as the types and amounts of construction equipment used would be the same. As discussed in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, construction-related daily maximum regional construction emissions would not exceed any SCAQMD daily significance thresholds, and the maximum localized daily Project-related construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD-recommended localized screening thresholds. Therefore, under Office Option Alternative 2, air quality impacts from localized and regional construction emissions on peak construction days would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Toxic Air Contaminants

As with the Project, construction of Office Option Alternative 2 would generate diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during grading and excavation activities. These activities represent the greatest potential for TAC emissions. As discussed in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts with regard to TAC emissions during construction. As the construction of Office Option Alternative 2 would be of a shorter duration than that of the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would also not result in a substantial, long-term (i.e., 70-year) source of TAC emissions. Impacts due to TAC emissions under Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project during grading and excavation activities.

(2) Operation

(a) Regional and Localized Emissions

Similar to the Project, operational regional air pollutant emissions associated with Office Option Alternative 2 would be generated by vehicle trips to the Project Site and the consumption of electricity and natural gas. Using the LADOT VMT Calculator, development of Office Option Alternative 2 would result in 2,204 daily vehicle trips compared to 2,972 daily vehicle trips under the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as residential.[33,34] As vehicular emissions depend on the number of trips, vehicular sources would result in a smaller increase in air emissions compared to the Project. In addition, because the overall square footage would be reduced when compared to the Project, demand for electricity and natural gas would be less than the Project. Therefore, impacts associated with regional operational emissions would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

With regard to on-site localized area source and stationary source emissions, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would not introduce any major new sources of air pollution within the Project Site. Therefore, similar to the Project, localized impacts from on-site emission sources associated with Office Option Alternative 2 would also be less than significant. Such impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the overall reduction in building area.

(b) Toxic Air Contaminants

As set forth in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, the primary sources of potential TACs associated with Project operations would include DPM from delivery trucks. Under Office Option Alternative 2, the overall increase in the number of deliveries and associated diesel particulate matter emissions would be less than the Project due to a smaller floor area. Similar to the Project, the land uses proposed under Office Option Alternative 2 are not considered land uses that generate substantial TAC emissions. Therefore, like the Project's Office Option, Office Option Alternative 2 would not release substantial amounts of TACs, and impacts would be less than significant. Still, because of the reduction in floor area, truck deliveries, and associated DPM emissions under Office Option Alternative 2, operational TACs impacts would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

---

[33] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[34] *The Project's Office Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate 3,534 daily vehicle trips.*

b. Cultural Resources

(1) Historic Resources

As described above, the Project Site includes six bungalows that are included in the Afton Square Historic District. Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would temporarily move the bungalows off-site during construction activity. The bungalows would be relocated to the Project Site and rehabilitated in accordance with a Preservation Plan and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to ensure they would retain their significance as contributors to the Historic District. Thus, the Historic District would continue to be eligible for listing in the National Register. Therefore, under Office Option Alternative 2, impacts to historic resources would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Archaeological Resources

Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would require excavation and grading for building foundations and subterranean parking. In the event that any archaeological resources are unexpectedly encountered during construction, work in the area would temporarily be halted while assessment of the find is conducted by a qualified archaeologist in accordance with the regulatory standards set forth in PRC Section 21083.2 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c) to ensure the appropriate treatment of any potential unique archaeological resources unexpectedly encountered during grading and excavation activities. Therefore, impacts related to archaeological resources under Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(3) Human Remains

Similar to archaeological resources, the potential to uncover human remains under Office Option Alternative 2 would be similar to the Project's Office Option because both the Project and Office Option Alternative 2 would require excavation and grading for building foundations and subterranean parking. While the uncovering of human remains is not anticipated, if human remains are discovered during construction, such resources would be treated in accordance with State law, including CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, PRC Section 5097.98, and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. Therefore, impacts related to human remains under Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

c. Energy

Similar to the Project, as discussed in Section IV.C, Energy, of this Draft EIR, construction activities associated with Office Option Alternative 2 would consume electricity to supply and convey water for dust control and, on a limited basis, may be used to power lighting, electronic equipment, and other construction activities necessitating electrical power. The energy consumed would be reduced compared to the Project due to the 25-percent reduction in the overall amount of construction and associated reduction in the duration of construction under this alternative. Furthermore, as with the Project, construction activities under Office Option Alternative 2 would comply with all applicable requirements relating to energy use.

As with the Project, operation of Office Option Alternative 2 would generate an increased consumption of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum-based fuels compared to existing conditions. However, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would replace the existing low-rise commercial buildings and an eight-unit multi-family building within the eastern portion of the Project Site with new buildings meeting updated energy efficiency standards (e.g., Title 24 energy efficiency standards, 2019 CALGreen Code requirements, Los Angeles Green Building Code requirements, etc.). In addition, Office Option Alternative 2 would result in less operational energy demand than the Project due to the 25-percent reduction in development. Furthermore, LADWP has confirmed that the electrical infrastructure in the Project area has adequate capacity to serve the Project; thus, adequate capacity would also be available to serve Office Option Alternative 2. In terms of petroleum-based fuel usage, the number of daily trips generated by this alternative would be lower in comparison to the Project due to the lower net new floor area under this alternative. Lastly, as with the Project, the consumption of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum-based fuels under this alternative would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary because the development would represent urban infill within an urbanized area in close proximity to transit, which would contribute to an energy efficient land use pattern consistent with SCAG's 2020–2045 RTP/SCS growth forecast in TPAs, because operation of the proposed uses would comply with applicable energy efficiency standards, and because some older buildings would be replaced with new buildings developed to the latest energy efficiency standards.

Therefore, long-term energy use during construction and operation of Office Option Alternative 2 would not occur in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner or conflict with plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project because of the overall reduction in energy use.

d. Geology and Soils

(1) Geologic Hazards

Under Office Option Alternative 2, impacts related to site-specific geologic hazards, including fault rupture, strong seismic shaking, and site stability would be similar to those under the Project discussed in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR. This is because such impacts are a function of the Project Site's underlying geologic conditions rather than the types or amounts of land uses proposed. Office Option Alternative 2 would be developed within the same location as the Project and would comply with the same regulatory requirements as the Project to ensure that the soils underlying the Project Site can adequately support the proposed development. As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would be designed and constructed to conform to the current seismic design provisions of the California Building Code and the Los Angeles Building Code. Office Option Alternative 2 would also comply with the same regulatory requirements as the Project, which require the preparation of a final design-level geotechnical engineering report to identify and minimize seismic risks. Therefore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the specific geologic conditions identified in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR. The impacts of Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Paleontological Resources

As discussed in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR, a records search conducted for the Project Site indicates there are no previously encountered fossil vertebrate localities located within the Project Site. Therefore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would not impact known paleontological resources. Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would require excavation and grading for building foundations and subterranean parking, which would reach the native soils beneath the Project Site. Therefore, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 has a relatively low potential to uncover subsurface paleontological resources during construction. In the event that paleontological resources are encountered during excavation and grading, Office Option Alternative 2 would be subject to the same condition of approval as the Project to ensure that the resources are properly recovered and evaluated. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

e. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GHG emissions from a development project are determined in large part by the number of daily trips generated and energy consumption from proposed land uses. As

discussed above, Office Option Alternative 2 would involve the same mix of land uses as the Project's Office Option but would reduce the total amount of development on the Project Site by 25 percent. Therefore, under Office Option Alternative 2, the total energy and water consumption would be reduced compared to the Project. Additionally, as discussed above in Subsection V.D.2.a.(2)(a), the number of daily vehicle trips generated by Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than the number of trips generated by the Project's Office Option. Thus, the amount of GHG emissions generated by Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than the amount generated by the Project. As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would incorporate project design features to reduce GHG emissions and would be designed to comply with the City's Green Building Ordinance, as applicable. With compliance with the City's Green Building Ordinance and the implementation of comparable sustainability features as the Project, it is anticipated that Office Option Alternative 2 would be consistent with the GHG reduction goals and objectives included in adopted State, regional, and local regulatory plans as set forth in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR. Thus, impacts related to GHG emissions under Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

f. Hydrology and Water Quality

(1) Hydrology

With respect to surface water hydrology, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would slightly increase the percentage of impervious surface area on the Project Site. However, similar to the Project, with implementation of drainage improvements, including the rerouting of and introduction of new storm drains on-site as needed, compliance with NPDES and City requirements, and implementation of BMPs during both construction and operation, stormwater flow rates would be affected only marginally. As with the Project, existing flow patterns and discharge points would be generally maintained under Office Option Alternative 2.

With respect to groundwater hydrology, as with the Project's Office Option, Office Option Alternative 2 would decrease the amount of impervious surface area on-site when compared to existing conditions. However, while the subterranean parking structure would be located underneath the pervious surfaces under the Project, such that the groundwater recharge potential would remain minimal, Office Option Alternative 2 would include a smaller footprint than the Project, including a smaller subterranean parking structure footprint. Hence, there would be some potential for a small increase in infiltration of irrigation water and rainwater to the groundwater under this alternative. Nevertheless, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would comply with the City's LID requirements through BMPs, such as a capture and reuse system. In addition, stormwater, which bypasses the BMP systems, would discharge to an approved discharge point in the public

right-of-way and not result in infiltration of a large amount of rainfall that would affect groundwater hydrology, including the direction of groundwater flow. In addition, the subterranean levels would be designed such that they can withstand hydrostatic forces and incorporate comprehensive waterproofing systems in accordance with current industry standards and construction methods. As such, permanent dewatering operations are not expected, and the groundwater level is expected to return to the existing level at the Project Site after construction is complete. Furthermore, while there are supply wells within one mile of the Project Site, similar to the Project, compliance with regulatory requirements would not result in adverse impacts to wells. Lastly, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would not include new injection or supply wells.

Based on the above, impacts to surface and groundwater hydrology would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Water Quality

With respect to surface and groundwater quality, Office Option Alternative 2 would introduce the same new land uses on-site as the Project, which would have the potential to generate pollutants that could affect surface water and groundwater. As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would also decrease the percentage of impervious surface area on the Project Site. However, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would comply with NPDES requirements and City regulations, including the implementation of BMPs and compliance with LID requirements through a capture and reuse system. Therefore, impacts to surface and groundwater quality would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

g. Land Use

(1) Physical Division of a Community

Office Option Alternative 2 would introduce the same new land uses on-site as the Project. Accordingly, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would be compatible with the uses in the surrounding area and would complement existing and future mixed-use development in the Project area and land uses within the Hollywood Community Plan area. Projects that have been newly constructed or are currently proposed consist of mixed-use developments, new residential, hotel, office, and commercial retail uses. Similar to this alternative, many of the recent developments provide new commercial uses. Thus, as with the Project, this alternative would represent a continuation of those types of projects and be similar to existing uses in the Project vicinity. In addition, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would not physically divide the Afton Square Historic District.

Therefore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would be compatible with the surrounding land uses and would not substantially or adversely change the existing land use relationships between the Project Site and existing and approved off-site uses. As such, impacts associated with physical division of a community under Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Conflict with Land Use Plans

Office Option Alternative 2 would involve the same mix of land uses as the Project's Office Option with an approximately 25-percent floor area reduction. Accordingly, this alternative's FAR and density would be reduced compared to the Project; specifically, the Project Site under this alternative would have an FAR of 4.47:1 compared to the Project's FAR of 5.98:1. Nonetheless, Office Option Alternative 2 would require the same discretionary approvals as the Project's Office Option, and, with approval of the requested discretionary actions and implementation of design features comparable to those of the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would be generally consistent with the overall intent of applicable goals, policies, and objectives in local and regional plans that govern development on the Project Site, including the City's General Plan, the Community Plan, and the LAMC. Thus, impacts related to land use consistency under Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

h. Noise

(1) Construction

The types of construction activities under Office Option Alternative 2 would be substantially similar to the Project, although the construction duration would be reduced due to the reduced development of Office Option Alternative 2 (e.g., smaller project, shorter tower, and less excavation associated with one less subterranean level). As with the Project, construction of Office Option Alternative 2 would generate noise from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, as well as from haul truck and construction worker trips. The overall duration of the construction period would be reduced compared to that of the Project. However, on- and off-site construction activities and the types and amounts of construction equipment, construction traffic, and the associated on- and off-site construction noise and vibration levels, would be expected to be similar to those of the Project during peak activity days (including off-site hauling), which are used for determining significance. Accordingly, noise and vibration impacts due to on- and off-site construction activities and construction traffic under Office Option Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the Project. Specifically, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would result in (1) less-than-significant impacts associated with off-site construction noise (Project-level

and cumulative) and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for building damage (both Project-level and cumulative); (2) less-than-significant impacts with mitigation associated with on-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for building damage (Project-level only); and (3) significant and unavoidable impacts associated with on-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative), on-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level only), and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level and cumulative).

(2) Operation

Office Option Alternative 2 would introduce operational noise sources similar to the Project, including (a) on-site stationary noise sources, involving outdoor building mechanical equipment, loading dock and trash compactors, parking, and activities within the proposed outdoor spaces; and (b) off-site mobile (roadway traffic) noise sources. However, it is anticipated that with the overall reduction in total floor area and parking spaces, and the associated reduction in the number of on-site employees and customers, building mechanical equipment pieces, loading docks, trash compactors, and on-site outdoor activity, the noise levels from building mechanical equipment, loading and trash compactors, and outdoor spaces would be reduced.[35] In addition, similar to the Project, on-site mechanical equipment used during operation of Office Option Alternative 2 would comply with the regulations under LAMC Section 112.02, which prohibit noise from air conditioning, refrigeration, heating, pumping, and filtering equipment from exceeding the ambient noise levels on the premises of other occupied properties by more than 5 dBA. Under Office Option Alternative 2, the loading dock and trash collection would be integrated into the northern portion of the building and the trash room would be located within the subterranean parking level, similar to the Project. Thus, noise impacts from loading dock and trash collection areas would be similar to the Project. Also similar to the Project, parking for Office Option Alternative 2 would be provided within subterranean parking levels, which would be effectively shielded from off-site sensitive receptors. The overall area for outdoor spaces under Office Option Alternative 2 would be reduced as compared to the Project, which would reduce the noise associated with the outdoor uses (i.e., people talking and amplified sound). Therefore, operational on-site noise impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduction in total floor area.

---

[35] *While Office Option Alternative 2 would also result in reduced parking noise within the proposed parking structure, the parking structure under both this alternative and the Project would be subterranean. Therefore, it is not anticipated that there would be much if any reduction in operational parking noise impacts at existing sensitive noise receptors under this alternative.*

With regard to off-site noise sources, as noted above, development of Office Option Alternative 2 would result in 2,204 daily vehicle trips compared to 2,972 daily vehicle trips under the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use.[36,37] Therefore, off-site noise associated with Project traffic would be less than significant. In addition, cumulative impacts would be less than significant. As such, the Project's Office Option's significant and unavoidable Project-level and cumulative impacts along Afton Place under driveway scenario 3 would be avoided.[38]

i. Public Services

(1) Fire Protection

(a) Construction

As previously described, the types of construction activities required for Office Option Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the Project. However, under Office Option Alternative 2, the overall duration of construction would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduced amount of development and excavation. Similar to the Project, in compliance with OSHA and Fire and Building Code requirements, construction managers and personnel would be trained in emergency response and fire safety operations. Additionally, construction of Office Option Alternative 2 would occur in compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local requirements concerning the handling, disposal, use, storage, and management of hazardous materials. Thus, as with the Project, compliance with regulatory requirements would reduce the potential for construction activities of Office Option Alternative 2 to expose people to the risk of fire or explosion related to hazardous materials.

Construction of Office Option Alternative 2 could also potentially impact the provision of LAFD services in the vicinity of the Project Site as a result of construction impacts to the surrounding roadways associated with the movement of construction equipment, the hauling of soil and construction materials to and from the Project Site, and construction worker trips. However, construction-related traffic, including hauling activities and construction worker trips, would occur outside the typical weekday commuter A.M. and P.M. peak periods to the extent feasible, thereby reducing the potential for traffic-related conflicts. In addition, as with the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would

---

[36] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[37] *The Project's Office Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate 3,534 daily vehicle trips.*

[38] *AES, Alternatives Noise Calculations, October 2021. See Appendix L of this Draft EIR.*

be implemented during construction of Office Option Alternative 2 to ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and near the Project Site during construction activities. Therefore, impacts on fire protection services during construction of Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduction in construction activities and duration.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.J.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, of this Draft EIR, the Project Site would continue to be served by Fire Station No. 27, the "first-in" station, as well as Fire Station Nos. 82 and 41. Office Option Alternative 2 would result in less new development than the Project, thus resulting in a smaller service population and lower increase in demand for fire protection and emergency medical services than the Project. Specifically, Office Option Alternative 2 would directly generate an estimated 28 residents and 1,413 employees for a total on-site population of 1,441 persons, compared to the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use, which would generate an estimated on-site population of 1,930 persons consisting of 28 residents and 1,902 employees.[39,40] In addition, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would implement all applicable City Building Code and Fire Code requirements regarding structural design, building materials, site access, fire flow, storage and management of hazardous materials, alarm and communications systems, etc.

With respect to emergency access, similar to the Project, emergency access would be maintained, and traffic generated by Office Option Alternative 2 would not impair the LAFD from responding to emergencies at the Project Site or the surrounding area. In addition, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would implement all applicable City Building Code and Fire Code requirements regarding structural design, building materials, site access, fire flow, storage and management of hazardous materials, alarm and communications systems, etc. Therefore, as with the Project, compliance with applicable regulatory requirements, including LAFD's fire/life safety plan review and LAFD's fire/life safety inspection, would ensure that adequate fire prevention features would be provided to reduce the demand on LAFD facilities and equipment.

Based on the above, operation of Office Option Alternative 2 would not require the addition of a new or expanded fire station in order to maintain service. Therefore, as with

---

[39] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 1, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[40] *The Project's Office Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate an on-site population of 1,938 persons consisting solely of employees.*

the Project, operation of Office Option Alternative 2 would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., fire stations), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Police Protection

(a) Construction

As previously described, the types of construction activities required for Office Option Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the Project. However, under Office Option Alternative 2, the overall duration of construction would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduced amount of development and excavation. Similar to the Project, the demand for police protection services during construction of Office Option Alternative 2 would be offset by the removal of the existing uses on the Project Site. In addition, the daytime population at the Project Site during construction would be temporary in nature. Office Option Alternative 2 would implement the same project design features as the Project, which include temporary security measures, such as fencing, lighting, and locked entry, to reduce the potential for theft and vandalism on the Project Site, thereby reducing the demand for police protection services.

With regard to emergency vehicle access, as with the Project, traffic generated during construction of Office Option Alternative 2, including hauling activities and construction worker trips, would occur outside the typical weekday commuter A.M. and P.M. peak periods to extent feasible, reducing traffic-related conflicts. In addition, as with the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction of Office Option Alternative 2 to ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and near the Project Site during construction. Therefore, impacts on police protection services during construction of Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduced construction activities and duration.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.I.2, Public Services—Police Protection, of this Draft EIR, and as with the Project, the Project Site under Office Option Alternative 2 would continue to be served by Hollywood Community Police Station. While the Office Option Alternative 2 and the Project's Office Option would have a similar impact on the existing officer-to-resident population ratio, this alternative would result in a 25-percent reduction in new office and retail/restaurant development as compared to the Project, thus resulting in a smaller non-residential service population and lower net increase in demand for police protection service than the Project. Specifically, Office Option Alternative 2 would directly generate an estimated 28 residents and 1,413 employees for a total on-site population of

1,441 persons, as compared to the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use which would generate an estimated on-site population of 1,930 persons consisting of 28 residents and 1,902 employees.[41,42] Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would implement Project Design Features POL-PDF-2 through POL-PDF-7, which require a standard set of security measures (e.g., closed circuit cameras, keycard entry, etc.) be incorporated into the proposed buildings; sufficient lighting and design of buildings, walkways, and parking areas, to ensure visibility/security; entry and exit points designed to be open and in view of surrounding sites; consultation with LAPD's crime prevention unit; and submitting a diagram of the Project Site to LAPD's Hollywood Division Commanding Officer that includes access routes and any additional information that might facilitate police response. As with the Project, these project design features would help reduce the increase in demand for police services under Office Option Alternative 2. Lastly, because of the reduced amount of new development under this alternative, operational traffic and the potential for impacts to emergency response times would be reduced compared to those of the Project. Based on the above, operation of Office Option Alternative 2, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., police stations), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(3) Schools

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would generate part-time and full-time jobs associated with its construction between the start of construction and full buildout. However, due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California and the operation of the market for construction labor, construction workers are not likely to relocate their households as a consequence of construction job opportunities. Therefore, construction employment generated by Office Option Alternative 2 would not result in a notable increase in the resident population or a corresponding demand for schools from construction workers in the vicinity of the Project Site. Impacts on school facilities during construction of Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

---

[41] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[42] *The Project's Office Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate a total on-site population of 1,938 persons consisting solely of employees.*

(b) Operation

As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would include new development that would create a demand for LAUSD school facilities (e.g., Grant Elementary School, Joseph Le Conte Middle School, and Hollywood High School). However, the demand for LAUSD facilities under Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than the Project as a result of the 25-percent reduction in development. Furthermore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would be required to pay the applicable SB 50 development fees for schools, which per Government Code Section 65995, is considered by the State to represent full mitigation of the impact of new development on schools. Based on the above, operation of Office Option Alternative 2, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., schools), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(4) Libraries

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would result in a temporary increase in construction workers on the Project Site. However, due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California and the operation of the market for construction labor, construction workers are not likely to relocate their households as a consequence of the construction job opportunities. Therefore, construction employment generated by Office Option Alternative 2 would not result in a notable increase in the residential population or a corresponding demand for library services in the vicinity of the Project Site. Impacts to library facilities during construction under Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

Residents are considered the primary users of library facilities within a given service area. While Office Option Alternative 2 would be developed with less commercial square footage than the Project, it would include the same number of residential units as the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use. Specifically, the nine residential units included in Office Option Alternative 2 would generate approximately 28 residents which is the same as the Project's Office Option. Furthermore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would generate tax revenues for the City's General Fund which would help offset the increases in library demand. Based on the above, operation of Office Option Alternative 2, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., libraries), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Office Option Alternative 2 would be less

than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project's Office Option.

(5) Parks and Recreation

(a) Construction

Construction of Office Option Alternative 2 would result in a temporary increase in the number of construction workers at the Project Site. As described above, due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California, and the operation of the market for construction labor, the likelihood that construction workers would relocate their households as a consequence of working on Office Option Alternative 2 is low. Therefore, the construction workers associated with Office Option Alternative 2 would not result in a notable increase in the residential population of the Project area, or a corresponding permanent demand for parks and recreational facilities in the vicinity of the Project Site. As such, similar to the Project, construction of Office Option Alternative 2 would not generate a demand for park or recreational facilities that cannot be adequately accommodated by existing or planned facilities and services or interfere with existing park usage. Therefore, impacts on parks and recreational facilities during construction of Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

Residents are considered the primary users of parks and recreation facilities. Similar to the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use, Office Option Alternative 2 would include nine residential units that would create a demand for RAP parks and recreational facilities. However, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would meet City open space requirements through the provision of common open space (e.g., courtyards) and private open space (patios) for its residents. Therefore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 residents would generally utilize on-site open space to meet their recreational needs. Additionally, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would be required to pay parks fees to the City that could be used to add or improve park facilities in the vicinity of the Project Site. Based on the above, operation of Office Option Alternative 2, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., parks), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project's Office Option.

j. Transportation

Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would generally support applicable transportation plans (Mobility Plan 2035, Plan for a Health Los Angeles, Vision Zero, etc.) and multimodal transportation options. As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would include passenger drop-offs to minimize impacts to the public right-of-way and enhance the user experience by integrating multi-modal transportation options, and new sidewalks, street trees, pedestrian lighting, and bicycle parking in accordance with the LAMC. In accordance with the City's TDM ordinance, Office Option Alternative 2 would also include certain TDM program elements (i.e., display transportation information, such as public transit routes and schedules, bicycle routes and facility information, and ridesharing promotional materials; designated carpool and vanpool parking close to the main pedestrian entrance; information about preferential carpool/vanpool spaces; bicycle parking in conformance with the LAMC; carpool/vanpool unloading area; sidewalks or other designated pathways connecting the external pedestrian network to each building in the development; safe and convenient access from the external circulation system to bicycle parking facilities on-site; and, if determined necessary by the City, bus stop improvements), which would reduce vehicle trips and support bicycle and pedestrian activity. As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would also represent urban infill development near transit, which would encourage alternative transportation use. Therefore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system and impacts. The impacts of Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

With respect to VMT, Office Option Alternative 2 would result in an average household VMT per capita of 3.3, which is below the Central APC threshold of 6.0 and an average work VMT per employee of 5.2 which is below the Central APC threshold of 7.6.[43] This is compared to an average household VMT per capita of 3.0 and average work VMT per employee of 4.9 with the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use.[44] Impacts of the Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant but would be greater than the Project due to a smaller ratio of office and restaurant space to residential units and thus residents having less opportunity to work and/or dine at the Project Site.

---

[43] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[44] *The Project's Office Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would result in a work VMT per employee of 5.2 which is the same as the Project and no household VMT.*

As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would not introduce hazardous geometric design features, and all driveways would be designed to LADOT standards. With respect to freeway safety, as discussed in Section IV.J, Transportation, of this Draft EIR, the Project's Office Option is projected to have a significant safety impact on the US-101 northbound off-ramp to Sunset Boulevard in Future Year 2027, but this impact would be mitigated with the implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1.[45] Because Office Option Alternative 2 would reduce the overall floor area compared to the Project's Office Option, this alternative would generate fewer peak hour trips than the Project. Therefore, even if Office Option Alternative 2 were projected to have a significant safety impact at this off-ramp, implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1 would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Impacts of Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant with mitigation and less when compared to the Project because fewer peak hour trips are anticipated.

Lastly, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would not interfere with emergency access as this alternative would implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan during construction to ensure emergency access during the construction period, would not close any existing public streets, and would provide emergency access in accordance with applicable requirements. The impacts of Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

k. Tribal Cultural Resources

Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 requires excavation and grading for building foundations and subterranean parking. While the uncovering of tribal cultural resources is not anticipated, if tribal cultural resources are discovered during construction, such resources would be treated in accordance with State law (i.e., CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(d), PRC Sections 21080.3.1(b), 21080.3.2(a), 21084.3, etc.). Accordingly, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

[45] *Although the cumulative impact associated with freeway off-ramp safety would remain significant and unavoidable, with implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1, the Project's Office Option's contribution would not be cumulative considerable*

I. Utilities and Service Systems

(1) Water Supply and Infrastructure

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, construction activities associated with Office Option Alternative 2 would generate a short-term demand for water. This demand would be less than the Project due to the reduction in the amount of construction that would be required under Office Option Alternative 2. As evaluated in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, the Project's temporary and intermittent demand for water during construction could be met by the City's available supplies during each year of construction. Also, as with the Project's Office Option, the water demand during construction under this alternative would be offset by the amount of water currently used by existing on-site uses to be removed. Since the water demand for construction activities would be reduced, the temporary and intermittent demand for water during construction under Office Option Alternative 2 would also be expected to be met by the City's available water supplies. Similarly, the existing LADWP water infrastructure would be adequate to provide the water flow necessary to serve Office Option Alternative 2. Furthermore, as with the Project, the design and installation of new service connections under Office Option Alternative 2 would be required to meet applicable City standards. Therefore, impacts on water supply and infrastructure associated with short-term construction activities would be less than significant under Office Option Alternative 2 and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would result in an increase in long-term water demand. As discussed in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, a WSA was prepared by LADWP for the Project, as required by SB 610, which concludes that sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the Project. Because Office Option Alternative 2 would include a 25-percent reduction in new floor area when compared to the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would generate less operational water demand than the Project. Furthermore, as with the Project, in addition to complying with applicable water conservation requirements, Office Option Alternative would incorporate the additional water conservation measures, such as those set forth in Project Design Feature WAT-PDF-1. Therefore, as with the Project, LADWP would also have sufficient water supplies available to serve Office Option Alternative 2 during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.

Regarding water infrastructure, as indicated in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, a conservative analysis for both fire suppression and domestic water flows has been completed by LADWP for the

Project as summarized in the Utility Report included as Appendix F of this Draft EIR. As discussed therein, based on the IFFAR, the Project has adequate fire flow available to comply with the standards specified in LAMC Section 57.507.3.1. Because Office Option Alternative 2 would include a 25-percent reduction in net new floor area when compared to the Project and generate a lower operational water demand, adequate water infrastructure capacity also exists to serve Office Option Alternative 2. Therefore, as with the Project, operation of Office Option Alternative 2 would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Based on the above, the operational impacts of Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Wastewater

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, during construction of Office Option Alternative 2, construction activities would not result in wastewater generation as construction workers would typically utilize portable restrooms, which would not contribute to wastewater flows to the City's wastewater system. Furthermore, as with the Project's Office Option, the removal of the existing on-site uses under this alternative would result in a short-term decrease in wastewater discharges to the public sewer system from the Project Site during the construction period. As such, wastewater generation from construction activities associated with Office Option Alternative 2 would not cause a measurable increase in wastewater flows. Therefore, construction of the Project would not substantially or incrementally exceed the future scheduled capacity of any one treatment plant by generating flows greater than those anticipated in One Water LA and the City's IRP.

Additionally, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 may include construction activities associated with the installation of new or relocated sewer connections. Such activities would be confined to trenching in order to place the sewer lines below surface and would be limited to the on-site wastewater conveyance infrastructure and minor off-site work associated with connections to the City's sewer lines in the streets adjacent to the Project Site. Similar to the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during the construction of Office Option Alternative 2 to reduce impacts to pedestrian and traffic flow, including emergency vehicle access, which could occur due to temporary off-site utility work. However, the amount of required wastewater infrastructure improvements and associated construction activities under this alternative would potentially be less than under the Project owing to less development and less associated wastewater generation under this alternative. Therefore, construction-related impacts to the

wastewater system under Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduced duration of construction.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.L.2, Utilities and Service Systems—Wastewater, of the Draft EIR, and as with the Project, wastewater generated by Office Option Alternative 2 would be conveyed by LASAN's existing wastewater conveyance system to the HWRP for treatment. Because the existing sewer lines and the HWRP have adequate capacity to serve the Project, and Office Option Alternative 2 would include a 25-percent reduction in development and generate proportionately less operational wastewater than the Project, the capacities of the sewer system and HWRP serving the Project Site would also be adequate to serve Office Option Alternative 2. Furthermore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 2 would comply with applicable City wastewater infrastructure design and wastewater reduction requirements and implement water conservation measures above applicable requirements, such as those detailed in Project Design Feature WAT-PDF-1, which would also reduce wastewater generation. Lastly, as with the Project, additional detailed sewer gauging and evaluation, as required by LAMC Section 64.14, would be conducted to obtain final approval of sewer capacity and connection permits during the standard required permitting process under Office Option Alternative 2. Therefore, as with the Project, operation of Office Option Alternative 2 would not (1) require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; or (2) result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project, that it has inadequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. The impacts of Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(3) Energy Infrastructure

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, construction activities associated with Office Option Alternative 2 would consume electricity to supply and convey water for dust control and, on a limited basis, may be used to power lighting, electronic equipment, and other construction activities necessitating electrical power. The energy consumed would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduction in the overall amount of construction and duration of construction. Therefore, impacts on energy infrastructure associated with short-term construction activities would be less than significant under Office Option Alternative 2 and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As with the Project, operation of Office Option Alternative 2 would generate an increased consumption of electricity and natural gas when compared to existing conditions. However, the consumption of electricity and natural gas under Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than the Project because of the reduced amount of overall development area. Therefore, impacts to energy infrastructure under Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

3. Comparison of Impacts

As evaluated above, Office Option Alternative 2 would not eliminate the Project's Residential Option's significant and unavoidable impacts associated with on-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative); on-site construction vibration (Project-level only); and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level and cumulative). It would, however, avoid the Office Option's significant and unavoidable impact associated with off-site operational noise (Project-level and cumulative). Office Option Alternative 2 would result in greater impacts associated with VMT, but these impacts would remain less than significant. All other impacts would be less than or similar to the Project's Office Option, which would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.

4. Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

Office Option Alternative 2 would develop the same mix of uses as the Project's Office Option, but at a 25 percent reduced density and FAR. As such, Office Option Alternative 2 would meet the portion of the Project's underlying purpose applicable the Project's Office Option which is to revitalize the infill Project Site by developing an integrated high-density mixed-use development that provides new office space, restaurant uses, and potential multi-family housing opportunities, all of which serve the community and promote walkability. However, the Office Option Alternative 2 would be less effective than the Project's Office Option in achieving this underlying purpose owing to the reduced density under this alternative. Also, Office Option Alternative 2 would meet the following Project Office Option's objectives to a lesser extent than the Project:

- Locate commercial uses in close proximity to transit stations, along transit corridors, and within high-activity areas, which promotes sustainability and reduces VMT, with associated reductions in air quality and GHG emissions.

- Promote local and regional mobility objectives by providing a high-density development comprising office and neighborhood-serving restaurant uses along the Vine Street commercial corner and in close proximity to public transportation.

- Consistent with the City's Walkability Checklist and Citywide Design Guidelines, create a street-level identity for the Project Site and improve the pedestrian experience through the introduction of active street adjacent uses, such as neighborhood-serving restaurant uses.

- To create economic vitality in the community through the creation of construction jobs, and permanent full-time on-site jobs and the generation of revenues to the City in the form of additional sales, business license, and property taxes.

Office Option Alternative 2 would, however, meet the following objectives to the same extent as the Project's Office Option:

- Redevelop an underutilized infill site while providing for the adaptive reuse of the historic bungalows on-site.

- Promote sustainable development by incorporating "Green" principles, including energy-efficient buildings, a pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly site design, water conservation features, and waste reduction features.

V. Alternatives

E. Office Option Alternative 3: Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning Alternative

1. Description of the Alternative

Office Option Alternative 3 would be developed consistent with the existing zoning designations for the Project Site (i.e., C4-2D-SN, (T)(Q) C2-2D, R4-2D, and R3-1XL). Specifically, Office Option Alternative 3 would involve the development of a low-rise, three-story building with 55,000 square feet of office uses. This new building would be located within the western portion of the Project Site, which includes the eight lots zoned as C4-2D-SN, (T)(Q)C2-2D, and R4-2D. The six bungalows comprising 8,988 square feet would be rehabilitated and adapted for reuse as nine residential units. Similar to the Project, this new building would be located within the western portion of the Project Site, and the six historic bungalows on-site would be relocated to the eastern portion of the Project Site. Office Option Alternative 3 would provide 2,100 square feet of open space. To accommodate Office Option Alternative 3, the existing low-rise commercial building, eight-unit multi-family building, and ancillary buildings adjacent to the bungalows would be removed.

Overall, Office Option Alternative 3 would comprise 63,988 square feet of floor area with a floor area ratio of 2:1 FAR, and the footprint of Office Option Alternative 3 would be smaller than that of the Project. Additionally, at a height of 45 feet, the new building proposed by Office Option Alternative 3 would be shorter than the Project's Office Option (i.e., 303 feet). In accordance with LAMC requirements, Office Option Alternative 3 would require and provide 128 vehicle parking spaces within an above-grade structure, consisting of 110 vehicle parking spaces for the proposed commercial uses and 18 vehicle parking spaces for the proposed residential uses. In accordance with LAMC requirements and City Ordinance No. 185,480, Office Option Alternative 3 would require and provide a total of 41 bicycle parking spaces, consisting of 27 bicycle parking spaces for the proposed commercial uses and 14 bicycle parking spaces for the proposed residential uses.

With regard to construction activities and schedule, it is anticipated that the overall duration of construction would be reduced compared to the Project based on the proposed development under this alternative (e.g., smaller project, shorter building, and no subterranean levels). However, as with the Project, a Construction Traffic Management

Plan and Truck Haul Route Program would be implemented during construction to minimize potential conflicts between construction activity and through traffic. As with the Project, the Construction Traffic Management Plan and Truck Haul Route Program would be subject to LADOT review and approval.

This alternative would implement a basic building design consistent with low-rise office buildings in the area. Signage, lighting, vehicular, and pedestrian access, and sustainability features would be similar to those proposed for the Project.

2. Environmental Impact Analysis

a. Air Quality

(1) Construction

(a) Regional and Localized Emissions

Office Option Alternative 3 would involve the same amount of demolition as the Project's Office Option but less grading, excavation, soil export, and new construction. As with the Project, construction of this alternative would generate air emissions through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and haul truck and construction worker trips. While the overall amount of excavation, soil export, and building construction would be less than what is proposed under the Project's Office Option over the entire duration of the construction period, the intensity of air emissions and fugitive dust from demolition, site preparation, grading, and other construction activities would be similar on days with maximum construction activities as the types and amounts of construction equipment used would be the similar.[46] As discussed in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, construction-related daily maximum regional construction emissions would not exceed any SCAQMD daily significance thresholds, and the maximum localized daily Project-related construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD-recommended localized screening thresholds. Therefore, under Office Option Alternative 3, air quality impacts from localized and regional construction emissions on peak construction days would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

[46] *Even though this alternative would not include subterranean parking levels, it would still include excavations for building footing and foundations, trenching for utilities, etc. The period that excavations occur would just be substantially shorter in duration under this alternative, but the type and amount of construction activities during peak construction days would be similar to the Project.*

(b) Toxic Air Contaminants

As with the Project, construction of Office Option Alternative 3 would generate diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during grading and excavation activities. These activities represent the greatest potential for TAC emissions. As discussed in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts with regard to TAC emissions during construction. As the construction of Office Option Alternative 3 would be of a much shorter duration than that of the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would also not result in a substantial, long-term (i.e., 70-year) source of TAC emissions. Impacts due to TAC emissions under Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project during grading and excavation activities.

(2) Operation

(a) Regional and Localized Emissions

Similar to the Project, operational regional air pollutant emissions associated with Office Option Alternative 3 would be generated by vehicle trips to the Project Site and the consumption of electricity and natural gas. Using the LADOT VMT Calculator, development of Office Option Alternative 3 would result in 363 daily vehicle trips compared to 2,927 daily vehicle trips under the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as residential.[47,48] As vehicular emissions depend on the number of trips, vehicular sources would result in a smaller increase in air emissions compared to the Project. In addition, because the overall square footage would be reduced when compared to the Project, demand for electricity and natural gas would be less than the Project. Therefore, impacts associated with regional operational emissions would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

With regard to on-site localized area source and stationary source emissions, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would not introduce any major new sources of air pollution within the Project Site. Therefore, similar to the Project, localized impacts from on-site emission sources associated with Office Option Alternative 3 would also be less than significant. Such impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the overall reduction in building area.

---

[47] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[48] *The Project's Office Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate 3,534 daily vehicle trips.*

(b) Toxic Air Contaminants

As set forth in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, the primary sources of potential TACs associated with Project operations would include DPM from delivery trucks. Under Office Option Alternative 3, the overall increase in the number of deliveries and associated DPM emissions would be less than the Project due to a smaller floor area. Similar to the Project, the land uses proposed under Office Option Alternative 3 are not considered land uses that generate substantial TAC emissions. Therefore, like the Project's Office Option, Office Option Alternative 3 would not release substantial amounts of TACs and impacts would be less than significant. Still, because of the reduction in floor area, truck deliveries, and associated DPM emissions under Office Option Alternative 3, operational TACs impacts would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

b. Cultural Resources

(1) Historic Resources

As described above, the Project Site includes six bungalows that are included in the Afton Square Historic District. Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would temporarily move the bungalows off-site during construction activity. The bungalows would be relocated to the Project Site and rehabilitated in accordance with a Preservation Plan and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to ensure they would retain their significance as contributors to the Historic District. Thus, the Historic District would continue to be eligible for listing in the National Register. Therefore, under Office Option Alternative 3, impacts to historic resources would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Archaeological Resources

Unlike the Project's Office Option, which includes eight subterranean parking levels, all parking for Office Option Alternative 3 would be above ground. Nevertheless, grading and minor excavation for building foundations would still be required under this alternative. In the event that any archaeological resources are unexpectedly encountered during construction, work in the area would temporarily be halted while assessment of the find is conducted by a qualified archaeologist in accordance with the regulatory standards set forth in PRC Section 21083.2 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c) to ensure the appropriate treatment of any potential unique archaeological resources unexpectedly encountered during grading and excavation activities. Nevertheless, because excavation and grading are still required, impacts related to archaeological resources under Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(3) Human Remains

Although no subterranean levels are proposed, similar to archeological resources, the potential to uncover human remains under Office Option Alternative 3 would be similar to the Project's Office Option because excavation and grading for building foundations is still required. While the uncovering of human remains is not anticipated, if human remains are discovered during construction, such resources would be treated in accordance with State law, including CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, PRC Section 5097.98, and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. Therefore, impacts related to human remains under Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

c. Energy

Similar to the Project as discussed in Section IV.C, Energy, of this Draft EIR, construction activities associated with Office Option Alternative 3 would consume electricity to supply and convey water for dust control and, on a limited basis, may be used to power lighting, electronic equipment, and other construction activities necessitating electrical power. The energy consumed would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduction in the overall amount of construction and associated reduction in the duration of construction under this alternative. Furthermore, as with the Project, construction activities under Office Option Alternative 3 would comply with all applicable requirements relating to energy use.

As with the Project, operation of Office Option Alternative 3 would generate an increased consumption of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum-based fuels compared to existing conditions. However, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would replace the existing low-rise commercial buildings and an eight-unit multi-family building within the eastern portion of the Project Site with new buildings meeting updated energy efficiency standards (e.g., Title 24 energy efficiency standards, 2019 CALGreen Code requirements, Los Angeles Green Building Code requirements, etc.). In addition, Office Option Alternative 3 would result in less operational energy demand than the Project due to the reduction in development. Furthermore, LADWP has confirmed that the electrical infrastructure in the Project area has adequate capacity to serve the Project; thus, adequate capacity would also be available to serve Office Option Alternative 3. In terms of petroleum-based fuel usage, the number of daily trips generated by this alternative would be lower in comparison to the Project due to the lower net new floor area under this alternative. Lastly, as with the Project, the consumption of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum-based fuels under this alternative would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary because the development would represent urban infill within an urbanized area in close proximity to transit, which would contribute to an energy efficient land use pattern consistent with SCAG's 2020–2045 RTP/SCS growth forecast in TPAs, because

operation of the proposed uses would comply with applicable energy efficiency standards, and because some older buildings would be replaced with new buildings developed to the latest energy efficiency standards.

Therefore, long-term energy use during construction and operation of Office Option Alternative 3 would not occur in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner or conflict with plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project because of the overall reduction in energy use.

d. Geology and Soils

(1) Geologic Hazards

Under Office Option Alternative 3, impacts related to site-specific geologic hazards, including fault rupture, strong seismic shaking, and site stability would be similar to those under the Project discussed in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR. This is because such impacts are a function of the Project Site's underlying geologic conditions rather than the types or amounts of land uses proposed. Office Option Alternative 3 would be developed within the same location as the Project and would comply with the same regulatory requirements as the Project to ensure that the soils underlying the Project Site can adequately support the proposed development. As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would be designed and constructed to conform to the current seismic design provisions of the California Building Code and the Los Angeles Building Code. Office Option Alternative 3 would also comply with the same regulatory requirements as the Project, which require the preparation of a final design-level geotechnical engineering report to identify and minimize seismic risks. Therefore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the specific geologic conditions identified in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR. The impacts of Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Paleontological Resources

As discussed in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR, a records search conducted for the Project Site indicates there are no previously encountered fossil vertebrate localities located within the Project Site. Therefore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would not impact known paleontological resources. Office Option Alternative 3 would not include any subterranean parking levels compared to eight with the Project's Office Option but would require grading and excavation for building foundations only. However, as discussed in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of the Draft EIR, soils

beneath the Project Site consist of artificial fill to a maximum depth of 13 feet. Therefore, the potential for Office Option Alternative 3 to uncover subsurface paleontological resources would be reduced when compared to the Project's Office Option because it is unlikely that native soils would be encountered. Nevertheless, in the event that paleontological resources are encountered during excavation and grading, Office Option Alternative 3 would be subject to the same condition of approval as the Project to ensure that the resources are properly recovered and evaluated. Impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

e. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GHG emissions from a development project are determined in large part by the number of daily trips generated and energy consumption from proposed land uses. As discussed above, Office Option Alternative 3 would involve less office development than the Project's Office Option and would not include the Project's retail and restaurant uses. Therefore, under Office Option Alternative 3, the total energy and water consumption would be reduced when compared to the Project. Additionally, as discussed above in Subsection V.E.2.a.(2)(a), the number of daily vehicle trips generated by Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than the number of trips generated by the Project's Office Option. Thus, the amount of GHG emissions generated by Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than the amount generated by the Project. As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would incorporate project design features to reduce GHG emissions and would be designed to comply with the City's Green Building Ordinance, as applicable. With compliance with the City's Green Building Ordinance and the implementation of comparable sustainability features as the Project, it is anticipated that Office Option Alternative 3 would be consistent with the GHG reduction goals and objectives included in adopted State, regional, and local regulatory plans as set forth in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR. Thus, impacts related to GHG emissions under Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

f. Hydrology and Water Quality

(1) Hydrology

With respect to surface water hydrology, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would slightly increase the percentage of impervious surface area on the Project Site. However, similar to the Project with implementation of drainage improvements, including the rerouting of and introduction of new storm drains on-site as needed, compliance with NPDES and City requirements, and implementation of BMPs during both construction and operation, stormwater flow rates would be affected only marginally. As with the Project, existing flow patterns and discharge points would be generally maintained under Office Option Alternative 3.

With respect to groundwater hydrology, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would decrease the amount of impervious surface area on-site when compared to existing conditions. However, given that the subterranean parking structure, which is impervious, would be located underneath the pervious surfaces and this alternative would have a similar site plan, the groundwater recharge potential would remain minimal similar to the Project because water infiltrating the surface would not reach the underlying groundwater. Additionally, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would comply with the City's LID requirements through BMPs, such as a capture and reuse system. In addition, stormwater, which bypasses the BMP systems, would discharge to an approved discharge point in the public right-of-way and not result in infiltration of a large amount of rainfall that would affect groundwater hydrology, including the direction of groundwater flow. Furthermore, while there are supply wells within one mile of the Project Site, similar to the Project, compliance with regulatory requirements would not result in adverse impacts to wells. Lastly, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would not include new injection or supply wells.

Based on the above, impacts to surface and groundwater hydrology would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Water Quality

With respect to surface and groundwater quality, Office Option Alternative 3 would introduce new development to the Project Site which, like the Project's Office Option, would have the potential to generate pollutants that could affect surface water and groundwater. As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would also decrease the percentage of impervious surface area on the Project Site. However, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would comply with NPDES requirements and City regulations, including the implementation of BMPs and compliance with LID requirements through a capture and reuse system. Therefore, impacts to surface and groundwater quality would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

g. Land Use

(1) Physical Division of Community

Office Option Alternative 3 would introduce office uses on-site. Accordingly, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would be compatible with the uses in the surrounding area and would complement existing and future mixed-use development in the Project area and land uses within the Hollywood Community Plan area. Projects that have been newly constructed or are currently proposed consist of mixed-use developments, new residential, hotel, office, and commercial retail uses. Similar to this alternative, many of the recent developments provide new commercial uses. Thus, as with the Project, this

alternative would represent a continuation of those types of projects and be similar to existing uses in the Project vicinity. In addition, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would not physically divide the Afton Square Historic District.

Therefore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would be compatible with the surrounding land uses and would not substantially or adversely change the existing land use relationships between the Project Site and existing and approved off-site uses. As such, impacts associated with physical division of a community under Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Conflict with Land Use Plans

Office Option Alternative 3 would involve the development of office uses at the Project Site. However, the amount of office development under this alternative would be limited to that permitted by the Project Site's existing zoning, which would be substantially less than the amount of office development proposed under the Project. Furthermore, Office Option Alternative 3 would not include the retail and restaurant uses proposed under the Project. Accordingly, this alternative's FAR and density would be reduced compared to the Project; specifically, the Project Site would have an FAR of 2:1 compared to the Project's FAR of 5.98:1. Unlike the Project's Office Option, Office Option Alternative 3 would not require a Vesting Zone and Height District Change. All other discretionary approvals would be similar to the Project's Office Option. With approval of the requested discretionary actions and implementation of design features comparable to those of the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would be generally consistent with the overall intent of applicable goals, policies, and objectives in local and regional plans that govern development on the Project Site, including the City's General Plan, the Community Plan, and the LAMC. Thus, impacts related to land use consistency under Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

h. Noise

(1) Construction

The types of construction activities under Office Option Alternative 3 would be substantially similar to the Project, although the construction duration would be reduced due to the reduced development of Residential Option Alternative 3 (e.g., smaller project, shorter tower, and less excavation because no subterranean levels are proposed). As with the Project, construction of Office Option Alternative 3 would generate noise from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, as well as from haul truck and construction worker trips. While the overall duration of the construction period would be reduced compared to

that of the Project, on- and off-site construction activities and types and amounts of construction equipment and the associated construction noise and vibration levels would be expected to be similar to those of the Project during peak activity days (including off-site hauling), which are used for determining significance. Accordingly, noise and vibration impacts due to on- and off-site construction activities under Office Option Alternative 3 would be similar to those of the Project. Specifically, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would result in (1) less-than-significant impacts associated with off-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative) and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for building damage (both Project-level and cumulative); (2) less-than-significant impacts with mitigation associated with on-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for building damage (Project-level only); and (3) significant and unavoidable impacts associated with on-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative), on-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level only), and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level and cumulative).

(2) Operation

Office Option Alternative 3 would introduce operational noise sources similar to the Project, including (a) on-site stationary noise sources, involving outdoor building mechanical equipment, loading dock and trash compactors, and parking; and (b) off-site mobile (roadway traffic) noise sources. Similar to the Project, on-site mechanical equipment used during operation of Office Option Alternative 3 would comply with the regulations under LAMC Section 112.02 which prohibit noise from air conditioning, refrigeration, heating, pumping, and filtering equipment from exceeding the ambient noise levels on the premises of other occupied properties by more than 5 dBA. Also similar to the Project, the loading dock and trash collection under this alternative would be integrated into the northern portion of the building, and the trash room would be screened from off-site receptors. In addition, although parking for Office Option Alternative 3 would be provided within an above-grade parking structure, unlike the Project where the parking would be provided in subterranean levels, the above-grade parking structure would include fully enclosed parking levels which would be effectively shielded from off-site sensitive receptors. However, the overall area for outdoor spaces under Office Option Alternative 3 would be reduced as compared to the Project, which would reduce the noise associated with the outdoor uses (i.e., people talking and amplified sound). In addition, this alternative would also not include retail and restaurant uses such that nighttime activity and associated noise at the Project Site would be reduced when compared to the Project. Furthermore, the reduced floor area under this alternative would result in fewer and/or smaller mechanical equipment pieces, fewer and/or smaller loading and trash compactors, smaller on-site employee and customer populations, and less outdoor activity in the outdoor spaces, all of which would lead to less on-site operational noise. Therefore, operational

on-site noise impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

With regard to off-site noise sources, as noted above, development of Office Option Alternative 3 would result in 363 daily vehicle trips compared to 2,972 daily vehicle trips under the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as residential.[49,50] Therefore, off-site noise associated with Project traffic would be less than significant and less when compared to less-than-significant impacts of the Project. In addition, cumulative impacts would be less than significant. As such, the Project's Office Option's significant and unavoidable Project-level and cumulative impacts along Afton Place under driveway scenario 3 would be avoided.[51]

i. Public Services

(1) Fire Protection

(a) Construction

As previously described, the types of construction activities required for Office Option Alternative 3 would be similar to those of the Project during peak construction days.[52] However, under Office Option Alternative 3, the overall duration of construction would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduced amount of development and excavation. Similar to the Project, in compliance with OSHA and Fire and Building Code requirements, construction managers and personnel would be trained in emergency response and fire safety operations. Additionally, construction of Office Option Alternative 3 would occur in compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local requirements concerning the handling, disposal, use, storage, and management of hazardous materials. Thus, as with the Project, compliance with regulatory requirements would reduce the potential for construction activities of Office Option Alternative 3 to expose people to the risk of fire or explosion related to hazardous materials.

---

[49] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[50] *The Project's Office Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate 3,534 daily vehicle trips.*

[51] *AES, Alternatives Noise Calculations, October 2021. See Appendix L of this Draft EIR.*

[52] *Even though this alternative would not include subterranean parking levels, it would still include excavations for building footing and foundations, trenching for utilities, etc. The period that excavations occur would just be substantially shorter in duration under this alternative, but the type and amount of construction activities during peak construction days would be similar to the Project.*

Construction of Office Option Alternative 3 could also potentially impact the provision of LAFD services in the vicinity of the Project Site as a result of construction impacts to the surrounding roadways associated with the movement of construction equipment, the hauling of soil and construction materials to and from the Project Site, and construction worker trips. However, construction-related traffic, including hauling activities and construction worker trips, would occur outside the typical weekday commuter A.M. and P.M. peak periods to the extent feasible, thereby reducing the potential for traffic-related conflicts. In addition, as with the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction of Office Option Alternative 3 to ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and near the Project Site during construction activities. Therefore, impacts on fire protection services during construction of Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduction in construction activities and duration.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.J.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, of this Draft EIR, the Project Site would continue to be served by Fire Station No. 27, the "first-in" station, as well as Fire Station Nos. 82 and 41. Office Option Alternative 3 would result in less new development than the Project, thus resulting in a smaller service population and lower increase in demand for fire protection and emergency medical services than the Project. Specifically, Office Option Alternative 3 would directly generate an estimated on-site population of 248 persons consisting of 220 employees and 28 residents, compared to the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use, which would generate an estimated on-site population of 1,930 persons consisting of 28 residents and 1,902 employees.[53,54] In addition, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would implement all applicable City Building Code and Fire Code requirements regarding structural design, building materials, site access, fire flow, storage and management of hazardous materials, alarm and communications systems, etc.

With respect to emergency access, similar to the Project, emergency access would be maintained, and traffic generated by Office Option Alternative 3 would not impair the LAFD from responding to emergencies at the Project Site or the surrounding area. In addition, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would implement all applicable City Building Code and Fire Code requirements regarding structural design, building

[53] *Based on rates included in Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) and Los Angeles Department of City Planning (DCP), City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Documentation, May 2020.*

[54] *The Project's Office Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate a total on-site population of 1,938 persons consisting solely of employees.*

materials, site access, fire flow, storage and management of hazardous materials, alarm and communications systems, etc. Therefore, as with the Project, compliance with applicable regulatory requirements, including LAFD's fire/life safety plan review and LAFD's fire/life safety inspection, would ensure that adequate fire prevention features would be provided to reduce the demand on LAFD facilities and equipment.

Based on the above, operation of Office Option Alternative 3 would not require the addition of a new or expanded fire station in order to maintain service. Therefore, as with the Project, operation of Office Option Alternative 3 would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., fire stations), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Police Protection

(a) Construction

As previously described, the types of construction activities required for Office Option Alternative 3 would be similar to those of the Project. However, under Office Option Alternative 3, the overall duration of construction would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduced amount of development and excavation. Similar to the Project, the demand for police protection services during construction of Office Option Alternative 3 would be offset by the removal of the existing uses on the Project Site. In addition, the daytime population at the Project Site during construction would be temporary in nature. Office Option Alternative 3 would implement the same project design features as the Project, which include temporary security measures, such as fencing, lighting, and locked entry, to reduce the potential for theft and vandalism on the Project Site, thereby reducing the demand for police protection services.

With regard to emergency vehicle access, as with the Project, traffic generated during construction of Office Option Alternative 3, including hauling activities and construction worker trips, would occur outside the typical weekday commuter A.M. and P.M. peak periods to extent feasible, reducing traffic-related conflicts. In addition, as with the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction of Office Option Alternative 3 to ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and near the Project Site during construction. Therefore, impacts on police protection services during construction of Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduced construction activities and duration.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.I.2, Public Services—Police Protection, of this Draft EIR, the Project Site would continue to be served by Hollywood Community Police Station. The same would be true under Office Option Alternative 3. While Office Option Alternative 3 and the Project's Office Option would have a similar impact on the existing officer-to-resident population ratio, this alternative would result in less new office development than the Project and no retail or restaurant uses, thus resulting in a smaller non-residential service population and lower net increase in demand for police protection service than the Project. Specifically, Office Option Alternative 3 would directly generate an estimated on-site population of 248 persons consisting of 220 employees and 28 residents, compared to the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use, which would generate an estimated on-site population of 1,930 persons consisting of 28 residents and 1,902 employees.[55,56] Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would implement Project Design Features POL-PDF-2 through POL-PDF-7, which require a standard set of security measures (e.g., closed circuit cameras, keycard entry, etc.) be incorporated into the proposed buildings; sufficient lighting and design of buildings, walkways, and parking areas, to ensure visibility/security; entry and exit points designed to be open and in view of surrounding sites; consultation with LAPD's crime prevention unit; and submitting a diagram of the Project Site to LAPD's Hollywood Division Commanding Officer that includes access routes and any additional information that might facilitate police response. As with the Project, these project design features would help reduce the increase in demand for police services under Office Option Alternative 3. Lastly, because of the reduced amount of new development under this alternative, operational traffic and the potential for impacts to emergency response times would be reduced compared to those of the Project. Based on the above, operation of Office Option Alternative 3, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., police stations), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(3) Schools

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would generate part-time and full-time jobs associated with its construction between the start of construction and full buildout.

---

[55] *Based on rates included in Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) and Los Angeles Department of City Planning (DCP), City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Documentation, May 2020.*

[56] *The Project's Office Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate a total on-site population of 1,938 persons consisting solely of employees.*

However, due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California and the operation of the market for construction labor, construction workers are not likely to relocate their households as a consequence of construction job opportunities. Therefore, construction employment generated by Office Option Alternative 3 would not result in a notable increase in the resident population or a corresponding demand for schools from construction workers in the vicinity of the Project Site. Impacts on school facilities during construction of Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would include new development that would create a demand for LAUSD school facilities (i.e., Grant Elementary School, Joseph Le Conte Middle School, and Hollywood High School). However, the demand for LAUSD facilities under Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than the Project as a result of the reduction in development. Furthermore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would be required to pay the applicable SB 50 development fees for schools, which per Government Code Section 65995, is considered by the State to represent full mitigation of the impact of new development on schools. Based on the above, operation of Office Option Alternative 3, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., schools), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(4) Libraries

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would result in a temporary increase in construction workers on the Project Site. However, due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California and the operation of the market for construction labor, construction workers are not likely to relocate their households as a consequence of the construction job opportunities. Therefore, construction employment generated by Office Option Alternative 3 would not result in a notable increase in the residential population or a corresponding demand for library services in the vicinity of the Project Site. Impacts to library facilities during construction under Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

Residents are considered the primary users of library facilities within a given service area. While Office Option Alternative 3 would be developed with less commercial square

footage than the Project, it would include the same number of residential units as the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use. Specifically, the nine residential units included in Office Option Alternative 3 would generate approximately 28 residents, which is the same as the Project's Office Option. Furthermore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would generate tax revenues for the City's General Fund which would help offset the increases in library demand. Based on the above, operation of Office Option Alternative 3, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., libraries), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project's Office Option.

(5) Parks and Recreation

(a) Construction

Construction of Office Option Alternative 3 would result in a temporary increase in the number of construction workers at the Project Site. As described above, due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California, and the operation of the market for construction labor, the likelihood that construction workers would relocate their households as a consequence of working on Office Option Alternative 3 is low. Therefore, the construction workers associated with Office Option Alternative 3 would not result in a notable increase in the residential population of the Project area, or a corresponding permanent demand for parks and recreational facilities in the vicinity of the Project Site. As such, similar to the Project, construction of Office Option Alternative 3 would not generate a demand for park or recreational facilities that cannot be adequately accommodated by existing or planned facilities and services or interfere with existing park usage. Therefore, impacts on parks and recreational facilities during construction of Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

Residents are considered the primary users of parks and recreation facilities. Similar to the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use, Office Option Alternative 3 would include nine residential units that would create a demand for RAP parks and recreational facilities. However, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would meet City open space requirements through the provision of common open space (e.g., courtyards) and private open space (patios) for its residents. Therefore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 residents would generally utilize on-site open space to meet their recreational needs. Additionally, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would be required to pay parks fees to the City that could be used to add or improve park facilities in the vicinity of the Project Site. Based on the above,

operation of Office Option Alternative 3, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., parks), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project's Office Option.

j. Transportation

Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would generally support applicable transportation plans (Mobility Plan 2035, Plan for a Health Los Angeles, Vision Zero, etc.) and multimodal transportation options. As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would include passenger drop-offs to minimize impacts to the public right-of-way and enhance the user experience by integrating multi-modal transportation options, and new sidewalks, street trees, pedestrian lighting, and bicycle parking in accordance with the LAMC. In accordance with the City's TDM ordinance, Office Option Alternative 3 would also include certain TDM program elements (i.e., display transportation information, such as public transit routes and schedules, bicycle routes and facility information, and ridesharing promotional materials), which would reduce vehicle trips and support bicycle and pedestrian activity. As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would also represent urban infill development near transit, which would encourage alternative transportation use. Therefore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system and impacts. The impacts of Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

With respect to VMT, Office Option Alternative 3 would result in a net increase of less than 250 daily trips (i.e., net daily 16 trips) and is, therefore, screened out from VMT analysis and presumed to have a less-than-significant VMT impact in accordance with LADOT guidelines.[57] Impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would not introduce hazardous geometric design features, and all driveways would be designed to LADOT standards. With respect to freeway safety, as discussed in Section IV.J, Transportation, of this Draft EIR, the Project's Office Option is projected to have a significant safety impact on the US-101 northbound off-ramp to Sunset Boulevard in Future Year 2027, but this impact

[57] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

would be mitigated with the implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1.[58] Because Office Option Alternative 3 would reduce the overall floor area compared to the Project's Office Option, this alternative would generate fewer peak hour trips than the Project. Therefore, even if Office Option Alternative 3 were projected to have a significant safety impact at this off-ramp, implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1 would reduce the impact to a less than significant level. Impacts would be less than the Project because fewer peak hour trips are anticipated and would be less than significant with mitigation.

Lastly, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would not interfere with emergency access as this alternative would implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan during construction to ensure emergency access during the construction period, would not close any existing public streets, and would provide emergency access in accordance with applicable requirements. The impacts of Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

k. Tribal Cultural Resources

As noted above, although Office Option Alternative 3 does not include subterranean parking levels, and grading for building foundations would still be required. While the uncovering of tribal cultural resources is not anticipated, if tribal cultural resources are discovered during construction, such resources would be treated in accordance with State law (i.e., CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(d), PRC Sections 21080.3.1(b), 21080.3.2(a), 21084.3, etc.). Accordingly, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

l. Utilities and Service Systems

(1) Water Supply and Infrastructure

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, construction activities associated with Office Option Alternative 2 would generate a short-term demand for water. This demand would be less than the Project due to the reduction in the amount of construction that would be required under Office Option Alternative 3. As evaluated in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, the Project's temporary and intermittent demand for water during construction could be met by the City's available

[58] *Although the cumulative impact associated with freeway off-ramp safety would remain significant and unavoidable, with implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1, the Project's Office Option's contribution would not be cumulative considerable*

supplies during each year of construction. Also, as with the Project's Office Option, the water demand during construction under this alternative would be offset by the amount of water currently used by existing on-site uses to be removed. Since the water demand for construction activities would be reduced, the temporary and intermittent demand for water during construction under Office Option Alternative 3 would also be expected to be met by the City's available water supplies. Similarly, the existing LADWP water infrastructure would be adequate to provide the water flow necessary to serve Office Option Alternative 3. Furthermore, as with the Project, the design and installation of new service connections under Office Option Alternative 3 would be required to meet applicable City standards. Therefore, impacts on water supply and infrastructure associated with short-term construction activities would be less than significant under Office Option Alternative 3 and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would result in an increase in long-term water demand. As discussed in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, a WSA was prepared by LADWP for the Project, as required by SB 610, which concludes that sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the Project. Because Office Option Alternative 3 would include substantially less new floor area than the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would generate less operational water demand than the Project. Furthermore, as with the Project, in addition to complying with applicable water conservation requirements, Office Option Alternative 3 would incorporate the additional water conservation measures, such as those set forth in Project Design Feature WAT-PDF-1. Therefore, as with the Project, LADWP would also have sufficient water supplies available to serve Office Option Alternative 3 during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.

Regarding water infrastructure, as indicated in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, a conservative analysis for both fire suppression and domestic water flows has been completed by LADWP for the Project as summarized in the Utility Report included as Appendix F of this Draft EIR. As discussed therein, based on the IFFAR, the Project has adequate fire flow available to comply with the standards specified in LAMC Section 57.507.3.1. Because Office Option Alternative 3 would include less net new floor area than the Project and generate a lower operational water demand, adequate water infrastructure capacity also exists to serve Office Option Alternative 3. Therefore, as with the Project, operation of Office Option Alternative 3 would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Based on the above, the operational impacts of Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Wastewater

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, during construction of Office Option Alternative 3, construction activities would not result in wastewater generation as construction workers would typically utilize portable restrooms, which would not contribute to wastewater flows to the City's wastewater system. Furthermore, as with the Project's Office Option, the removal of the existing on-site uses under this alternative would result in a short-term decrease in wastewater discharges to the public sewer system from the Project Site during the construction period. As such, wastewater generation from construction activities associated with Office Option Alternative 3 would not cause a measurable increase in wastewater flows. Therefore, construction of the Project would not substantially or incrementally exceed the future scheduled capacity of any one treatment plant by generating flows greater than those anticipated in One Water LA and the City's IRP.

Additionally, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 may include construction activities associated with the installation of new or relocated sewer connections. Such activities would be confined to trenching in order to place the sewer lines below surface and would be limited to the on-site wastewater conveyance infrastructure and minor off-site work associated with connections to the City's sewer lines in the streets adjacent to the Project Site. Similar to the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during the construction of Office Option Alternative 3 to reduce impacts to pedestrian and traffic flow, including emergency vehicle access, which could occur due to temporary off-site utility work. However, the amount of required wastewater infrastructure improvements and associated construction activities under this alternative would potentially be less than under the Project owing to less development and less associated wastewater generation under this alternative. Therefore, construction-related impacts to the wastewater system under Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduced duration of construction.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.L.2, Utilities and Service Systems—Wastewater, of the Draft EIR, and as with the Project, wastewater generated by Office Option Alternative 3 would be conveyed by LASAN's existing wastewater conveyance system to the HWRP for treatment. Because the existing sewer lines and the HWRP have adequate capacity to serve the Project, and Office Option Alternative 3 would include substantially less

development and generate proportionately less operational wastewater than the Project, the capacities of the sewer system and HWRP serving the Project Site would also be adequate to serve Office Option Alternative 3. Furthermore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 3 would comply with applicable City wastewater infrastructure design and wastewater reduction requirements and implement water conservation measures above applicable requirements, such as those detailed in Project Design Feature WAT-PDF-1, which would also reduce wastewater generation. Lastly, as with the Project, additional detailed sewer gauging and evaluation, as required by LAMC Section 64.14, would be conducted to obtain final approval of sewer capacity and connection permits during the standard required permitting process under both Office Option Alternative 3 and the Project. Therefore, as with the Project, operation of Office Option Alternative 3 would not (1) require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; or (2) result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project, that it has inadequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. The impacts of Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(3) Energy Infrastructure

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, construction activities associated with Office Option Alternative 3 would consume electricity to supply and convey water for dust control and, on a limited basis, may be used to power lighting, electronic equipment, and other construction activities necessitating electrical power. The energy consumed would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduction in the overall amount of construction and duration of construction. Therefore, impacts on energy infrastructure associated with short-term construction activities would be less than significant under Office Option Alternative 3 and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As with the Project, operation of Office Option Alternative 3 would generate an increased consumption of electricity and natural gas when compared to existing conditions. However, the consumption of electricity and natural gas under Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than the Project because of the reduced amount of overall development area. Therefore, impacts to energy infrastructure under Office Option Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

3. Comparison of Impacts

As evaluated above, Office Option Alternative 3 would not eliminate the Project's Office Option's significant and unavoidable impacts associated with on-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative); on-site construction vibration (Project-level only); and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level and cumulative). It would, however, avoid the Office Option's significant and unavoidable impact associated with off-site operational noise (Project-level and cumulative). All other impacts would be less than or similar to the Project's Office Option, which would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.

4. Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

Office Option Alternative 3 would develop office uses like the Project's Office Option but at a reduced density to conform with the Project Site's existing zoning, and would not include development of the Project's retail and restaurant uses. As such, Office Option Alternative 3 would only partially meet the Project's underlying purpose applicable to the Project's Office Option which is to revitalize the infill Project Site by developing an integrated high-density mixed-use development that provides new office space, restaurant uses, and potential multi-family housing opportunities, all of which serve the community and promote walkability. Also, Office Option Alternative 3 would meet the following Project Office Option's objectives, but to a lesser extent than the Project:

- Locate commercial uses in close proximity to transit stations, along transit corridors, and within high-activity areas, which promotes sustainability and reduces VMT, with associated reductions in air quality and GHG emissions.

- To create economic vitality in the community through the creation of construction jobs, and permanent full-time on-site jobs and the generation of revenues to the City in the form of additional sales, business license, and property taxes.

Also, Office Option Alternative 3 would not meet the following Project Office Option objectives:

- Promote local and regional mobility objectives by providing a high-density development comprising office and neighborhood-serving restaurant uses along the Vine Street commercial corner and in close proximity to public transportation.

- Consistent with the City's Walkability Checklist and Citywide Design Guidelines, create a street-level identity for the Project Site and improve the pedestrian

experience through the introduction of active street adjacent uses, such as neighborhood-serving restaurant uses.

However, Office Option Alternative 3 would meet the following objectives to the same extent as the Project's Office Option:

- Redevelop an underutilized infill site while providing for the adaptive reuse of the historic bungalows on-site.
- Promote sustainable development by incorporating "Green" principles, including energy-efficient buildings, a pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly site design, water conservation features, and waste reduction features.

V. Alternatives

F. Office Option Alternative 4: Development in Accordance with Hollywood Community Plan Update Alternative

1. Description of the Alternative

Office Option Alternative 4 would be developed consistent with the proposed zoning under the Hollywood Community Plan Update. Specifically, the four western lots currently zoned as C4-2D-SN would be rezoned as C4-2D-SN-CPIO. One lot currently zoned (T)(Q)C2-2D would be rezoned as [Q]C2-2D-CPIO. Three lots currently zoned as R4-2D would be rezoned as R4-1D-CPIO. Five lots currently zoned as R3-1XL would be rezoned to R3-1XL-CPIO. Office Option Alternative 4 would involve the development of a mid-rise, six-story mixed-use building, consisting of 151,490 square feet of office uses and 13,562 square feet of ground floor restaurant uses. The six bungalows comprising 8,988 square feet would be reused as nine residential units. In addition, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would relocate the six historic bungalows to the eastern portion of the Project Site. Office Option Alternative 4 would provide 2,100 square feet of open space. To accommodate Office Option Alternative 4, the existing low-rise commercial building, eight-unit multi-family building, and ancillary buildings adjacent to the bungalows would be removed.

Overall, Office Option Alternative 4 would comprise 174,040 square feet of floor area with an FAR of 2.15:1, and the footprint of Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than that of the Project. Additionally, at a height of 95 feet, the new building proposed by Office Option Alternative 4 would be shorter than both Project options (i.e., 360 feet 4 inches and 303 feet, respectively). In accordance with LAMC requirements, Office Option Alternative 4 would require and provide 349 vehicle parking spaces within two subterranean levels. Specifically, 331 vehicle parking spaces would be required and provided for commercial uses, and 18 vehicle parking spaces would be required and provided for the residential uses. In accordance with LAMC requirements and City Ordinance No. 185,480, Office Option Alternative 4 would require and provide a total of 71 bicycle parking spaces. Specifically, 10 bicycle parking spaces would be required and provided for residential uses, and 61 bicycle parking spaces would be required and provided for commercial uses.

With regard to construction activities and schedule, it is anticipated that the overall duration of construction would be reduced compared to the Project based on the proposed development under this alternative (e.g., smaller project, shorter tower, and fewer subterranean levels). However, as with the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan and Truck Haul Route Program would be implemented during construction to minimize potential conflicts between construction activity and through traffic. As with the Project, the Construction Traffic Management Plan and Truck Haul Route Program would be subject to LADOT review and approval.

This alternative would implement the same building design, signage, lighting, vehicular and pedestrian access, and sustainability features as those proposed for the Project.

2. Environmental Impact Analysis

a. Air Quality

(1) Construction

(a) Regional and Localized Emissions

Office Option Alternative 4 would involve the same amount of demolition and grading as the Project's Office Option but less excavation, soil export, and new construction. As with the Project, construction of this alternative would generate air emissions through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and haul truck and construction worker trips. While the overall amount of excavation, soil export, and building construction would be less than what is proposed under the Project's Office Option over the entire duration of the construction period, the intensity of air emissions and fugitive dust from demolition, site preparation, grading, and other construction activities would be similar on days with maximum construction activities as the types and amount of construction equipment used would be the same. As discussed in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, construction-related daily maximum regional construction emissions would not exceed any SCAQMD daily significance thresholds, and the maximum localized daily Project-related construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD-recommended localized screening thresholds. Therefore, under Office Option Alternative 4, air quality impacts from localized and regional construction emissions on peak construction days would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Toxic Air Contaminants

As with the Project, construction of Office Option Alternative 4 would generate diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during grading and excavation activities. These activities represent the greatest potential for TAC emissions.

As discussed in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts with regard to TAC emissions during construction. As the construction of Office Option Alternative 4 would be of a shorter duration than that of the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would also not result in a substantial, long-term (i.e., 70-year) source of TAC emissions. Impacts due to TAC emissions under Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project during grading and excavation activities.

(2) Operation

(a) Regional and Localized Emissions

Similar to the Project, operational regional air pollutant emissions associated with Office Option Alternative 4 would be generated by vehicle trips to the Project Site and the consumption of electricity and natural gas. Using the LADOT VMT Calculator, development of Office Option Alternative 4 would result in 1,680 daily vehicle trips compared to 2,972 daily vehicle trips under the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as residential.[59,60] As vehicular emissions depend on the number of trips, vehicular sources would result in a smaller increase in air emissions compared to the Project. In addition, because the overall square footage would be reduced when compared to the Project, demand for electricity and natural gas would be less than the Project. Therefore, impacts associated with regional operational emissions would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

With regard to on-site localized area source and stationary source emissions, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would not introduce any major new sources of air pollution within the Project Site. Therefore, similar to the Project, localized impacts from on-site emission sources associated with Office Option Alternative 4 would also be less than significant. Such impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the overall reduction in building area.

(b) Toxic Air Contaminants

As set forth in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, the primary sources of potential TACs associated with Project operations would include DPM from delivery trucks. Under Office Option Alternative 4, the overall increase in the number of deliveries and associated DPM emissions would be less than the Project due to a smaller floor area.

---

[59] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[60] *The Project's Office Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate 3,534 daily vehicle trips.*

Similar to the Project, the land uses proposed under Office Option Alternative 4 are not considered land uses that generate substantial TAC emissions. Therefore, as with the Project's Office Option, Office Option Alternative 4 would not release substantial amounts of TACs and impacts would be less than significant. Still, because the reduction in floor area, truck deliveries, and associated DPM emissions under Office Option Alternative 3, operational TACs impacts would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

b. Cultural Resources

(1) Historic Resources

As described above, the Project Site includes six bungalows that are included in the Afton Square Historic District. Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would temporarily move the bungalows off-site during construction activity. The bungalows would be relocated to the Project Site and rehabilitated in accordance with a Preservation Plan and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties to ensure they would retain their significance as contributors to the Historic District. Thus, the Historic District would continue to be eligible for listing in the National Register. Therefore, under Office Option Alternative 4, impacts to historic resources would be less than significant and similar to the Project's less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Archaeological Resources

Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would require excavation and grading for building foundations and subterranean parking. In the event that any archaeological resources are unexpectedly encountered during construction, work in the area would temporarily be halted while assessment of the find is conducted by a qualified archaeologist in accordance with the regulatory standards set forth in PRC Section 21083.2 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c) to ensure the appropriate treatment of any potential unique archaeological resources unexpectedly encountered during grading and excavation activities. Therefore, impacts related to archaeological resources under Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project's Office Option.

(3) Human Remains

Similar to archeological resources, the potential to uncover human remains under Office Option Alternative 4 would be similar to the Project's Office Option because excavation and grading for building foundations and subterranean parking levels would still be required. While the uncovering of human remains is not anticipated, if human remains are discovered during construction, such resources would be treated in accordance with

State law, including CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5, PRC Section 5097.98, and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. Therefore, impacts related to human remains under Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project's Office Option.

c. Energy

Similar to the Project as discussed in Section IV.C, Energy, of this Draft EIR, construction activities associated with Office Option Alternative 4 would consume electricity to supply and convey water for dust control and, on a limited basis, may be used to power lighting, electronic equipment, and other construction activities necessitating electrical power. The energy consumed would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduction in the overall amount of construction and associated reduction in the duration of construction under this alternative. Furthermore, as with the Project, construction activities under Office Option Alternative 4 would comply with all applicable requirements relating to energy use.

As with the Project, operation of Office Option Alternative 4 would generate an increased consumption of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum-based fuels compared to existing conditions. However, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would replace the existing low-rise commercial buildings and an eight-unit multi-family building within the eastern portion of the Project Site with new buildings meeting updated energy efficiency standards (e.g., Title 24 energy efficiency standards, 2019 CALGreen Code requirements, Los Angeles Green Building Code requirements, etc.). In addition, Office Option Alternative 4 would result in less operational energy demand than the Project due to the reduction in development. Furthermore, LADWP has confirmed that the electrical infrastructure in the Project area has adequate capacity to serve the Project; thus, adequate capacity would also be available to serve Office Option Alternative 4. In terms of petroleum-based fuel usage, the number of daily trips generated by this alternative would be lower in comparison to the Project due to the reduced floor area under this alternative. Lastly, as with the Project, the consumption of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum-based fuels under this alternative would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary because the development would represent urban infill within an urbanized area in close proximity to transit, which would contribute to an energy efficient land use pattern consistent with SCAG's 2020–2045 RTP/SCS growth forecast in TPAs, because operation of the proposed uses would comply with applicable energy efficiency standards, and because some older buildings would be replaced with new buildings developed to the latest energy efficiency standards.

Therefore, long-term energy use during construction and operation of Office Option Alternative 4 would not occur in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner or conflict with plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Impacts would be less than

significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project because of the overall reduction in energy use.

d. Geology and Soils

(1) Geologic Hazards

Under Office Option Alternative 4, impacts related to site-specific geologic hazards, including fault rupture, strong seismic shaking, and site stability would be similar to those under the Project discussed in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR. This is because such impacts are a function of the Project Site's underlying geologic conditions rather than the types or amounts of land uses proposed. Office Option Alternative 4 would be developed within the same location as the Project and would comply with the same regulatory requirements as the Project to ensure that the soils underlying the Project Site can adequately support the proposed development. As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would be designed and constructed to conform to the current seismic design provisions of the California Building Code and the Los Angeles Building Code. Office Option Alternative 4 would also comply with the same regulatory requirements as the Project, which require the preparation of a final design-level geotechnical engineering report to identify and minimize seismic risks. Therefore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the specific geologic conditions identified in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR. The impacts of Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Paleontological Resources

As discussed in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR, a records search conducted for the Project Site indicates there are no previously encountered fossil vertebrate localities located within the Project Site. Therefore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would not impact known paleontological resources. Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would require excavation and grading for building foundations and subterranean parking. Therefore, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 has a relatively low potential to uncover subsurface paleontological resources during construction. In the event that paleontological resources are encountered during excavation and grading, Office Option Alternative 4 would be subject to the same condition of approval as the Project to ensure that the resources are properly recovered and evaluated. Impacts would be less than significant and similar to the Project's less-than-significant impacts.

e. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GHG emissions from a development project are determined in large part by the number of daily trips generated and energy consumption from proposed land uses. As discussed above, Office Option Alternative 4 would involve the same mix of land uses as the Project's Office Option but would reduce the total amount of development on the Project Site. Therefore, under Office Option Alternative 4, the total energy and water consumption would be reduced when compared to the Project. Additionally, as discussed above in Subsection V.F.2.a.(2)(a), the number of daily vehicle trips generated by Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than the number of trips generated by the Project's Office Option. Thus, the amount of GHG emissions generated by Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than the amount generated by the Project. As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would incorporate project design features to reduce GHG emissions and would be designed to comply with the City's Green Building Ordinance, as applicable. With compliance with the City's Green Building Ordinance and the implementation of comparable sustainability features as the Project, it is anticipated that Office Option Alternative 4 would be consistent with the GHG reduction goals and objectives included in adopted State, regional, and local regulatory plans as set forth in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR. Thus, impacts related to GHG emissions under Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

f. Hydrology and Water Quality

(1) Hydrology

With respect to surface water hydrology, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would slightly increase the percentage of impervious surface area on the Project Site. However, similar to the Project, with implementation of drainage improvements, including the rerouting of and introduction of new storm drains on-site as needed, compliance with NPDES and City requirements, and implementation of BMPs during both construction and operation, stormwater flow rates would be affected only marginally. As with the Project, existing flow patterns and discharge points would be generally maintained under Office Option Alternative 4.

With respect to groundwater hydrology, as with the Project's Office Option, Office Option Alternative 4 would decrease the amount of impervious surface area on-site when compared to existing conditions. However, Office Option Alternative 4 would include a smaller footprint than the Project, including a smaller subterranean parking structure footprint. Hence, there would be some potential for an increase in infiltration of irrigation water and rainwater to the groundwater under this alternative. Nevertheless, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would comply with the City's LID requirements through

BMPs, such as a capture and reuse system. In addition, stormwater, which bypasses the BMP systems, would discharge to an approved discharge point in the public right-of-way and not result in infiltration of a large amount of rainfall that would affect groundwater hydrology, including the direction of groundwater flow. In addition, the subterranean levels would be designed such that they can withstand hydrostatic forces and incorporate comprehensive waterproofing systems in accordance with current industry standards and construction methods. As such, permanent dewatering operations are not expected, and the groundwater level is expected to return to the existing level at the Project Site after construction is complete. Furthermore, while there are supply wells within one mile of the Project Site, similar to the Project, compliance with regulatory requirements would not result in adverse impacts to wells. Lastly, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would not include new injection or supply wells.

Based on the above, impacts to surface and groundwater hydrology would be less than significant and similar to the Project's less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Water Quality

With respect to surface and groundwater quality, Office Option Alternative 4 would introduce the same new land uses on-site as the Project, which would have the potential to generate pollutants that could affect surface water and groundwater. As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would also decrease the percentage of impervious surface area on the Project Site. However, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would comply with NPDES requirements and City regulations, including the implementation of BMPs and compliance with LID requirements through a capture and reuse system. Therefore, impacts to surface and groundwater quality would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

g. Land Use

(1) Physical Division of Community

Office Option Alternative 4 would introduce the same new land uses on-site as the Project. Accordingly, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would be compatible with the uses in the surrounding area and would complement existing and future mixed-use development in the Project area and land uses within the Hollywood Community Plan area. Projects that have been newly constructed or are currently proposed consist of mixed-use developments, new residential, hotel, office, and commercial retail uses. Similar to this alternative, many of the recent developments provide new commercial uses. Thus, as with the Project, this alternative would represent a continuation of those types of projects and be similar to existing uses in the Project vicinity. In addition, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would not physically divide the Afton Square Historic District.

Therefore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would be compatible with the surrounding land uses and would not substantially or adversely change the existing land use relationships between the Project Site and existing and approved off-site uses. As such, impacts associated with physical division of a community under Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Conflict with Land Use Plans

Office Option Alternative 4 would involve the same mix of land uses as the Project's Office Option to the extent permitted by the proposed zoning under the Hollywood Community Plan Update. Accordingly, this alternative's FAR and density would be reduced compared to the Project; specifically, the Project Site under this alternative would have an FAR of 2.15:1 compared to the Project's FAR of 5.98:1. Unlike the Project's Office Option, Office Option Alternative 4 would not require a General Plan Amendment or Vesting Zone and Height District Change, provided the Hollywood Community Plan Update is adopted. All other discretionary approvals would be similar to the Project's Office Option. With approval of the requested discretionary actions and implementation of design features comparable to those of the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would be generally consistent with the overall intent of applicable goals, policies, and objectives in local and regional plans that govern development on the Project Site, including the City's General Plan, the Community Plan, and the LAMC. Thus, impacts related to land use consistency under Residential Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

h. Noise

(1) Construction

The types of construction activities under Office Option Alternative 4 would be substantially similar to the Project, although the construction duration would be reduced due to the reduced development of Office Option Alternative 4 (e.g., smaller project, shorter tower, and fewer subterranean levels). As with the Project, construction of Office Option Alternative 4 would generate noise from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, as well as from haul truck and construction worker trips. While the overall duration of the construction period would be reduced compared to that of the Project, on- and off-site construction activities and construction equipment types and amounts, and the associated construction noise and vibration levels, would be expected to be similar to those of the Project during peak activity days (including off-site hauling), which are used for determining significance. Accordingly, noise and vibration impacts due to on- and off-site construction activities under Office Option Alternative 4 would be similar to those of the Project. Specifically, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would result in (1) less-than-

significant impacts associated with off-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative) and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for building damage (both Project-level and cumulative); (2) less-than-significant impacts with mitigation associated with on-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for building damage (Project-level only); and (3) significant and unavoidable impacts associated with on-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative), on-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance, and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level and cumulative).

(2) Operation

Office Option Alternative 4 would introduce operational noise sources similar to the Project, including (a) on-site stationary noise sources, involving outdoor building mechanical equipment, loading dock and trash compactors, parking, and activities within the proposed outdoor spaces; and (b) off-site mobile (roadway traffic) noise sources. However, it is anticipated that with the overall reduction in total floor area and parking spaces, and the associated reduction in the number of on-site employees and customers, building mechanical equipment pieces, loading docks, trash compactors, and on-site outdoor activity, the noise levels from building mechanical equipment, loading and trash compactors, and outdoor spaces would be reduced.[61] In addition, similar to the Project, on-site mechanical equipment used during operation of Office Option Alternative 4 would comply with the regulations under LAMC Section 112.02, which prohibit noise from air conditioning, refrigeration, heating, pumping, and filtering equipment from exceeding the ambient noise levels on the premises of other occupied properties by more than 5 dBA. Under Office Option Alternative 4, the loading dock and trash collection would be integrated into the northern portion of the building and the trash room would be located within the subterranean parking level, similar to the Project. Thus, noise impacts from loading dock and trash collection areas would be similar to the Project. Also similar to the Project, parking for Office Option Alternative 4 would be provided within subterranean parking levels, which would be effectively shielded from off-site sensitive receptors. The overall area for outdoor spaces under Office Option Alternative 4 would be reduced as compared to the Project, which would reduce the noise associated with the outdoor uses (i.e., people talking and amplified sound). Therefore, operational on-site noise impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduction in total floor area.

---

[61] *While Office Option Alternative 4 would also result in reduced parking noise within the proposed parking structure, the parking structure under both this alternative and the Project would be subterranean. Therefore, it is not anticipated that there would be much if any reduction in operational parking noise impacts at existing sensitive noise receptors under this alternative.*

With regard to off-site noise sources, as noted above, development of Office Option Alternative 4 would result in 1,680 daily vehicle trips compared to 2,972 daily vehicle trips under the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as residential.[62,63] Therefore, off-site noise associated with Project traffic would be less than significant. In addition, cumulative impacts would be less than significant. As such, the Project's Office Option's significant and unavoidable Project-specific and cumulative impact along Afton Place under driveway scenario 3 would be avoided.[64]

i. Public Services

(1) Fire Protection

(a) Construction

As previously described, the types of construction activities required for Office Option Alternative 4 would be similar to those of the Project. However, under Office Option Alternative 4, the overall duration of construction would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduced amount of development and excavation. Similar to the Project, in compliance with OSHA and Fire and Building Code requirements, construction managers and personnel would be trained in emergency response and fire safety operations. Additionally, construction of Office Option Alternative 4 would occur in compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local requirements concerning the handling, disposal, use, storage, and management of hazardous materials. Thus, as with the Project, compliance with regulatory requirements would reduce the potential for construction activities of Office Option Alternative 4 to expose people to the risk of fire or explosion related to hazardous materials.

Construction of Office Option Alternative 4 could also potentially impact the provision of LAFD services in the vicinity of the Project Site as a result of construction impacts to the surrounding roadways associated with the movement of construction equipment, the hauling of soil and construction materials to and from the Project Site, and construction worker trips. However, construction-related traffic, including hauling activities and construction worker trips, would occur outside the typical weekday commuter A.M. and P.M. peak periods to the extent feasible, thereby reducing the potential for traffic-related conflicts. In addition, as with the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would

---

[62] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[63] *The Project's Office Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate 3,534 daily vehicle trips.*

[64] *AES, Alternatives Noise Calculations, October 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

be implemented during construction of Office Option Alternative 4 to ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and near the Project Site during construction activities. Therefore, impacts on fire protection services during construction of Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduction in construction activities and duration.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.J.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, of this Draft EIR, the Project Site would continue to be served by Fire Station No. 27, the "first-in" station, as well as Fire Station Nos. 82 and 41. Office Option Alternative 4 would result in less new development than the Project, thus resulting in a smaller service population and lower increase in demand for fire protection and emergency medical services than the Project. Specifically, Office Option Alternative 4 would directly generate an estimated 28 residents and 660 employees for a total on-site population of 688 persons, compared to the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use, which would generate an estimated on-site population of 1,930 persons consisting of 28 residents and 1,902 employees.[65,66] In addition, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would implement all applicable City Building Code and Fire Code requirements regarding structural design, building materials, site access, fire flow, storage and management of hazardous materials, alarm and communications systems, etc.

With respect to emergency access, similar to the Project, emergency access would be maintained, and traffic generated by Office Option Alternative 4 would not impair the LAFD from responding to emergencies at the Project Site or the surrounding area. In addition, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would implement all applicable City Building Code and Fire Code requirements regarding structural design, building materials, site access, fire flow, storage and management of hazardous materials, alarm and communications systems, etc. Therefore, as with the Project, compliance with applicable regulatory requirements, including LAFD's fire/life safety plan review and LAFD's fire/life safety inspection, would ensure that adequate fire prevention features would be provided to reduce the demand on LAFD facilities and equipment.

Based on the above, operation of Office Option Alternative 4 would not require the addition of a new or expanded fire station in order to maintain service. Therefore, as with

---

[65] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[66] *The Project's Office Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate a total on-site population of 1,938 persons.*

the Project, operation of Office Option Alternative 4 would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., fire stations), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Police Protection

(a) Construction

As previously described, the types of construction activities required for Office Option Alternative 4 would be similar to those of the Project. However, under Office Option Alternative 4, the overall duration of construction would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduced amount of development and excavation. Similar to the Project, the demand for police protection services during construction of Office Option Alternative 4 would be offset by the removal of the existing uses on the Project Site. In addition, the daytime population at the Project Site during construction would be temporary in nature. Office Option Alternative 4 would implement the same project design features as the Project, which include temporary security measures, such as fencing, lighting, and locked entry, to reduce the potential for theft and vandalism on the Project Site, thereby reducing the demand for police protection services.

With regard to emergency vehicle access, as with the Project, traffic generated during construction of Office Option Alternative 4, including hauling activities and construction worker trips, would occur outside the typical weekday commuter A.M. and P.M. peak periods to extent feasible, reducing traffic-related conflicts. In addition, as with the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction of Office Option Alternative 4 to ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and near the Project Site during construction. Therefore, impacts on police protection services during construction of Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduced construction activities and duration.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.I.2, Public Services—Police Protection, of this Draft EIR, and as with the Project, the Project Site under Office Option Alternative 4 would continue to be served by Hollywood Community Police Station. While Office Option Alternative 4 and the Project's Office Option would have the same minimal impact on the existing officer-to-resident population ratio, this alternative would result in less new development than the Project, thus resulting in a smaller non-residential service population and lower net increase in demand for police protection service than the Project. Specifically, Office Option Alternative 4 would directly generate an estimated 28 residents and 660 employees for a total on-site population of 688 persons, compared to the Project's Office Option with

the bungalows retained as a residential use which would generate an estimated on-site population of 1,930 persons consisting of 28 residents and 1,902 employees.[67,68] Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would implement Project Design Features POL-PDF-2 through POL-PDF-7, which require a standard set of security measures (e.g., closed circuit cameras, keycard entry, etc.) be incorporated into the proposed buildings; sufficient lighting and design of buildings, walkways, and parking areas, to ensure visibility/security; entry and exit points designed to be open and in view of surrounding sites; consultation with LAPD's crime prevention unit; and submitting a diagram of the Project Site to LAPD's Hollywood Division Commanding Officer that includes access routes and any additional information that might facilitate police response. As with the Project, these project design features would help reduce the increase in demand for police services under Office Option Alternative 4. Lastly, because of the reduced amount of new development under this alternative, operational traffic and the potential for impacts to emergency response times would be reduced compared to those of the Project. Based on the above, operation of Office Option Alternative 4, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., police stations), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(3) Schools

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would generate part-time and full-time jobs associated with its construction between the start of construction and full buildout. However, due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California and the operation of the market for construction labor, construction workers are not likely to relocate their households as a consequence of construction job opportunities. Therefore, construction employment generated by Office Option Alternative 4 would not result in a notable increase in the resident population or a corresponding demand for schools from construction workers in the vicinity of the Project Site. Impacts on school facilities during construction of Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

---

[67] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[68] *The Project's Office Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would generate a total on-site population of 1,938 persons consisting solely of employees.*

(b) Operation

As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would include new development that would create a demand for LAUSD school facilities (e.g., Grant Elementary School, Joseph Le Conte Middle School, and Hollywood High School). However, the demand for LAUSD facilities under Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than the Project as a result of the reduction in development. Furthermore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would be required to pay the applicable SB 50 development fees for schools, which per Government Code Section 65995, is considered by the State to represent full mitigation of the impact of new development on schools. Based on the above, operation of Office Option Alternative 4, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., schools), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(4) Libraries

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would result in a temporary increase in construction workers on the Project Site. However, due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California and the operation of the market for construction labor, construction workers are not likely to relocate their households as a consequence of the construction job opportunities. Therefore, construction employment generated by Office Option Alternative 4 would not result in a notable increase in the residential population or a corresponding demand for library services in the vicinity of the Project Site. Impacts to library facilities during construction under Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

Residents are considered the primary users of library facilities within a given service area. While Office Option Alternative 4 would be developed with less commercial square footage than the Project, it would include the same number of residential units as the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use. Specifically, the nine residential units included in Office Option Alternative 4 would generate approximately 28 residents, which is the same as the Project's Office Option. Furthermore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would generate tax revenues for the City's General Fund which would help offset the increases in library demand. Based on the above, operation of Office Option Alternative 4, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., libraries), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Office Option Alternative 4 would be less

than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project's Office Option.

(5) Parks and Recreation

(a) Construction

Construction of Office Option Alternative 4 would result in a temporary increase in the number of construction workers at the Project Site. As described above, due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California, and the operation of the market for construction labor, the likelihood that construction workers would relocate their households as a consequence of working on Office Option Alternative 4 is low. Therefore, the construction workers associated with Office Option Alternative 4 would not result in a notable increase in the residential population of the Project area, or a corresponding permanent demand for parks and recreational facilities in the vicinity of the Project Site. As such, similar to the Project, construction of Office Option Alternative 4 would not generate a demand for park or recreational facilities that cannot be adequately accommodated by existing or planned facilities and services or interfere with existing park usage. Therefore, impacts on parks and recreational facilities during construction of Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

Residents are considered the primary users of parks and recreation facilities. Similar to the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use, Office Option Alternative 4 would include nine residential units that would create a demand for RAP parks and recreational facilities. However, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would meet City open space requirements through the provision of common open space (e.g., courtyards) and private open space (patios) for its residents. Therefore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 residents would generally utilize on-site open space to meet their recreational needs. Additionally, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would be required to pay parks fees to the City that could be used to add or improve park facilities in the vicinity of the Project Site. Based on the above, operation of Office Option Alternative 4, as with the Project, would not result in the need for new or altered government facilities (i.e., parks), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts under Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project's Office Option.

j. Transportation

Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would generally support applicable transportation plans (Mobility Plan 2035, Plan for a Health Los Angeles, Vision Zero, etc.) and multimodal transportation options. As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would include passenger drop-offs to minimize impacts to the public right-of-way and enhance the user experience by integrating multi-modal transportation options, and new sidewalks, street trees, pedestrian lighting, and bicycle parking in accordance with the LAMC. In accordance with the City's TDM ordinance, Office Option Alternative 4 would also include certain TDM program elements (i.e., display transportation information, such as public transit routes and schedules, bicycle routes and facility information, and ridesharing promotional materials; designated carpool and vanpool parking close to the main pedestrian entrance; information about preferential carpool/vanpool spaces; bicycle parking in conformance with the LAMC; carpool/vanpool unloading area; sidewalks or other designated pathways connecting the external pedestrian network to each building in the development; safe and convenient access from the external circulation system to bicycle parking facilities on-site; and, if determined necessary by the City, bus stop improvements), which would reduce vehicle trips and support bicycle and pedestrian activity. As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would also represent urban infill development near transit which would encourage alternative transportation use. Therefore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system and impacts. The impacts of Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

With respect to VMT, Office Option Alternative 4 would result in an average household VMT per capita of 3.3, which is below the Central APC threshold of 6.0 and an average work VMT per employee of 5.9 which is below the Central APC threshold of 7.6.[69] This is compared to an average household VMT per capita of 3.0 and average work VMT per employee of 4.9 with the Project's Office Option with the bungalows retained as a residential use.[70] Impacts of the Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant but would be greater than the Project due to a smaller ratio of office and restaurant space to residential units and thus residents having less opportunity to work and/or dine at the Project Site.

---

[69] *Fehr & Peers, Analysis of 1360 N. Vine Street Project Alternatives, November 19, 2021. See Appendix V of this Draft EIR.*

[70] *The Project's Office Option may alternately convert the bungalows to a restaurant use. This scenario would result in a work VMT per employee of 5.2 which is the same as the Project and no household VMT.*

As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would not introduce hazardous geometric design features, and all driveways would be designed to LADOT standards. With respect to freeway safety, as discussed in Section IV.J, Transportation, of this Draft EIR, the Project's Office Option is projected to have a significant safety impact on the US-101 northbound off-ramp to Sunset Boulevard in Future Year 2027, but this impact would be mitigated with the implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1.[71] Because Office Option Alternative 4 would reduce the overall floor area compared to the Project's Office Option, this alternative would generate fewer peak hour trips than the Project. Therefore, even if Office Option Alternative 4 were projected to have a significant safety impact at this off-ramp, implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1 would reduce the impact to a less than significant level. Impacts of Office Option Alternative 2 would be less than significant with mitigation and less when compared to the Project because fewer peak hour trips are anticipated.

Lastly, similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would not interfere with emergency access as this alternative would implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan during construction to ensure emergency access during the construction period, would not close any existing public streets, and would provide emergency access in accordance with applicable requirements. The impacts of Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

k. Tribal Cultural Resources

Similar to the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 requires excavation and grading for building foundations and subterranean parking. While the uncovering of tribal cultural resources is not anticipated, if tribal cultural resources are discovered during construction, such resources would be treated in accordance with State law (i.e., CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(d), PRC Sections 21080.3.1(b), 21080.3.2(a), 21084.3, etc.). Accordingly, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

[71] *Although the cumulative impact associated with freeway off-ramp safety would remain significant and unavoidable, with implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1, the Project's Office Option's contribution would not be cumulative considerable*

I. Utilities and Service Systems

(1) Water Supply and Infrastructure

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, construction activities associated with Office Option Alternative 4 would generate a short-term demand for water. This demand would be less than the Project due to the reduction in the amount of construction that would be required under Office Option Alternative 4. As evaluated in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, the Project's temporary and intermittent demand for water during construction could be met by the City's available supplies during each year of construction. Also, as with the Project's Office Option, the water demand during construction under this alternative would be offset by the amount of water currently used by existing on-site uses to be removed. Since the water demand for construction activities would be reduced, the temporary and intermittent demand for water during construction under Office Option Alternative 4 would also be expected to be met by the City's available water supplies. Similarly, the existing LADWP water infrastructure would be adequate to provide the water flow necessary to serve Office Option Alternative 4. Furthermore, as with the Project, the design and installation of new service connections under Office Option Alternative 4 would be required to meet applicable City standards. Therefore, impacts on water supply and infrastructure associated with short-term construction activities would be less than significant under Office Option Alternative 4 and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would result in an increase in long-term water demand. As discussed in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, a WSA was prepared by LADWP for the Project, as required by SB 610, which concludes that sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the Project. Because Office Option Alternative 4 would include less new floor area than the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would generate less operational water demand than the Project. Furthermore, as with the Project, in addition to complying with applicable water conservation requirements, Office Option Alternative 4 would incorporate the additional water conservation measures, such as those set forth in Project Design Feature WAT-PDF-1. Therefore, as with the Project, LADWP would also have sufficient water supplies available to serve Office Option Alternative 4 during normal, dry, and multiple dry years.

Regarding water infrastructure, as indicated in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, a conservative analysis for both fire suppression and domestic water flows has been completed by LADWP for the

Project as summarized in the Utility Report included as Appendix F of this Draft EIR. As discussed therein, based on the IFFAR, the Project has adequate fire flow available to comply with the standards specified in LAMC Section 57.507.3.1. Because Office Option Alternative 4 would include less net new floor area than the Project and generate a lower operational water demand, adequate water infrastructure capacity also exists to serve Office Option Alternative 4. Therefore, as with the Project, operation of Office Option Alternative 4 would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Based on the above, the operational impacts of Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Wastewater

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, during construction of Office Option Alternative 4, construction activities would not result in wastewater generation as construction workers would typically utilize portable restrooms, which would not contribute to wastewater flows to the City's wastewater system. Furthermore, as with the Project's Office Option, the removal of the existing on-site uses under this alternative would result in a short-term decrease in wastewater discharges to the public sewer system from the Project Site during the construction period. As such, wastewater generation from construction activities associated with Office Option Alternative 4 would not cause a measurable increase in wastewater flows. Therefore, construction of the Project would not substantially or incrementally exceed the future scheduled capacity of any one treatment plant by generating flows greater than those anticipated in One Water LA and the City's IRP.

Additionally, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 may include construction activities associated with the installation of new or relocated sewer connections. Such activities would be confined to trenching in order to place the sewer lines below surface and would be limited to the on-site wastewater conveyance infrastructure and minor off-site work associated with connections to the City's sewer lines in the streets adjacent to the Project Site. Similar to the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during the construction of Office Option Alternative 4 to reduce impacts to pedestrian and traffic flow, including emergency vehicle access, which could occur due to temporary off-site utility work. However, the amount of required wastewater infrastructure improvements and associated construction activities under this alternative would potentially be less than under the Project owing to less development and less associated wastewater generation under this alternative. Therefore, construction-related impacts to the

wastewater system under Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to the reduced duration of construction.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.L.2, Utilities and Service Systems—Wastewater, of the Draft EIR, and as with the Project, wastewater generated by Office Option Alternative 4 would be conveyed by LASAN's existing wastewater conveyance system to the HWRP for treatment. Because the existing sewer lines and the HWRP have adequate capacity to serve the Project, and Office Option Alternative 4 would include less development and generate proportionately less operational wastewater than the Project, the capacities of the sewer system and HWRP serving the Project Site would also be adequate to serve Office Option Alternative 4. Furthermore, as with the Project, Office Option Alternative 4 would comply with applicable City wastewater infrastructure design and wastewater reduction requirements and implement water conservation measures above applicable requirements, such as those detailed in Project Design Feature WAT-PDF-1, which would also reduce wastewater generation. Lastly, as with the Project, additional detailed sewer gauging and evaluation, as required by LAMC Section 64.14, would be conducted to obtain final approval of sewer capacity and connection permits during the standard required permitting process under Office Option Alternative 4. Therefore, as with the Project, operation of Office Option Alternative 4 would not (1) require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects; or (2) result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project, that it has inadequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. The impacts of Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(3) Energy Infrastructure

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, construction activities associated with Office Option Alternative 4 would consume electricity to supply and convey water for dust control and, on a limited basis, may be used to power lighting, electronic equipment, and other construction activities necessitating electrical power. The energy consumed would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduction in the overall amount of construction and duration of construction. Therefore, impacts on energy infrastructure associated with short-term construction activities would be less than significant under Office Option Alternative 4 and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As with the Project, operation of Office Option Alternative 4 would generate an increased consumption of electricity and natural gas when compared to existing conditions. However, the consumption of electricity and natural gas under Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than the Project because of the reduced amount of overall development area. Therefore, impacts to energy infrastructure under Office Option Alternative 4 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

3. Comparison of Impacts

As evaluated above, Office Option Alternative 4 would not eliminate the Project's Residential Option's significant and unavoidable impacts associated with on-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative); on-site construction vibration (Project-level only); and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level and cumulative). It would, however, avoid the Office Option's significant and unavoidable impact associated with off-site operational noise (Project-level and cumulative). Office Option Alternative 4 would result in greater impacts associated with VMT, but these impacts would remain less than significant. All other impacts would be less than or similar to the Project's Office Option, which would be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation.

4. Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

Office Option Alternative 4 would develop the same mix of uses as the Project's Office Option but at a reduced density to conform to the Hollywood Community Plan Update. As such, Office Option Alternative 4 would meet the portion of the Project's underlying purpose applicable to the Project's Office Option, which is to revitalize the infill Project Site by developing an integrated high-density mixed-use development that provides new space, restaurant uses, and potential multi-family housing opportunities, all of which serve the community and promote walkability. However, the Office Option Alternative 4 would be less effective than the Project's Office Option in achieving this underlying purpose owing to the reduced density under this alternative. Also, Office Option Alternative 4 would meet the following Project Office Option's objectives to a lesser extent than the Project:

- Locate commercial uses in close proximity to transit stations, along transit corridors, and within high-activity areas, which promotes sustainability and reduces VMT, with associated reductions in air quality and GHG emissions.

- Promote local and regional mobility objectives by providing a high-density development comprising office and neighborhood-serving restaurant uses along the Vine Street commercial corner and in close proximity to public transportation.

- Consistent with the City's Walkability Checklist and Citywide Design Guidelines, create a street-level identity for the Project Site and improve the pedestrian experience through the introduction of active street adjacent uses, such as neighborhood-serving restaurant uses.

- To create economic vitality in the community through the creation of construction jobs, and permanent full-time on-site jobs and the generation of revenues to the City in the form of additional sales, business license, and property taxes.

Office Option Alternative 4 would, however, meet the following objectives to the same extent as the Project's Office Option:

- Redevelop an underutilized infill site while providing for the adaptive reuse of the historic bungalows on-site.

- Promote sustainable development by incorporating "Green" principles, including energy-efficient buildings, a pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly site design, water conservation features, and waste reduction features.

V. Alternatives

G. Environmentally Superior Alternative

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

Table V-1 on page V-8 provides a summary matrix that compares the impacts associated with the Project with the impacts of each of the analyzed alternatives. A more detailed description of the potential impacts associated with each alternative is provided above. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), the analysis below addresses the ability of the alternatives to "avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects" of the Project.

Alternative 1, the No Project/No Build Alternative, would avoid all of the Project's significant environmental impacts, including those related to on-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative); on-site construction vibration (Project-level); off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level and cumulative); and off-site operational noise (Project-level and cumulative—Office Option). Alternative 1 would eliminate all of the Project's remaining less-than-significant and less-than-significant with mitigation impacts as no changes to the existing conditions would occur. However, Alternative 1 would not meet any of the Project objectives or the Project's underlying purpose to revitalize the infill Project Site by developing an integrated high-density mixed-use development that provides new multi-family housing opportunities (including Very Low Income housing units), neighborhood serving commercial retail/restaurant uses, and a grocery store, or alternatively, a mixed-used development with office space, restaurant uses, and potential multi-family housing opportunities, all of which serve the community and promote walkability.

As stated above, the CEQA Guidelines require the identification of an Environmentally Superior Alternative other than a No Project Alternative. Accordingly, in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, a comparative evaluation of the remaining alternatives indicates that Residential Option Alternative 3 is the Environmentally Superior Alternative to the Project's Residential Option and Office Option Alternative 3 is the Environmentally Superior Alternative to the Project's Office Option. Office Option Alternative 3 would also be the overall Environmentally Superior Alternative.

a. Environmentally Superior Residential Option: Residential Option Alternative 3

As evaluated above, Residential Option Alternative 3, the Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning and Hollywood Community Update Alternative, is the Environmentally Superior Alternative to the Project's Residential Option. Residential Option Alternative 3 would not eliminate the Project's Residential Option's significant and unavoidable impacts associated with on-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative); on-site construction vibration (Project-level only); and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level and cumulative). All other impacts would be less than or similar to the Project's Residential Option. Residential Option Alternative 3 would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative to the Project's Residential Option because it includes fewer subterranean levels and results in fewer daily vehicle trips than both the Project's Residential Option and Residential Option Alternative 2.

Residential Option Alternative 3 would develop the same mix of uses as the Project's Residential Option but at a slightly reduced density to conform to existing zoning and the Hollywood Community Plan Update. As such, Residential Option Alternative 3 would meet the Project's Residential Option's underlying purpose to revitalize the infill Project Site by developing an integrated high-density mixed-use development that provides new multi-family housing opportunities (including Very Low Income housing units), neighborhood serving commercial retail/restaurant uses, and a grocery store to a lesser extent than the Project's Residential Option. Residential Option Alternative 3 would meet most the Project's Residential Option's objectives to a lesser extent than the Project, including the following:

- Consistent with the policies set forth in the City's General Plan Housing Element, provide multi-family housing units to support the much-needed demand for housing including affordable housing.
- Locate residential and commercial uses in close proximity to transit stations, along transit corridors, and within high activity areas, which promotes sustainability and reduces VMT, with associated reductions in air quality and GHG emissions.
- Redevelop an under-utilized infill site while providing for the adaptive reuse of the historic bungalows on-site.
- Promote local and regional mobility objectives by providing a high-density mixed-use development comprising residential and neighborhood-serving commercial uses along the Vine Street commercial corner and in close proximity to public transportation.

- Consistent with the City's Walkability Checklist and Citywide Design Guidelines, create a street-level identity for the Project Site and improve the pedestrian experience through the introduction of active street adjacent uses, such as neighborhood-serving commercial uses.

- Create economic vitality in the community through the provision of construction jobs, and permanent full-time on-site jobs and the generation of revenues to the City in the form of additional sales, business license, and property taxes.

Residential Option Alternative 3 would, however, meet the following objective to the same extent as the Project's Residential Option:

- Promote sustainable development by incorporating "Green" principles, including energy-efficient buildings, a pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly site design, water conservation features, and waste reduction features.

b. Environmentally Superior Office Alternative: Office Option Alternative 3

As evaluated above, Office Option Alternative 3, the Development in Accordance with Existing Zoning Alternative, is the Environmentally Superior Alternative to the Project's Office Option, as well as the overall Environmentally Superior Alternative. Office Option Alternative 3 would not eliminate the Project's Residential Option's significant and unavoidable impacts associated with on-site construction noise (Project-level and cumulative); on-site construction vibration (Project-level); and off-site construction vibration pursuant to the threshold for human annoyance (Project-level and cumulative). It would, however, avoid the Office Option's significant and unavoidable impact associated with off-site operational noise (Project-level and cumulative). All other impacts would be less than or similar to the Project's Office Option. Office Option Alternative 3 would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative to the Project's Office Option because no subterranean levels are proposed and it would result in fewer daily trips than the Project's Office Option, Office Option Alternative 2, or Office Option Alternative 4.

Office Option Alternative 3 would develop office uses at the Project Site like the Project's Office Option, but at a reduced density to conform with the Project Site's existing zoning. This alternative would also not develop ground floor restaurant uses like the Project's Office Option. As such, Office Option Alternative 3 would partially meet the Project's Office Option's purpose to revitalize the infill Project Site by developing an integrated high-density mixed-use development that provides a mixed-used development with office space, restaurant uses, and potential multi-family housing opportunities, all of which serve the community and promote walkability, although it would not provide restaurant uses. Also, Office Option Alternative 3 would not be truly mixed-use, other than

it would include office development and restore the existing on-site bungalows back to their previous residential use.

Office Option Alternative 3 would meet most the Project's Office Option's objectives to a lesser extent than the Project, including the following:

- Locate commercial uses in close proximity to transit stations, along transit corridors, and within high-activity areas, which promotes sustainability and reduces VMT, with associated reductions in air quality and GHG emissions.
- To create economic vitality in the community through the creation of construction jobs, and permanent full-time on-site jobs and the generation of revenues to the City in the form of additional sales, business license, and property taxes.

Also, Office Option Alternative 3 would not meet the following Project Office Option objectives:

- Promote local and regional mobility objectives by providing a high-density development comprising office and neighborhood-serving restaurant uses along the Vine Street commercial corner and in close proximity to public transportation.
- Consistent with the City's Walkability Checklist and Citywide Design Guidelines, create a street-level identity for the Project Site and improve the pedestrian experience through the introduction of active street adjacent uses, such as neighborhood-serving restaurant uses.

Office Option Alternative 3 would, however, meet the following objectives to the same extent as the Project's Office Option:

- Redevelop an underutilized infill site while providing for the adaptive reuse of the historic bungalows on-site.
- Promote sustainable development by incorporating "Green" principles, including energy-efficient buildings, a pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly site design, water conservation features, and waste reduction features.