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

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

This section of the Final EIR provides revisions, clarifications, and corrections to the Draft EIR that have been made to revise, clarify, or correct the environmental impact analysis for the 1000 Seward Project (Project) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15132(a). For the reasons set forth in Section III.C, below, the revisions, clarifications, and corrections described in this section do not result in any "new significant information" or any new or increased significant environmental impacts associated with the Project pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, and merely clarify, amplify, or refine information in the Draft EIR.

This section is divided into three parts: Section III.A, General Revisions and Corrections to the Draft EIR; Section III.B, Revisions and Corrections to Draft EIR Sections and Appendices; and Section III.C, Effect of Revisions and Corrections.

## A. General Revisions and Corrections to the Draft EIR

Since publication of the Draft EIR, minor revisions have been made to the building design. Specifically, the building height has been reduced by one floor from ten to nine; two levels of above grade parking have been removed; and the distribution of the Project's square footage has been changed. Within the proposed development, there has been a slight increase in office and retail square footage and a slight decrease in restaurant square footage. Provided below are revisions to the Project Description that apply to the entirety of the Draft EIR:

Section II, Project Description, page II-1, revise the first and second paragraphs as follows:

> The 1000 Seward Project (Project) includes the development of a ~~ten~~ nine-story, mixed-use office building on a 34,152 square-foot (0.78-acre) site located at 1000 and 1006 Seward Street; 1003, 1007, and 1013 Hudson Avenue; and 6565 Romaine Street (Project Site) in the Hollywood Community Plan area of the City of Los Angeles (City). The Project would include the

development of new office, restaurant, and retail uses totaling 150,600 square feet. Specifically, the Project would develop ~~136,200~~ 136,984 square feet of office uses, ~~12,200~~ 11,152 square feet of restaurant uses (of which 6,100 square feet may be used for an entertainment use on the roof level), and ~~2,200~~ 2,464 square feet of retail uses. The proposed uses would be located within a single ~~ten~~-nine-story building (with an additional rooftop level for mechanical equipment and an outdoor tenant terrace) with a maximum height of ~~133~~ 127 feet 6 inches to the top of the highest occupiable level (i.e., roof level) and a maximum height of 155 feet to the top of the~~ mechanical equipment level~~ elevator shaft. In accordance with the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC), the Project would provide 310 vehicular parking spaces and 58 bicycle parking spaces (36 long-term and 22 short-term) within four subterranean parking levels, one at-grade level, and ~~three~~ one fully enclosed and mechanically ventilated above grade parking level~~s~~.

Section II, Project Description, page II-6, revise the last paragraph as follows:

The Project proposes to develop new office, restaurant, and retail uses totaling 150,600 square feet. As shown in Revised Table II-1 on page ~~II-7~~ III-3 of the Final EIR, the Project would demolish both existing buildings on the Project Site and develop ~~136,200~~ 136,984 square feet of office uses, ~~12,200~~ 11,152 square feet of restaurant uses (of which 6,100 square feet may be used for an entertainment use), and ~~2,200~~ 2,464 square feet of retail uses. The proposed uses would be located within a single ~~ten~~ nine-story building (with an additional rooftop level for mechanical equipment and an outdoor entertainment/tenant terrace) with a maximum height of ~~133~~ 127 feet 6 inches to the top of the highest occupiable level and a maximum height of 155 feet to the top of the~~ mechanical equipment level~~ elevator shaft. The Project would result in 150,600 square feet of floor area within the Project Site with a FAR of 4.4:1. In accordance with the LAMC, the Project would provide 310 vehicular parking spaces and 58 bicycle parking spaces (36 long-term and *22* short-term) within four subterranean levels, one at-grade level, and ~~three~~ one fully enclosed and mechanically ventilated above grade parking level~~s~~.

Section II, Project Description, page II-7, replace Table II-1 with Revised Table II-1 on page III-3 as follows:

**Revised Table II-1**
**Summary of Proposed Floor Area**[a]

| Land Use | Floor Area |
|---|---|
| Office | ~~136,200 sf~~<br>136,984 sf |
| Restaurant[b] | ~~12,200 sf~~<br>11,152 sf |
| Retail | ~~2,200 sf~~<br>2,464 sf |
| **Project Total** | **150,600 sf** |

*sf = square feet*

[a] *Square footage is calculated pursuant to the LAMC definition of floor area for the purpose of calculating FAR. In accordance with LAMC Section 12.03, floor area is defined as "[t]he area in square feet confined within the exterior walls of a building, but not including the area of the following: exterior walls, stairways, shafts, rooms housing building-operating equipment or machinery, parking areas with associated driveways and ramps, space for the landing and storage of helicopters, and basement storage areas."*

[b] *6,100 square feet may be used for entertainment uses.*

*Source: Hawkins Brown, ~~2020~~ 2023.*

Section II, Project Description, page II-7, revise the second and third sentences of the first paragraph as follows:

> Above the ground level, ~~Levels 2 and 3~~ the mezzanine would include additional parking and additional office uses. Levels ~~4~~ 3 through ~~9~~ 8 would include office uses and several outdoor terraces and Level ~~10~~ 9 would feature restaurant/hospitality/entertainment uses, office uses, and an outdoor dining terrace.

Section II, Project Description, page II-9, revise the second and third sentences of the first full paragraph as follows:

> Tenant terraces would be located on Levels 2, 3, 4, ~~5,~~ 7, 8, 9, and the roof and would feature lounge seating and landscaping. Meanwhile Level ~~10~~ 9 would include a restaurant/entertainment terrace.

Section II, Project Description, page II-9, revise the last sentence of the second full paragraph as follows:

> Secondary pedestrian access would be available along Seward Street, including access to the Level ~~10~~ 9 restaurant.

Section II, Project Description, page II-11, revise the second sentence of the second paragraph as follows:

> The Project provides 310 vehicle parking spaces within four subterranean levels, which would extend to a maximum depth of 45 feet, one at-grade level that would be enclosed with the exception of the entrance, and in ~~three~~ one fully enclosed and mechanically ventilated above grade parking level~~s~~.

As discussed in detail below in Section C, Effect of Revisions and Corrections, the overall change is so slight, these revisions have little or no effect on the analysis included throughout the Draft EIR. This conclusion is supported by memoranda addressing this change related to Air Quality-GHG-Energy and Transportation, which are included in Appendices FEIR-4 and FEIR-5, respectively. Accordingly, corrections and additions to the Draft EIR reflecting this change have been made only where the Project Design Features or Mitigation Measures are affected.

# B. Revisions and Corrections to Draft EIR Sections and Appendices

Additional changes have been made to the Draft EIR as a result of public and agency comments received in response to the Draft EIR and/or new information that has become available since publication of the Draft EIR. Deletions are shown in ~~strikethrough text~~ and additions are shown in underlined text. Such changes are presented by EIR section.

## I. Executive Summary

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-15, revise Project Design Features NOI-PDF-4 and NOI-PDF-5 as follows:

> **Project Design Feature NOI-PDF-4:** Outdoor amplified sound systems, if any, will be designed so as not to exceed the maximum noise level of 70 dBA ($L_{eq-1hr}$) at a distance of 15 feet from the amplified speaker sound systems at Level 4 3, 75 dBA ($L_{eq-1hr}$) at a distance of 15 feet from the amplified speaker sound systems at Level 1, ~~Level 2,~~ Level ~~5,~~ 4, Level ~~8,~~ 7, Level ~~9,~~ 8, and Level ~~10~~ 9 terraces, and 80 dBA ($L_{eq-1hr}$) at a distance of 25 feet from the amplified speaker sound systems at Roof level terrace. A qualified noise consultant will provide written documentation that the design of the system complies with this maximum noise level.

**Project Design Feature NOI-PDF-5:** The hours of operation for use of the outdoor terrace at Level ~~4~~ 3 will be from 7:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-18, add the following to the end of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-1:

In addition, the Applicant shall install a noise monitoring system on the Project Site near noise receptor location R1. The noise monitoring system shall be located 5 feet above grade and behind the construction noise barrier. The noise monitoring system shall have the following capabilities:

a) The noise monitoring system shall be programmed to measure and store, during the Project construction hours, the ambient noise levels in the unit of dBA averaged over a one-hour period (hourly $L_{eq}$).

b) The noise monitoring system shall be programmed with a noise limit of 74 dBA (hourly $L_{eq}$).

c) The noise monitoring system shall provide an alert if the ambient noise levels exceed the 74 dBA (hourly $L_{eq}$) noise limit.

d) In the event the noise limit is triggered, the designated Construction Manager (CM) will be notified via an electronic text message. If the measured noise level is determined to be from the Project construction, the CM shall identify the source of construction noise, and take feasible and reasonable efforts to reduce the construction-related noise levels below the 74 dBA limit.

# II. Project Description

No additional corrections or additions beyond the general corrections described above have been made to this section of the Draft EIR.

# IV.A. Air Quality

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-14, add the following to the first paragraph:

The 2022 AQMP is focused on attaining the 2015 8-hour $O_3$ standard of 70 parts per billion. The 2022 AQMP builds upon measures already in place

from previous AQMPs and includes a variety of additional strategies such as regulation, accelerated development of available clean technologies, incentives and other CAA measures to achieve this standard.

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-14, revise the second paragraph as follows:

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

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-14, revise first sentence of the third paragraph and footnote 18 as follows:

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

[18] *SCAG, Final ~~2016~~ 2022 RTP/SCS, ~~2016~~ 2022.*

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-15, revise the last sentence of the first paragraph as follows:

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

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-15, revise the second paragraph and footnote 20 as follows:

The ~~2016~~ 2022 AQMP forecasts the ~~2031~~ 2037 emissions inventories "with growth" based on SCAG's ~~2016–2040~~ 2020–2045 RTP/SCS. The region is projected to see a 12-percent growth in population, ~~16~~ 17-percent growth in housing units, ~~23~~ 11-percent growth in employment, and ~~8~~ 5-percent growth in vehicle miles traveled between ~~2012~~ 2018 and ~~2031~~ 2037. Despite regional growth in the past, air quality has improved substantially over the

years, primarily due to the effects of air quality control programs at the local, state and federal levels.[20]

[20] *SCAQMD, Figure 1-4 of the Final ~~2016~~ 2022 AQMP.*

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-15, remove the third paragraph:

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

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-20, revise the second paragraph, footnote 27, and footnote 28 as follows:

SCAQMD has the responsibility for ensuring that all national and State ambient air quality standards are achieved and maintained throughout the Air Basin. To meet the standards, SCAQMD has adopted a series of AQMPs. The ~~2016~~ 2022 AQMP includes strategies to ensure that rapidly approaching attainment deadlines are met and that public health is protected to the maximum extent feasible. The most significant air quality challenge in the Air Basin is to reduce $NO_X$ emissions[26] sufficiently to meet the upcoming $O_3$ standard deadlines. The ~~2016~~ 2022 AQMP provides a baseline year ~~2012~~ 2018 inventory of ~~512~~ 351 tons per day (tpd) of $NO_X$ and modeling results show that $NO_X$ emissions are projected to be ~~214~~ 184 tpd in the 8-hour ozone attainment year of ~~2031~~ 2037, due to continued implementation of already adopted regulatory actions ("baseline emissions"). The ~~2016~~ 2022 AQMP suggests that total Air Basin emissions of $NO_X$ must be reduced to ~~96~~ 124 tpd by ~~2031~~ 2037 to attain the 8-hour $O_3$ standard. Although the existing air regulations and programs will continue to lower $NO_X$ emissions in the region, an additional ~~55~~ 67 percent in the year ~~2031~~ 2037 are necessary to attain the 8- hour $O_3$ standard.[27,28]

[27] *Estimates are based on the inventory and modeling results and are relative to the baseline emission levels for each attainment year (see Final ~~2016~~ 2022 AQMP for detailed discussion).*

[28] *SCAQMD, Final ~~2016~~ 2022 AQMP, ~~2017~~ 2022 (page ~~ES-2~~ 4-1).*

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-21, revise the first three paragraphs and footnote 29, delete footnote 30, and renumber all subsequent footnotes in the section as follow:

> The overall control strategy is an integral approach relying on fair-share emission reductions from federal, State and local levels. The ~~2016~~ 2022 AQMP is composed of stationary and mobile source emission reductions from traditional regulatory control measures, incentive-based programs, co-benefits from climate programs, mobile source strategies and reductions from federal sources, which include aircraft, locomotives and ocean-going vessels. These strategies are to be implemented in partnership with CARB and USEPA. In addition, SCAG's ~~2016–2040~~ 2020–2045 RTP/SCS[29,~~30~~] includes transportation programs, measures, and strategies generally designed to reduce VMT, which are contained in the AQMP.
>
> Pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 40460, SCAG has the responsibility of preparing and approving the portions of the AQMP relating to the integration of regional land use programs, measures, and strategies. SCAQMD combines its portion of the Plan with those prepared by SCAG. The RTP/SCS and Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), included as Appendix IV-C to the ~~2016~~ 2022 AQMP for the Basin, are based on SCAG's ~~2016–2040~~ 2020–2045 RTP/SCS.
>
> The ~~2016~~ 2022 AQMP forecasts the ~~2031~~ 2037 emissions inventories "with growth" based on SCAG's ~~2016–2040~~ 2020–2045 RTP/SCS. The region is projected to see a 12-percent growth in population, ~~16-~~17-percent growth in housing units, ~~23-~~11-percent growth in employment, and ~~8-~~5-percent growth in vehicle miles traveled between ~~2012–~~2018 and ~~2031~~ 2037.
>
> [29] *SCAG, Final ~~2016–2040~~ 2020–2045 RTP/SCS, ~~2016~~ 2020.*
>
> ~~[30] *The 2020-2040 RTP/SCS was approved by SCAG in September 2020. Conisstency with the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS is therefore analyzed in Section IV.E, Land Use, of this Draft EIR. However, the 2016 AQMP relies on the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS.*~~

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-30, revise the last sentence of the last paragraph as follows:

> ~~Table IV.A-3~~ Revised Table IV.A-3 on page III-9 of the Final EIR presents an estimate of the existing emissions within the Project Site.

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-30, replace Table IV.A-3 with Revised Table IV.A-3 below as follows:

**Revised Table IV.A-3**
**Estimated Daily Regional Operational Criteria Pollutant Emissions—Baseline[a]**

| Emission Source | Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | VOC | $NO_X$ | CO | $SO_X$ | $PM_{10}$ | $PM_{2.5}$ |
| **Winter Emissions** | | | | | | |
| Area | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Energy | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Mobile | <1 | 1 | 7 | <1 | 1 | <1 |
| **Total Existing Winter Emissions[a]** | **<1** | **1** | **7** | **<1** | **1** | **<1** |
| **Summer Emissions** | | | | | | |
| Area | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Energy | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Mobile | <1 | 1 | 7 | <1 | 1 | <1 |
| **Total Existing Summer Emissions[a]** | **<1** | **1** | **7** | **<1** | **1** | **<1** |

*Numbers may not add up exactly due to rounding.*

[a] *The CalEEMod model printout sheets and/or calculation worksheets are presented in Appendix B (CalEEMod Output) of this Draft EIR.*

*Source: Eyestone Environmental, ~~2021~~ 2023.*

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-46, revise the second sentence of the third paragraph as follows:

> As shown in ~~Table IV.A-6 on page IV.A-56~~ Revised Table IV.A-6 on page III-13 of the Final EIR and in the analysis below, localized $NO_2$ as $NO_X$, CO, $PM_{10}$, and $PM_{2.5}$ would not exceed the SCAQMD-recommended localized significance thresholds.

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-47, revise the paragraphs on the page as follows:

> With respect to the second criterion for determining consistency with AQMP growth assumptions, the projections in the AQMP for achieving air quality goals are based on assumptions in SCAG's ~~2016–2040~~ 2020–2045 RTP/SCS regarding population, housing, and growth trends. Determining whether or not a project exceeds the assumptions reflected in the AQMP involves the evaluation of three criteria: (1) consistency with applicable

population, housing, and employment growth projections; (2) project mitigation measures; and (3) appropriate incorporation of AQMP land use planning strategies. The following discussion provides an analysis with respect to each of these three criteria.

- Is the project consistent with the population, housing, and employment growth projections upon which AQMP forecasted emission levels are based?

A project is consistent with the AQMP, in part, if it is consistent with the population, housing, and employment assumptions that were used in the development of the AQMP. In the case of the ~~2016~~ 2022 AQMP, two sources of data form the basis for the projections of air pollutant emissions: the City's General Plan and SCAG's ~~2016–2040~~ 2020–2045 RTP/SCS. ~~As noted above, the 2020–2045 RTP/SCS is now available.~~

As described in Section IV.E, Land Use and Planning, of this Draft EIR, the City's General Plan serves as a comprehensive, long-term plan for future development of the City. The ~~2016–2040 and~~ 2020–2045 RTP/SCS provide socioeconomic forecast projections of regional employment growth. The employment forecasts, which are adopted by SCAG's Regional Council, are based on the local plans and policies applicable to the specific area; these are used by SCAG in all phases of implementation and review.

The Project would generate short-term construction jobs, but these jobs would not necessarily bring new construction workers or their families into the region since construction workers are typically drawn from an existing regional pool of construction workers who travel among construction sites within the region as individual projects are completed and are not typically brought from other regions to work on developments such as the Project. Moreover, these jobs would be relatively small in number and temporary in nature. Therefore, the Project's construction jobs would not conflict with the long-term employment or population projections upon which the ~~2016~~ 2022 AQMP is based.

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-48, revise the paragraphs, delete footnote 69, and renumber subsequent footnotes in the section as follows:

- To what extent is project development consistent with the control measures set forth in the AQMP?

As an infill development, the Project advances goals of the AQMP and RTP/SCS to reduce VMT and related vehicle emissions. Pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 40460, SCAG has the responsibility of preparing and approving the portions of the AQMP relating to the integration of regional land use programs, measures, and strategies. SCAQMD combines its portion of the Plan with those prepared by SCAG. The RTP/SCS and TCMs, included as Appendix IV-C to the ~~2016~~ 2022 AQMP/SIP for the Basin, are based on SCAG's ~~2016–2040~~ 2020–2045 RTP/SCS.

With regard to land use developments, such as the Project, the AQMP's ~~2016–2040~~ 2020–2045 RTP/SCS land use control measures (i.e., goals and policies) focus on the reduction of vehicle trips and VMT. CARB adopted a target reduction for the SCAG region of 19 percent for 2035 from passenger vehicle use. The Project would introduce a complementary mix of land uses contributing to the development of Hollywood as a major center for employment and retail services. The Project would also provide required short- and long-term bicycle parking spaces in compliance with the requirements of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC). The increase in transit accessibility and the bicycle parking spaces provided on-site would further reduce vehicle trips and VMT by encouraging walking and non-automotive forms of transportation. The Project would enhance pedestrian activity along Seward Street, Hudson Avenue, and Romaine Street through building design and proposed streetscape amenities by providing ground-level, community-serving retail and restaurant uses, as well as new landscaping. The Project trip-generation estimates[68] account for the Project's TDM measures (included in TR-PDF-1) by taking a credit for transit and walking for future visitors and employees. Accounting for these TDM measures would result in a 40-percent reduction in Project-related transportation VMT and emissions in comparison to the standard rates within the LADOT VMT model for a project within the City. This reduction in VMT would support the goals of the ~~2016–2040~~ 2020–2045 RTP/SCS with an estimated ~~18~~-19-percent reduction in per capita GHG emissions from passenger vehicles by 2035 and 21-percent reduction in per capita GHG emissions from passenger vehicles by ~~2040~~ 2045.[69] **Accordingly, the Project would support AQMP and RTP/SCS objectives of reducing VMT and the related vehicular air emissions.**

~~*[69] The 2020–2045 RTP/SCS reflects CARB's updated SB 375 targets for the SCAG region, requiring a 19-percent decrease in VMT by 2035.*~~

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-49, revise the second paragraph as follows:

> In conclusion, analysis of Threshold (a) is based on the Project's consistency with the AQMP as well as the City of Los Angeles' Air Quality Element goals, objectives, and policies that are relevant to the Project. The determination of AQMP consistency is primarily concerned with the long-term influence of the Project on air quality in the Air Basin. As discussed above, the Project would not increase the frequency or severity of an existing air quality violation or cause or contribute to new violations for these pollutants. As the Project would not exceed any of the State and federal standards, the Project would also not delay timely attainment of air quality standards or interim emission reductions specified in the AQMP. In addition, because the Project is consistent with growth projections that form the basis of the ~~2016~~ 2022 AQMP, the Project would be consistent with the emissions forecasts in the AQMP. Furthermore, compliance with the regulatory requirements identified above and in Section IV.D, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR, no significant air quality impacts would occur and as such, the no air quality mitigation measures are necessary for the Project to meet this AQMP consistency criterion. Additionally, as the Project would support the City's and SCAQMD's objectives of reducing VMT and the related vehicular air emissions, the Project would be consistent with AQMP control measures.

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-55, revise the first two sentences of the last paragraph as follows:

> The emissions levels in ~~Table IV.A-6 on page IV.A-56~~ Revised Table IV.A-6 on page III-13 of the Final EIR represent the highest daily emissions projected to occur during each year of construction. As presented in Revised Table IV.A-6, construction-related daily maximum regional construction emissions would not exceed any of the SCAQMD daily significance thresholds.

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-56, replace Table IV.A-6 with Revised Table IV.A-6 on page III-13 as follows:

**Revised Table IV.A-6**
**Estimate of Maximum Regional Project Daily Construction Emissions (pounds per day)**

| Construction Year | VOC | $NO_X$ | CO | $SO_X$ | $PM_{10}$ | $PM_{2.5}$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Regional Construction Emissions (Winter)** | | | | | | |
| Year 1 | 3 | 80 | 25 | <1 | 9 | 3 |
| Year 2 | 4 | 63 | 37 | <1 | 9 | 3 |
| Year 3 | 17 | 30 | 42 | <1 | 7 | 3 |
| **Maximum Unmitigated Construction Winter Emissions**[a] | 17 | 80 | 42 | <1 | 9 | 3 |
| **SCAQMD Daily Significance Thresholds** | **75** | **100** | **550** | **150** | **150** | **55** |
| **Over/(Under)** | **(58)** | **(20)** | **(508)** | **(150)** | **(141)** | **(52)** |
| **Maximum Unmitigated Construction Emissions Exceed Threshold?** | **No** | **No** | **No** | **No** | **No** | **No** |
| **Regional Construction Emissions (Summer)** | | | | | | |
| Year 1 | 3 | 77 | 25 | <1 | 9 | 3 |
| Year 2 | 4 | 61 | 37 | <1 | 9 | 3 |
| Year 3 | 17 | 29 | 43 | <1 | 7 | 3 |
| **Maximum Unmitigated Construction Summer Emissions**[a] | **17** | **77** | **43** | **<1** | **9** | **3** |
| **SCAQMD Daily Significance Thresholds** | **75** | **100** | **550** | **150** | **150** | **55** |
| **Over/(Under)** | **(58)** | **(23)** | **(507)** | **(150)** | **(141)** | **(52)** |
| **Maximum Unmitigated Construction Emissions Exceed Threshold?** | **No** | **No** | **No** | **No** | **No** | **No** |

*Numbers may not add up exactly due to rounding.*

[a] *The CalEEMod model printout sheets and/or calculation worksheets are presented in Appendix B (CalEEMod Output) of ~~this~~ the Draft EIR and Appendix FEIR-3 of this Final EIR.*

*Source: Eyestone Environmental, ~~2021~~ 2023.*

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-56, revise the first and second sentences of the first full paragraph as follows:

> ~~Table IV.A-7 on page IV.A-57~~ Revised Table IV.A-7 on page III-14 of the Final EIR provides Project operational emissions with incorporation of project design features. As shown in Revised Table IV.A-7, regional emissions resulting from operation of the Project would not exceed any SCAQMD's daily regional operational thresholds.

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-57, replace Table IV.A-7 with Revised Table IV.A-7 on page III-14 as follows:

**Revised Table IV.A-7**
**Estimate of Maximum Regional Project Daily Operational Emissions—At Project Buildout**[a]

| Emission Source | Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | VOC | $NO_X$ | CO | $SO_X$ | $PM_{10}$ | $PM_{2.5}$ |
| **Project (Winter)** | | | | | | |
| Area | 3 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Energy (Natural Gas) | <1 | 1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Mobile | 3 | 4 | 33 | <1 | 8 | 2 |
| Stationary | <1 | ~~<1~~2 | ~~<1~~1 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| **Total Proposed Winter Uses Emissions** | 7 | ~~5~~7 | ~~34~~35 | <1 | 8 | 2 |
| **SCAQMD Significance Threshold** | 55 | 55 | 550 | 150 | 150 | 55 |
| **Over/(Under)** | (48) | **(~~46~~48)** | **(~~516~~515)** | (150) | (142) | (53) |
| **Exceed Threshold?** | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| **Project (Summer)** | | | | | | |
| Area | 3 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Energy (Natural Gas) | <1 | 1 | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Mobile | 3 | 3 | 33 | <1 | 8 | 2 |
| Stationary | <1 | 2 | 1 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| **Total Proposed Summer Uses Emissions** | **7** | **7** | **35** | **<1** | **8** | **2** |
| **SCAQMD Significance Threshold** | **55** | **55** | **550** | **150** | **150** | **55** |
| **Over/(Under)** | **(48)** | **(48)** | **(515)** | **(150)** | **(142)** | **(53)** |
| **Exceed Threshold?** | **No** | **No** | **No** | **No** | **No** | **No** |

*Numbers may not add up exactly due to rounding.*

[a] *The CalEEMod model printout sheets and/or calculation worksheets are presented in Appendix B (CalEEMod Output) of ~~this~~ the Draft EIR and Appendix FEIR-3 of this Final EIR. The table reflects net emissions (i.e., Project emissions less existing emissions).*

*Source: Eyestone Environmental, ~~2021~~ 2023.*

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-57, revise the first sentence of the first paragraph as follows:

> As analyzed in Threshold (c) below and provided in ~~Table IV.A-8 on page IV.A-58,~~ Revised Table IV.A-8 on page III-15 of the Final EIR, maximum construction emissions would not exceed any of the SCAQMD-recommended localized screening thresholds.

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-58, replace Table IV.A-8 with Revised Table IV.A-8 on page III-15 as follows:

**Revised Table IV.A-8**
**Estimate of Maximum Localized Daily Project Construction Emissions**
**(pounds per day)**

| Construction Year | $NO_X$ | CO | $PM_{10}$ | $PM_{2.5}$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Localized Construction Emissions (Winter)** | | | | |
| Year 1 | 17 | 11 | 1 | 1 |
| Year 2 | 25 | 28 | 1 | 1 |
| Year 3 | 17 | 25 | <1 | <1 |
| **Maximum Unmitigated Daily Winter Localized Emissions** | 25 | 28 | 1 | 1 |
| **SCAQMD Localized Significance Thresholds**[b] | **74** | **680** | **5** | **3** |
| **Over/(Under)** | **(49)** | **(652)** | **(4)** | **(2)** |
| **Exceed Threshold?** | **No** | **No** | **No** | **No** |
| **Localized Construction Emissions (Summer)** | | | | |
| Year 1 | 17 | 11 | 1 | 1 |
| Year 2 | 25 | 28 | 1 | 1 |
| Year 3 | 17 | 25 | <1 | <1 |
| **Maximum Unmitigated Daily Summer Localized Emissions** | **25** | **28** | **1** | **1** |
| **SCAQMD Localized Significance Thresholds**[b] | **74** | **680** | **5** | **3** |
| **Over/(Under)** | **(49)** | **(652)** | **(4)** | **(2)** |
| **Exceed Threshold?** | **No** | **No** | **No** | **No** |

*Numbers may not add up exactly due to rounding.*

[a] *Potential localized construction impacts were evaluated using SCAQMD's LSTs for Source Receptor Area 1.*

[b] *The SCAQMD Daily Significance Thresholds are based on a 1-acre Project Site. The closest sensitive receptors are residential uses north of the Project Site. The localized threshold is based on a 25-meter receptor distance which is the closest receptor distance on the SCAQMD mass rate LST look-up table.*

*Source: Eyestone Environmental, ~~2021~~ 2023.*

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-59, revise the fifth and sixth sentences of the first full paragraph as follows:

> The maximum daily localized emissions from Project construction and LSTs are presented in ~~Table IV.A-8 on page IV.A-58,~~ Revised Table IV.A-8 above of the Final EIR, . As shown in Revised Table IV.A-8, maximum construction emissions would not exceed and of the SCAQMD-recommended localized screening thresholds.

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-60, revise the first paragraph as follows:

> Operation of the Project would not introduce any major new sources of air pollution within the Project Site. Emissions estimates for criteria air pollutants from on-site sources are presented in ~~Table IV.A-9 on page IV.A-61~~ Revised Table IV.A-9 on page III-17 of the Final EIR. The SCAQMD LST mass rate look-up tables, which apply to projects that have active areas that are less than or equal to 5 acres in size, were used to evaluate potential localized impacts. As shown in Revised Table IV.A-9, on-site operational emissions would not exceed any of the LSTs. **Therefore, localized on-site operational emissions resulting from the Project would result in a less-than-significant air quality impact.**

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-61, replace Table IV.A-9 with Revised Table IV.A-9 on page III-17 as follows:

**Revised Table IV.A-9**
**Estimate of Maximum Localized Project Daily Operational Emissions—At Project Buildout[a]**
**(pounds per day)**

| Emission Source | $NO_X$ | CO | $PM_{10}$ | $PM_{2.5}$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Project (Winter)** | | | | |
| Area | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Energy (Natural Gas) | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Stationary | ~~<1~~2 | ~~<1~~1 | <1 | <1 |
| **On-Site Winter Total[b]** | **~~2~~3** | **~~1~~2** | **~~<0.1~~0.1** | **~~<0.1~~0.1** |
| **SCAQMD Significance Threshold[c]** | **74** | **680** | **1** | **1** |
| **Over/(Under)** | **(~~72~~71)** | **(~~679~~678)** | **(~~0.9~~0.9)** | **(~~0.9~~0.9)** |
| **Exceed Threshold?** | **No** | **No** | **No** | **No** |
| **Project (Summer)** | | | | |
| Area | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Energy (Natural Gas) | <1 | <1 | <1 | <1 |
| Stationary | 2 | 1 | <1 | <1 |
| **On-Site Summer Total[b]** | **3** | **2** | **0.1** | **0.1** |
| **SCAQMD Significance Threshold[c]** | **74** | **680** | **1** | **1** |
| **Over/(Under)** | **(72)** | **(678)** | **(0.9)** | **(0.9)** |
| **Exceed Threshold?** | **No** | **No** | **No** | **No** |

*Numbers may not add up exactly due to rounding.*

[a] *The CalEEMod model printout sheets and/or calculation worksheets are presented in Appendix B (CalEEMod Output) of ~~this~~ the Draft EIR and Appendix FEIR-3 of this Final EIR. The table reflects net emissions (i.e., Project emissions less existing emissions).*

[b] *The SCAQMD Daily Significance Thresholds are based on a one-acre Project Site. The closest sensitive receptors are residential uses north of the Project Site. The localized threshold is based on a 25-meter receptor distance which is the closest receptor distance on the SCAQMD mass rate LST look-up table.*

*Source: Eyestone Environmental, ~~2021~~ 2023.*

## IV.B. Cultural Resources

No additional corrections or additions beyond the general corrections described above have been made to this section of the Draft EIR.

## IV.C. Energy

No additional corrections or additions beyond the general corrections described above have been made to this section of the Draft EIR.

# IV.D. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Section IV.D, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.D-20, add the following before the Cap-and-Trade Program:

*(iii) 2022 Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan*

The 2022 Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan was approved by CARB on November 2022 and built upon the previous Scoping Plans. The 2022 Scoping Plan outlines a technologically feasible, cost-effective, and equity-focused path to achieve carbon neutrality by 2045 or earlier. The major element of this plan is the aggressive reduction of fossil fuels by 86 percent in 2045 relative to 2022. This means a rapid adoption of zero-emission transportation and phasing out fossil fuel for home heating.[32a] A consistency analysis with the 2022 Scoping Plan is included in Appendix FEIR-5 of this Final EIR.

[32a] *CARB, 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality, November 2022.*

Section IV.D, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.D-73, replace Table IV.D-11 with Revised Table IV.D-11 on page III-19 as follows:

**Revised Table IV.D-11**
**Annual Project GHG Emissions Summary (Buildout Year)[a]**
**(metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent [$MTCO_2e$])**

| Scope | Project without Project Features | Project with Project Features | Reduction from Project Features |
|---|---|---|---|
| Area[b] | <1 | <1 | 0 |
| Energy[c] | 945 | 887 | (59) |
| Mobile[d] | 1,933 | 1,075 | (858) |
| EV Chargers[e] | (32) | (32) | 0 |
| Stationary[f] | ~~**2**~~ **103** | ~~**2**~~ **103** | 0 |
| Solid Waste[g] | 28 | 28 | 0 |
| Water/Wastewater[h] | 174 | 136 | (38) |
| Construction | 124 | 124 | 0 |
| **Total Emissions** | ~~**3,174**~~ **3,275** | ~~**2,219**~~ **2,320** | **(955)** |

*Numbers may not add up exactly due to rounding.*

[a] *$CO_2e$ was calculated using CalEEMod and the results are provided in Section 2.0 of the Operation CalEEMod output file within Appendix B of this Draft EIR. Totals may not add up due to rounding.*

[b] *Area source emissions are from landscape equipment.*

[c] *Energy source emissions are based on CalEEMod default electricity and natural gas usage rates. Emissions from electricity generation only take into account carbon intensity at build out year and do not take into account decreasing carbon intensity in subsequent years required by SB 100 (RPS). However, it is recognized that the RPS would require utilities to supply 100% renewable energy by 2045.*

[d] *Emissions were calculated with CalEEMod which includes EMFAC2017 emission factors. EMFAC2017 does not take account for further reductions in GHG emission as the result of implementation of LCFS amendments. Mobile source emissions also do not account for increasing fuel economy standards for future years.*

[e] *Emissions were calculated consistent with the City requirements.*

[f] *Stationary source emissions are from an on-site emergency generator.*

[g] *Solid waste emissions are calculated based on CalEEMod default solid waste generation rates.*

[h] *Water/Wastewater emissions are calculated based on CalEEMod default water consumption rates. The CalEEMod estimate of water consumption is considered conservative compared to more current water demand rates used by LADWP, which are reflected in Section IV.J.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR.*

*Source: Eyestone Environmental, ~~2021~~ 2023.*

Section IV.D, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.D-76, revise the second paragraph as follows:

Emissions related to stationary sources were calculated using the CalEEMod emissions inventory model. It is anticipated that the Project would include an emergency generator on-site. As shown in ~~Table IV.D-11 on page~~

~~IV.D-73,~~ Revised Table IV.D-11 on page III-19 of the Final EIR, the Project is expected to result in ~~2~~ 103 $MTCO_2e$ per year from stationary sources.

Section IV.D, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.D-78, revise the second paragraph as follows:

As shown in ~~Table IV.D-11,~~ Revised Table IV.D-11 on page III-19 of the Final EIR, when taking into consideration implementation of relevant project design features, as well as the requirements set forth in the City of Los Angeles Green Building Code, and full implementation of current State mandates, the Project's GHG emissions for the Project in 2025 would equal 124 $MTCO_2e$ per year (amortized over 30 years) during construction and ~~2,095~~ 2,197 $MTCO_2e$ per year during operation of the Project with a combined total of ~~2,219~~ 2,320 $MTCO_2e$ per year.

## IV.E. Land Use

No additional corrections or additions beyond the general corrections described above have been made to this section of the Draft EIR.

## IV.F. Noise

Section IV.F, Noise, page IV.F-32, revise Project Design Feature NOI-PDF-4 as follows:

**Project Design Feature NOI-PDF-4:** Outdoor amplified sound systems, if any, will be designed so as not to exceed the maximum noise level of 70 dBA ($L_{eq-1hr}$) at a distance of 15 feet from the amplified speaker sound systems at Level ~~4,~~ 3, 75 dBA ($L_{eq-1hr}$) at a distance of 15 feet from the amplified speaker sound systems at Level 1, ~~Level 2,~~ Level ~~5,~~ 4, Level ~~8,~~ 7, Level ~~9,~~ 8, and Level ~~10,~~ 9, terraces, and 80 dBA ($L_{eq-1hr}$) at a distance of 25 feet from the amplified speaker sound systems at Roof level terrace. A qualified noise consultant will provide written documentation that the design of the system complies with this maximum noise level.

Section IV.F, Noise, page IV.F-32, revise Project Design Feature NOI-PDF-5 as follows:

**Project Design Feature NOI-PDF-5:** The hours of operation for use of the outdoor terrace at Level ~~4~~ 3 will be from 7:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M.

Section IV.F, Noise, page IV.F-46, add the following to the end of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-1 (i.e., after the last bullet point):

In addition, the Applicant shall install a noise monitoring system on the Project Site near noise receptor location R1. The noise monitoring system shall be located 5 feet above grade and behind the construction noise barrier. The noise monitoring system shall have the following capabilities:

a) The noise monitoring system shall be programmed to measure and store, during the Project construction hours, the ambient noise levels in the unit of dBA averaged over a one-hour period (hourly $L_{eq}$).

b) The noise monitoring system shall be programmed with a noise limit of 74 dBA (hourly $L_{eq}$).

c) The noise monitoring system shall provide an alert if the ambient noise levels exceed the 74 dBA (hourly $L_{eq}$) noise limit.

d) In the event the noise limit is triggered, the designated Construction Manager (CM) will be notified via an electronic text message. If the measured noise level is determined to be from the Project construction, the CM shall identify the source of construction noise, and take feasible and reasonable efforts to reduce the construction-related noise levels below the 74 dBA limit.

## IV.G.1 Public Services—Fire Protection

No additional corrections or additions beyond the general corrections described above have been made to this section of the Draft EIR.

## IV.G.2 Public Services—Police Protection

No additional corrections or additions beyond the general corrections described above have been made to this section of the Draft EIR.

## IV.H. Transportation

No additional corrections or additions beyond the general corrections described above have been made to this section of the Draft EIR.

## IV.I. Tribal Cultural Resources

No additional corrections or additions beyond the general corrections described above have been made to this section of the Draft EIR.

## IV.J.1 Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure

Section IV.J.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, page IV.J.1-22, delete the second paragraph and footnote 47:

> ~~Through continued and additional local supply development and conservation savings, LADWP's reliance on MWD water supplies may be reduced significantly from the five-year average from Fiscal Years 2010–2011 through 2014–2015 of 57 percent of total demand to 11 percent under average weather conditions and to 44 percent under single-dry year conditions by fiscal year 2040.[47]~~
>
> ~~[47] *LADWP, 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, April 2016.*~~

Section IV.J.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, page IV.J.1-29, revise footnote 79 as follows:

> [79] *LADWP, ~~2015~~ 2020 Urban Water Management Plan, ~~June 2016~~ May 2021.*

Section IV.J.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, page IV.J.1-38, revise the second paragraph as follows and add footnote 92a as follows:

> In addition, the 2020 UWMP utilized SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS data that provide for more reliable water demand forecasts, taking into account changes in population, housing units and employment. As the Project does not include residential uses, it would not represent any of the population growth in the SCAG region. The Project would, however, increase the number of employees on the Project Site.[92a] Based on employee generation factors from the LADOT, the Project is estimated to generate approximately 584 net new employees on the Project Site. This increase

would represent 0.03 percent of the total number of employees in 2025 and 1.18 percent of the growth between 2020 and 2025. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the growth projections in the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS.

[92a] *LADOT and Los Angeles Department of City Planning (DCP), City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Documentation, Version 1.3, May 2020.*

## IV.J.3 Utilities and Service Systems—Energy Infrastructure

No additional corrections or additions beyond the general corrections described above have been made to this section of the Draft EIR.

## V. Alternatives

Section V, Alternatives, page V-26, revise the third full sentence as follows:

Overall construction TAC emissions generated by Alternative 2 would be less than to those of the Project because, while grading activities would cover roughly the same area under both the Project and Alternative 2, the depth of excavation and associated use of heavy construction equipment would be less under this alternative as one less level of subterranean parking would be constructed (i.e., three under this alternative versus four under the Project). Additionally, Alternative 2 would result in a ~~a~~ reduction in total floor area (i.e., 91,457 net square feet under Alternative 2 versus 139,607 net square feet under the Project).

Section V, Alternatives, page V-37, revise the second sentence under i. Tribal Cultural Resources as follows:

As discussed in Section IV.I, Tribal Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR and in the Tribal Cultural Resources (TCR) Report included as Appendix L, while the Project Site is located near tar pits, water sources, and roads that may have provided important resources to prehistoric and protohistoric populations, no known TCRs have been previously recorded on the Project Site or within the search radius of the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) records search.

Section V, Alternatives, page V-41, revise the fourth paragraph as follows:

Alternative 2 would meet the following Project objectives, although to a lesser extent than the Project ~~the Project~~ due to the reduction in development:

Section V, Alternatives, page V-45, revise the first full sentence as follows:

Similar to the Project, operational regional air pollutant emissions associated with Alternative ~~2~~ 3 would be generated by vehicle trips to the Project Site and the consumption of electricity and natural gas.

## VI. Other CEQA Considerations

No additional corrections or additions beyond the general corrections described above have been made to this section of the Draft EIR.

## Appendices

No corrections or additions have been made to the appendices of the Draft EIR

# C. Effect of Revisions and Corrections

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 requires that an EIR which has been made available for public review, but not yet certified, be recirculated whenever significant new information has been added to the EIR. The entire document need not be circulated if revisions are limited to specific portions of the document.

The relevant portions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 read as follows:

> *(a) A lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review under Section 15087 but before certification. As used in this section, the term "information" can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. "Significant new*

*information" requiring recirculation include, for example, a disclosure showing that:*

*(1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.*

*(2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.*

*(3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.*

*(4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. (Mountain Lion Coalition v. Fish and Game Com. (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d 1043)*

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

The information contained in this section of the Final EIR clarifies, amplifies, or refines information in the Draft EIR but does not make any changes that would meet the definition of "significant new information" as defined above. The information added to the Draft EIR does not change the Draft EIR in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a new or substantially increased significant environmental effect of the Project or disclose a feasible alternative or mitigation measure the Applicant has declined to adopt. As provided by the discussion below, the revisions, clarifications, and corrections to the Draft EIR would not result in new significant impacts or increase any impact already identified in the Draft EIR.

With respect to the changes to the Project Description, as noted above, these proposed changes would not result in significant new impacts or increased impacts as these proposed modifications represent an overall reduction in development. This conclusion is supported by memoranda addressing this change related to Air Quality–GHG–Energy and Transportation, which are included in Appendices FEIR-4 and FEIR-5, respectively. Specifically, as discussed therein, these minor modifications to floor area by land use would not result in any new significant impacts.

In addition, with regard to noise, the amount of demolition, excavation/export would not change with the minor revisions to the building design. The overall phasing of construction with the minor revisions would result in similar overlapping construction activities. Thus, the noise and vibration levels generated from site excavation and construction activities would be similar on days with maximum construction activities. Therefore, construction noise and vibration impacts from these minor revisions would be similar to those set forth in Section IV.F. Noise of the Draft EIR, which concluded that the Project would result in significant and unavoidable noise impacts from on-site and off-site construction, and significant and unavoidable vibration impacts from on-site construction (both building damage and human annoyance) and off-site construction. In addition, the minor revisions made to the building design would have minimal changes to potential operational noise impacts. Noise levels associated with on-site sources would be slightly lower due to the slight reduction in overall square footage. Similarly, the off-site noise levels would be slightly lower, as the slight reduction in development would result in fewer vehicular trips. Therefore, impacts associated with operational noise would be less than significant and slightly less when compared to the less than significant impacts disclosed in Section IV. F. of the Draft EIR.

The other analyses within the Draft EIR would either not be affected by the minor modifications to floor area by land use or impacts would clearly be less based on the reduction in development (i.e., water demand and wastewater generation would be substantially reduced based in the reduction of restaurant square footage). Lastly, it should be noted that while the revisions include one less aboveground parking level, the overall building height has not been changed. This is because of an error in the original text of the Draft EIR where the building height did not account for the elevator shaft. Since the Draft EIR analyzed a maximum building height of 155 feet, which is the height of the revised Project, no changes are required.

The remaining corrections provided above are limited to typographical errors and minor revisions or modifications to bolster existing mitigation that do not constitute new information. Overall, these additions and corrections would not result in new significant impacts or increase the impacts of the Project.

Based on the above, the revisions, clarifications, and corrections to the Draft EIR and the modifications to the Project do not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in an impact already identified in the Draft EIR or disclose a feasible alternative or mitigation measure the Applicant has declined to adopt. The revisions to the Draft EIR clarify, amplify, or refine the information in the Draft EIR. Thus, none of the conditions in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 are met and recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required.