



656 South San Vicente Medical Office Project

Case Number: ENV-2017-468-EIR

State Clearinghouse: 2020010172

Project Location: 650 – 676 South San Vicente Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90048

Community Plan Area: Wilshire

Council District: 5—Paul Koretz

Project Description: The 656 South San Vicente Medical Office Project (Project) would demolish a 5,738 square-foot, vacant educational building, an 8,225 square-foot commercial building, and associated surface parking in order to develop a medical office and retail-commercial development on an approximately 0.76-acre (33,087 gross square feet, 32,290 net square feet) site located at 650-676 South San Vicente Boulevard (Project Site). The Project would include up to 145,305 square feet of floor area, for a 4.5:1 floor area ratio (FAR) that would include 140,305 square feet of medical office space and 5,000 square feet of ground floor retail-commercial space. The proposed building would be 12 stories and approximately 218 feet in height (230 feet to the top of the mechanical penthouse). The Project would provide 418 parking spaces within four screened, above-ground levels, including 393 vehicle parking spaces for medical office and 25 vehicle parking spaces for retail-commercial uses. The Project would also include 716 bicycle parking spaces.

PREPARED FOR:

The City of Los Angeles
Department of City Planning

PREPARED BY:

Environmental Science Associates (ESA)

APPLICANT:

656–676 SSV Property Owner, LLC and 650 SSV Property Owner, LLC

February 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	3
Technical Corrections and Clarifications.....	4
Conclusion.....	14
Appendix A: Additional Comment Letters	15
List of Tables	
2-1 Additional Comments Received in Response to Draft EIR.....	4

1 INTRODUCTION

This Erratum includes clarifications and minor modifications to the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 656 South San Vicente Medical Office Project (Project). These modifications clarify and refine the EIR and provide supplemental information to the City decision-makers and the public. Specifically, subsequent to completion of the Final EIR, several comment letters were inadvertently omitted from the Final EIR and are therefore addressed below.

CEQA requires recirculation of a Draft EIR only when “significant new information” is added to a Draft EIR after public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR has occurred (refer to California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21092.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5), but before the EIR is certified. CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 specifically states:

New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement. “Significant new information” requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- *A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.*
- *A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted to reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.*
- *A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.*
- *The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.*

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 also provides that “[r]ecirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR [...] A decision not to recirculate an EIR must be supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record.”

As demonstrated by the following discussion, additional responses to comments would not result in new significant impacts or increase the severity of significant impacts already identified in the Draft EIR or Final EIR and, therefore, do not warrant recirculation of the EIR. Specifically, these submitted comments do not constitute “significant new information” as that term is defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. Thus, none of the conditions in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines are met, and recirculation is not required.

2 TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

2.1 Introduction

Several Draft EIR comment letters were inadvertently omitted from the Final EIR circulated on January 7, 2022. **Table 2-1, Comments Received in Response to the Draft EIR**, provides a list of the additional comment letters received by the City. Table 2-1 also summarizes the environmental issues raised by each commenter regarding the Draft EIR.

Section 2.2, Responses to Comments, below, presents the additional comment letters submitted during the public comment period for the Draft EIR. Each letter/correspondence is assigned a number and each comment that requires a response within a given letter/correspondence is also assigned a number. A copy of each comment letter is provided in **Appendix A, Additional Comment Letters**, of this Erratum.

As required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(c), the focus of the responses to comments is “the disposition of significant environmental issues raised.” Therefore, detailed responses are not provided to comments that do not relate to environmental issues. However, in some cases, additional information has been added for reference and clarity.

**TABLE 2-1
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS RECEIVED IN RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT EIR**

No.	From	Date Received	Aesthetics	Air Quality	Cultural Resources	Geology and Soils	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Noise and Vibration	Traffic	Alternatives	Other	Request for Extension	Support
Individuals													
IND 7	Amy Galaudet 6120 W. 5 th St. Los Angeles, CA 90048	07/31/2021						X	X		X		
IND 8	Andrew Lichtstein	07/31/2021							X		X		
IND 9	Ann Rubin 6524 Commodore Sloat Dr. Los Angeles, CA 90048	08/02/2021	X					X	X		X		

2.2 Response to Comments

Comment Letter No. IND 7

Amy Galaudet
6120 W. 5th St.
Los Angeles, CA 90048
Received July 31, 2021

Comment No. IND 7-1

Here are the facts that are of great concern to the community. and these are dire concerns.

Environmental concerns. The non stop construction, has left this city in a highly impacted state, Nothing health wise is being enforced.

Noise, I read in Yesterday AARP that noise causes stroke and heart attacks. not to mention hearing damage. I knew this before. as I have , scientists and Doctor's in my own family.

To, sit in clogged, unrelenting traffic congestion is a major health issue. Trying to get home with blocked streets, and stalled traffic because a developer/speculator decided to mark our city causes anger and rage, that in turn causes all kind of heath issues, and death.

Digging into the earth brings up Fungi, Bacterium, diesel, methane, and all kinds of deadly material that becomes airborne, and this is what we breathe, You breath, your family and mine. and children, And for what, more empty buildings, more teardowns so foreign money can be laundered Big 5 was a staple in our community. We need another office building in a Residential neighborhood, big rigs, cranes, non stop noise.

Response to Comment No. IND 7-1

This comment expresses concern regarding traffic, noise, and hazardous materials related to human health. Transportation impacts were analyzed in **Section IV.I, *Transportation***, of the Draft EIR, with supporting information provided in the Transportation Assessment, included in Appendix J-1 of the Draft EIR. The analysis in **Section IV.I, *Transportation***, of the Draft EIR concluded that impacts related to transportation would be less than significant. Noise and vibration impacts were analyzed in **Section IV.G, *Noise***, of the Draft EIR, with supporting information provided in the Noise Analysis, included in Appendix H of the Draft EIR. The analysis in **Section IV.G, *Noise***, of the Draft EIR concluded that construction noise would result in a significant and unavoidable impact, even with the implementation of mitigation measures. Airborne pollutant impacts were analyzed in **Section IV.A Air Quality**, of the Draft EIR, which concluded that impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

Comment No. IND 7-2

What happened to all the mom and pop bushiness', gone, because of speculator. What have to over 23,000. rent controlled apartments and the people that lived in them?

The middle class is going. We all need a middle class, like a hive needs the worker bees and the carpenter bees. A city can subsist with only the rich. and rich do not ride the subway, No one rides the subway during another pandemic or just flue season.

I am disheartened by the lack of concern shown by the developer/speculator, It screams loud and clear, "we don't care about you.

Another fatal mistake is not have a design review board, The outrageous ugliness being put up is another concern, although not as dire as our heath.

I am an owner of residential, and commercial property, and disheartened at what is going on in my city.

Response to Comment No. IND 7-2

This comment expresses an opinion regarding local businesses and is unrelated to the environmental review process. This comment does not raise any specific issues with respect to the content and adequacy of the Draft EIR and, as such, no further response is warranted. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their review and consideration.

Comment No. IND 7-3

I get my info from many sources, as more, and more people are becoming aware of what the city. and Sacramento has been doing to destroy, the peace and comfort of our lives, while not accomplishing anything.

Putting up another useless building when so many are empty does not make sense.. As for the middle class. Talking about it for about 20 years and doing nothing just proves what is happening in Sacramento.

Taking away local control. and building luxury is a farce. Because the owner of the Times Newspaper does not print, the plans to up zone our homes homes, and tear down historic buildings, because he is a Real Estate mogul tells us a lot. That the TV News does not discuss the the horror of what is happening, Tells us much. But, more and more people are finding out. Talk about Climate Change, and keep poisoning our air, Thanks you so, for keeping us informed. Right now there are many more organizations that are getting the word out.

Please be part of it. It is your city, our city, and Speculators are trying to take it from us,

Response to Comment No. IND 7-3

This comment expresses an opinion unrelated to the environmental review process. This comment does not raise any specific issues with respect to the content and adequacy of the Draft EIR and, as such, no further response is warranted. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. IND 8

Andrew Lichtstein
Received July 31, 2021

Comment No. IND 8-1

I am writing you today to voice my opposition to this project.

As a 30+ year resident and homeowner in Beverly Grove, I am concerned about its scale, our aging utility infrastructure, the environmental impact, the disruptive traffic and the lack of commitment to affordable housing.

It seems planning is quick to green light projects that benefit developers and speculators (residential and commercial) and ignore the real needs of the city and its community at large.

Approval should be granted for affordable housing solutions for workers in the area - aids, nurses, teachers, retail, and community services - residents, and people WHO USE Metro.

This the mission of Transit Oriented Community. This medical building proposal, in an area of already abundant vacant office space is illogical and renders the TOC a fraud.

I am NOT opposed to building affordable housing ON major thoroughfares in Los Angeles - this building is not that.

However, building NEW it is NOT the IMMEDIATE solution to housing and integrating the unhoused population.

This....Is not housing.

It's unsafe for the surrounding neighbors and residents.

It's unnecessary

Response to Comment No. IND 8-1

This comment expresses opposition to the Project, expresses opinion about affordable housing/transit-oriented projects, and expresses concern about environmental impacts related to utility infrastructure and traffic. Utility infrastructure is addressed in **Section XIX, Utilities and Service Systems**, of the Initial Study, provided in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. The analysis therein concluded that the Project would have a less-than-significant impact as it relates to utilities and service systems. Transportation impacts were analyzed in **Section IV.I, Transportation**, of the Draft EIR, with supporting information provided in the Transportation Assessment, included in Appendix J-1 of the Draft EIR. The analysis in **Section IV.I, Transportation**, of the Draft EIR concluded that impacts related to transportation would be less than significant. Regarding transit-oriented developments (TODs), as stated in **Section IV.J, Transportation** of the Draft EIR, CEQA streamlining afforded to TODs under Senate Bill 375 applies to mixed use projects that (1) are at least 50 percent residential, (2) meet density requirements, and (3) are within 0.5 mile of a transit stop. Because the Project is located within 0.5 mile of a transit stop, it meets these requirements and does not have to include residential uses to achieve streamlining in accordance with Senate Bill 375.

Comment Letter No. IND 9

Ann Rubin
6524 Commodore Sloat Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90048
Received August 2, 2021

Comment No. IND 9-1

As a resident of the nearby Carthy Circle neighborhood and with deep concern for the quality of life in our area, I am writing in response to the draft EIR for the proposed medical building on the sites of Big 5 and Montesorri school on San Vicente, just north of Wilshire.

Re-Zoning:

Primarily, I remain unconvinced that the overall size of the proposed building is appropriate for this small corner lot, with tremendous negative impacts on the residents and property owners of the Beverly Grove neighborhood that will render their apartments undesirable because of the reduced quality of life. I am concerned about shadows and stealing the sun from residential properties that would reduce the wellness of people and decrease property values. There is insufficient buffer/transition area between the proposed building and residential buildings. The building is simply too massive for the lot.

IF the building provided *affordable* housing, including for the workers at Cedars, I would likely be amenable to the extra height. This discretionary development — so close to the Purple Metro stop — is better suited to housing, not a medical building that attracts an enormous number of patrons all day long and via automobiles and adds no street-life in the evenings. The zoning change should not be granted.

Moreover, the proposed zoning change would set precedent for changing the zoning on more parcels north on San Vicente along the western border of the Beverly Grove neighborhood, and this is incompatible with the neighborhood, as well as removes our vistas. We understand that Wilshire is zoned for unlimited height, and we live with that — but this corner is not on Wilshire.

Response to Comment No. IND 9-1

This comment expresses concern that the Project is too large for the lot, that shade and shadow could impact residential properties, that the Project would be better suited for affordable housing, and that the zone change would set a precedent. As explained in **Section IV.F, Land Use and Planning**, on page IV.F-24, with the vesting zone change from C1 to the proposed zoning C2, there are no yard requirements applicable to the Project. Additionally, no zone setbacks are required for non-residential projects in the C Zone. As such, the Project's proposed zero-foot front yard, side yard, and rear yard setbacks would be consistent with this proposed zoning. Further, Site Plan Review is required for the addition of 50,000 square feet or more of nonresidential floor area. As the Project would include the addition of approximately 145,305 square feet of medical office and commercial floor area, Site Plan review would be required and would therefore be obtained as part of the entitlement process.

Regarding the height of the building, as explained in **Section IV.F, Land Use and Planning**, on page IV.F-24, while the Project would result in a building height that is taller than what the current zoning would allow (which would be limited to three stories and 45 feet in height), the proposed

12-story medical office building would be compatible with development along South San Vicente Boulevard and Wilshire Boulevard, which is characterized by a mix of mid-to high-rise buildings, including a 10-story office building with ground floor commercial uses directly across from the Project Site, a 22-story medical office building fronting Wilshire Boulevard to the southeast of the Project Site, and a 12-story office building to the east of the Project Site. Because the Project is located within a Transit Priority Area and meets the criteria of Senate Bill 743 and the City's Zoning Information File No. 2452, visual resources, aesthetic character, shade and shadow, light and glare, and scenic vistas, and any other aesthetic impact as defined in the City's CEQA Threshold Guide would not be considered an impact (Draft EIR page II-6). The Draft EIR also evaluates impacts on aesthetics in **Section I, Aesthetics**, of the Initial Study, provided in Appendix A of the Draft EIR, which explains that the Project cannot have a substantial adverse effect on aesthetic resources pursuant to PRC Section 21099(d)(1) and ZI No. 2452.

As stated in **Section IV.J, Transportation** of the Draft EIR, CEQA streamlining afforded to transit-oriented developments (TODs) under Senate Bill 375 applies to mixed use projects that (1) are at least 50 percent residential, (2) meet density requirements, and (3) are within 0.5 mile of a transit stop. Because the Project is located within 0.5 mile of a transit stop, it meets these requirements and does not have to include residential uses to achieve streamlining in accordance with Senate Bill 375.

Comment No. IND 9-2

Parking and cars:

This project proposes a multi-level parking lot just 2 blocks from the Metro Purple subway stop slated to open in 2023. This completely violates the City's and State's intent and policies to reduce VMTs and to promote the development of denser housing to reduce the impacts of climate change. The last thing we need is another major parking lot that will add more cars to the streets, increasing danger, pollution, and stress, just when we thought VMTs would be reduced as drivers abandon their cars for the new subway. If this development was for housing, residents who want to rely on public transit could self-select for renting the units or purchasing condominium units. While I understand needing parking spaces for some medical patients, do we need to build parking spaces for doctors, nurses, and employees who want to drive private cars to work? If the developer is granted all these profitable concessions at the expense of the community good, shouldn't it be required to significantly fund First/Last Mile subway stop improvements as part of mitigations?

Response to Comment No. IND 9-2

This comment expresses an opinion that the Project includes too much parking. As detailed in **Chapter II, Project Description**, of the Draft EIR, the Project meets the criteria of Senate Bill (SB) 743 and Zoning Information (ZI) File No. 2542, pursuant to PRC Section 21099 (d)(1), that states a project's "aesthetic and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project on an infill site within a transit priority area shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment." As such, parking impacts would not be considered significant under CEQA. As further detailed in **Chapter II, Project Description**, of the Draft EIR, the Project is requesting a parking reduction not to exceed 20 percent pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 12.32 P, as well as replace up to 30 percent of required automobile parking spaces with bicycle spaces (at a rate of four bicycle parking spaces per one

automobile parking space) pursuant to LAMC Section 12.21.A.4(c). The net total parking requirement for the Project is 418 spaces. Thus, as the Project is requesting a parking reduction, fewer vehicle parking spaces would be implemented than would otherwise be required per LAMC.

Comment No. IND 9-3

Major Intersection of San Vicente and Wilshire:

Any development on this corner needs to be part of larger redesign improvements for the intersection at San Vicente and Wilshire to ensure pedestrian safety and comfort while walking to and from subway stops and the neighborhoods. San Vicente and Wilshire Blvd is a dangerous, very large intersection for both pedestrians and drivers, in particular because of the angle of San Vicente. This intersection will be used by many more pedestrians once the Purple Metro subway stop opens. We must have a safe and hospitable pedestrian pathway. Many of us depend on the buses on Wilshire and need to safely cross the intersection that will be exponentially busier because of the new medical building.

** Key question: How will vehicles traveling from the north from Burton Way, San Vicente, and La Cienega on to San Vicente south get over to the east side of San Vicente to access the valet service? ** This traffic pattern will increase VMTs in the Beverly Grove and Carthay Circle neighborhoods. The traffic circulation plan for entering this building will cause havoc on the area and needs to be more closely evaluated.

I do not think the traffic impact has been sufficiently considered under normal pre-Pandemic conditions. In terms of my own neighborhood of Carthay Circle, please study the development's impact on traffic on San Vicente, between 6th Street and Fairfax. San Vicente is either a dangerous raceway (speed limit is 40 MPH) or a miserable traffic jam that will only be exacerbated by the proposed medical building.

Response to Comment No. IND 9-3

This comment expresses concern regarding pedestrian safety, vehicle access and traffic patterns, and pre-pandemic traffic volumes. The Project does not include any improvements that alter the geometry of the San Vicente Boulevard and Wilshire Boulevard intersection, and therefore would not have any impact on the street configuration and geometry that could impact pedestrian or vehicular safety. In addition, LADOT has reviewed and signed off on the proposed site plan. LADOT has the sole authority to alter the existing geometry of crosswalks. As detailed in **Section IV.I, *Transportation***, of the Draft EIR, the Project would explore opportunities to manage site access and circulation operations as well as provide road safety enhancements for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit users, which can include contribution toward signal improvements and crosswalk upgrades at adjacent intersections. Additionally, as it relates to cumulative traffic impacts during construction of projects such as the Purple Line extension, the Project and related projects would be required to implement a construction traffic management plan (refer to Project Design Feature TRAF-PDF-2 and TRAF-PDF-3 as provided in **Section IV.I, *Transportation***, of the Draft EIR) to reduce impacts.

To evaluate the operational conditions at the intersections, traffic volume counts at the nearby intersections were collected in January and February 2020, as detailed on page 13 of the Transportation Assessment. The traffic volume counts were also compared to traffic volume data

collected in 2017, which predates on-going construction, including but not limited to Metro construction for subway stations, in the vicinity of the Project. It was determined that the traffic volume counts collected in 2020 was higher at each of the study intersection, and, thus, for conservative purposes, the traffic volume counts in 2020 were used as the basis of the non-CEQA operational evaluation of the Transportation Assessment.

Comment No. IND 9-4

Building Materials:

I am concerned about reflective sun-glare, or heat, from the building into residential areas, including on San Vicente, Schumacher, and Commodore Sloat in Carthay Circle HPOZ, where we have small houses and duplexes (with period-era windows) and enjoy walking our residential streets, as do many office workers on Wilshire and visitors from adjacent neighborhood. We are the de factor open space for this densifying area, and we don't want this proposed over-sized building to degrade the use of our landscape, or the enjoyment of our homes.

Response to Comment No. IND 9-4

This comment expresses concern regarding the potential for reflective sun-glare or heat from the Project on the Carthay Circle HPOZ, located south of the intersection of San Vicente Boulevard and Wilshire Boulevard. Light and glare impacts are addressed in **Section I, Aesthetics**, of the Initial Study, provided in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. As explained therein, all glass used in the Project building would have minimal reflectivity to reduce glare to surrounding neighbors. As required by LAMC Section 93.0117(b), exterior light sources and building materials would be designed such that they would not cause more than two (2) foot-candles of lighting intensity or generate direct glare onto exterior glazed windows or glass doors on properties containing residential units. Additionally, the Project cannot have a substantial adverse effect on aesthetic resources pursuant to PRC Section 21099(d)(1) and ZI No. 2452. **Section IV.B, Cultural Resources**, addresses the specific concern regarding the visual environment in the Carthay Circle HPOZ on page IV.B-33: "Similarly, the primary character-defining viewsheds for the Carthay Circle HPOZ are within and along the subdivision streets and would be retained." Impacts to historic resources in the vicinity of the Project would be less than significant.

Comment No. IND 9-5

Decorative High-Rise Lighting:

I oppose any nighttime artificial lighting that could be seen in the Carthay Circle HPOZ residential neighborhood. This would be night-sky blight and visual pollution that would mar our beautiful evening skies, adding insult to injury for blocking the existing view of the Hollywood Hills that belongs to us all.

Response to Comment No. IND 9-5

The comment expresses opposition to nighttime lighting associated with the Project. Light impacts are addressed in **Section I, Aesthetics**, of the Initial Study, provided in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. As explained in that section, new lighting required for the proposed development would include building identification, commercial accent lighting, wayfinding, balcony/garden lighting, and security lighting. However, as required by LAMC Section 93.0117(b), exterior light sources and building materials would be designed such that they would not cause more than two (2) foot-

candles of lighting intensity or generate direct glare onto exterior glazed windows or glass doors on properties containing residential units. Light fixtures would be shielded and directed towards the areas to be lit and away from adjacent light-sensitive residential land uses. Additionally, the Project cannot have a substantial adverse effect on aesthetic resources pursuant to PRC Section 21099(d)(1) and ZI No. 2452.

Comment No. IND 9-6

Landscaping and Green Issues:

Any new building must include sufficient number of large trees — planted in the ground — and permeable ground to absorb rain runoff, instead of sending polluted water into storm drains and out to the ocean. This area floods during rains. This is an acute problem on nearby Wilshire. The proposed building does not include sufficient setbacks to allow for the planting of trees of significant size that are needed to eventually help reduce heat-island effect. Any QUIMBY Funds should support parks in the immediate area to mitigate negative impacts.

Mitigations should include requiring the owner of the proposed development to maintain the portion of the San Vicente median to the west of the building. These medians have important, large mature trees. Gaps exist where more trees should be planted with appropriate ground cover. This will help clean air, calm traffic, buffer sounds, cool the environment, and more benefits to the urban ecology. Can the proposed development be compelled to be responsible for maintenance — including irrigation — going forward?

Response to Comment No. IND 9-6

This comment expresses an opinion that the Project must include trees and landscaping. As detailed in **Chapter II, Project Description**, of the Draft EIR, there are seven trees existing on the Project Site, all of which are significant (eight inches or greater of cumulative trunk diameter if multi-trunked, as measured 54 inches above ground), non-protected trees, as discussed in the Tree Report, provided in Appendix A, Initial Study. The Project would replace all significant, non-protected trees at 1:1 ratio with a minimum of 24-inch box tree. As illustrated in Figure II-9, the Project would provide 17 trees on the ground level, with additional trees provided in the small terraced landscaped patios on Floors 6 through 10. Because the Project includes approval of a Vesting Tentative Tract map, the Project would pay required Quimby Fees. The Project Site does not extend into the median on San Vicente to the west of the Project Site, and therefore no mitigation or tree planting is required at those locations.

Regarding flooding, which is addressed in **Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality**, of the Initial Study, provided in Appendix A of the Draft EIR, the Project Site is currently largely covered in impervious surfaces and implementation of the Project would result in a net decrease in impervious surfaces, and would therefore not alter any course of a stream or river. In addition, the required LID features that would be incorporated into the Project design would control stormwater runoff and result in a minor decrease in runoff. Thus, the peak stormwater flows would be virtually the same or less than existing conditions.

Comment No. IND 9-7

Negative Impacts During Construction:

I am concerned about construction noise during evenings and weekends. We ask for no construction on weekends.

Friday nights and Saturdays are particularly quiet (and sacred) in our area, and deeply valued after the noisy and endless car traffic subsides from the workweek. Carthay Circle is surrounded and bi-sected by major traffic thoroughfares, so we get more than our fair share of noise, including from emergency vehicles enroute to Cedars Medical Center.

Thank you for considering these concerns.

Response to Comment No. IND 9-7

As explained in **Chapter II, *Project Description***, of the Draft EIR, construction hours would occur in accordance with the LAMC requirements, which prohibit construction between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., Monday through Friday, 6:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. on Saturday, and at any time on Sunday. Noise and vibration impacts were analyzed in **Section IV.G, *Noise***, of the Draft EIR, with supporting information provided in the Noise Analysis, included in Appendix H of the Draft EIR. The analysis in **Section IV.G, *Noise***, of the Draft EIR concluded that construction noise would result in a significant and unavoidable impact, even with the implementation of mitigation measures.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis presented above, the changes to the EIR set forth in this Erratum do not result in any of the conditions set forth in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines requiring recirculation of the Draft EIR. Specifically, the information included in this Erratum does not disclose any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of an impact already identified in the Draft EIR, nor does it contain significant new information that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project or a feasible alternative or mitigation measure that the Applicant has declined to adopt. All of the information added in this Erratum merely clarifies, corrects, adds to, or makes insignificant modifications to information in the EIR. The City has reviewed the information in this Erratum and has determined that it does not change any of the basic findings or conclusions of the EIR, does not constitute “significant new information” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, and does not require recirculation of the EIR.