

I. Executive Summary

I. Executive Summary

In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15123, this section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) contains a brief summary of the East End Studios ADLA Project (Project) and its potential environmental effects. More detailed information regarding the Project and its potential environmental effects is provided in the following sections of this Draft EIR. Also included in this section is an overview of the purpose and focus of this Draft EIR, a description of the organization of this Draft EIR, an overview of existing Project Site Conditions, a general description of the Project, issues raised during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) process, including areas of controversy, a description of the public review process for this Draft EIR, a summary of environmental impacts, a list of the Project Design Features (PDFs) and mitigation measures to be implemented as part of the Project, and a summary of the alternatives to the Project evaluated in this Draft EIR that would reduce or avoid impacts, including identification of the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

1. Purpose of this Draft EIR

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

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

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

In accordance with Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR shall contain a brief statement indicating reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and not discussed in detail in the Draft EIR. An Initial Study was prepared for the Project and a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed for public comment to the State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, responsible agencies, owners and occupants within a 500-foot radius of the Project Site, and all other interested parties on February 9, 2023, for a 30-day review period. In addition, a public scoping meeting for the Project was held on February 23, 2023. The Initial Study, NOP, and NOP comment letters are included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR. The Initial Study provides a detailed discussion of the potential environmental impact areas and the reasons that each environmental impact area is or is not analyzed further in this Draft EIR. The City determined through the Initial Study that the environmental factors listed below would be potentially impacted by the Project:

- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources (Historical Resources)
- Energy
- Geology and Soils (Paleontological Resources)
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use and Planning (Consistency with Plans)
- Noise
- Public Services (Fire Protection and Police Protection)
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems (Water Supply and Infrastructure, Wastewater, and Energy Infrastructure)

The City determined through the Initial Study that the Project would not have the potential to cause significant impacts related to: aesthetics; agriculture and forestry resources; air quality (odors); biological resources; cultural resources (archaeological resources and human remains); geology and soils (faulting, seismicity, landslides, and soil

erosion); hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use (physical division of an established community); mineral resources; noise (airport or airstrip-related hazards); population and housing; public services (schools, parks, and other public facilities); recreation; transportation (hazards due a geometric design feature); utilities and service systems (stormwater drainage facilities, telecommunication facilities, and solid waste); and wildfire. Therefore, these topics are not analyzed further in this Draft EIR. The Initial Study, which demonstrated that no significant impacts would occur for these issue areas, is included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR.

3. Draft EIR Organization

This Draft EIR is comprised of the following sections:

- I. **Executive Summary.** This section describes the purpose of the Draft EIR, Draft EIR focus and effects found not to be significant, Draft EIR organization, existing conditions, Project summary, issues raised during the NOP process, including areas of controversy, public review process, summary of environmental impacts, PDFs, mitigation measures, and summary of alternatives.
- II. **Project Description.** This section describes the location, existing conditions, objectives, and characteristics of the Project, and identifies requested permits and approvals.
- III. **Environmental Setting.** This section contains a description of the existing physical and built environment and a list of related projects in the vicinity of the Project Site.
- IV. **Environmental Impact Analysis.** This section contains the environmental setting for the specific environmental topic, Project and cumulative impact analyses, PDFs (where applicable), mitigation measures, (where necessary) and conclusions regarding the level of significance after mitigation for each of the following environmental issues: air quality; cultural resources (historic resources); energy; geology and soils (paleontological resources); greenhouse gas emissions; land use and planning (consistency with plans); noise; public services (fire protection and police protection); transportation; tribal cultural resources; and utilities and service systems (water supply and infrastructure, wastewater, and energy infrastructure).
- V. **Alternatives.** This section provides an analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project including: No Project/No Build Alternative; Reduced Development Alternative; and Increased Setback Alternative.

- VI. Other CEQA Considerations.** This section provides a discussion of significant unavoidable impacts that would result from the Project and the reasons why the Project is being proposed notwithstanding the significant unavoidable impacts. An analysis of the significant irreversible changes in the environment and potential secondary effects that would result from the Project is also included. This section also analyzes potential growth-inducing impacts of the Project and potential secondary effects caused by the implementation of the mitigation measures for the Project. Lastly, a summary of the possible effects of the Project that were determined not to be significant within the Initial Study is provided.
- VII. References.** This section lists the references and sources used in the preparation of this Draft EIR.
- VIII. Acronyms and Abbreviations.** This section provides a list of acronyms and abbreviations used in this Draft EIR.
- IX. List of Preparers.** This section lists the persons, public agencies, and organizations that were consulted or contributed to the preparation of this Draft EIR.

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

- Appendix A Initial Study, Notice of Preparation (NOP), and NOP Comment Letters
 - Appendix A.1 Initial Study
 - Appendix A.2 Notice of Preparation
 - Appendix A.3 NOP Comment Letters
- Appendix B Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
 - Appendix B.1 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Methodology
 - Appendix B.2 Air Quality Worksheets
 - Appendix B.3 Greenhouse Gas Worksheets
 - Appendix B.4 Modeling Output Files
- Appendix C Cultural Resources Technical Report
- Appendix D Energy Analysis Spreadsheets
- Appendix E Paleontological Resources Technical Report

- Appendix F Land Use Tables
- Appendix G Noise Calculation Worksheets
- Appendix H Public Service Provider Response Letters
 - Appendix H.1 Los Angeles Fire Department Letter
 - Appendix H.2 Los Angeles Police Department Letter
- Appendix I Transportation
 - Appendix I.1 Transportation Assessment
 - Appendix I.2 Los Angeles Department of Transportation Assessment Letter
- Appendix J Tribal Cultural Resources Report
- Appendix K Water Supply Assessment
- Appendix L Utility Infrastructure Technical Reports
 - Appendix L.1 Utility Technical Report
 - Appendix L.2 Dry Utility Technical Report
- Appendix M Alternatives Analyses
 - Appendix M.1 Alternatives Noise Model Worksheets
 - Appendix M.2 VMT Calculator Output for Alternative 2
 - Appendix M.3 VMT Calculator Output for Alternative 3

4. Existing Project Site Conditions

The Project Site is located at 1206–1338 East 6th Street, 1205–1321 Wholesale Street, 1210–1361 Produce Street, 635 and 639 Mill Street, and 640 South Alameda Street within the Central City North Community Plan of the City of Los Angeles. The Project Site is bounded by 6th Street to the north, Mill Street to the east, commercial and industrial zoned land currently developed with warehouse uses to the south, and Alameda Street to the west. As labeled on the City’s Zone Information and Map Access System (ZIMAS) map, there is a strip of land between the two existing warehouse structures labeled as Produce Street. However, this is not a public right-of-way, and the land is privately owned and zoned for heavy industrial uses. Similarly, there is an additional strip of land adjacent to the south of the Project Site labeled as Wholesale Street on the City’s ZIMAS map. However, this is not a public right-of-way, and the land is privately-owned and zoned for commercial uses.

The Project Site is currently developed with two single-story warehouse structures, consisting of approximately 311,000 square feet of floor area. The existing buildings are currently used for storage and distribution purposes. The Project Site also includes surface parking areas for automobiles and tractor trailer trucks. The Project Site is relatively flat with limited ornamental landscaping. A total of six trees were identified surrounding the Project Site, all of which are located along Alameda Street in the public right-of-way. No on-site trees were observed.

The Project Site is located within the Central City North Community Plan area. The Project Site is designated as Heavy Industrial and is zoned as M3-1-RIO (Heavy Industrial, Height District 1, River Improvement Overlay District). The M3 zone corresponds to and is consistent with the Project Site's Heavy Industrial land use designation. The M3 zone allows for motion picture, television, video, and other media production (and supporting office) uses by right. The Project Site is designated within Height District 1. All uses located in the M3 zone and within Height District 1 are restricted to a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 1.5 times the property's buildable area.¹ Height District 1 does not impose a vertical height limitation on the Project Site. The M3 zone does not impose any setback requirements for commercial or industrial uses. Accordingly, buildable area for FAR purposes is the same as lot area.

The City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning updated the Central City North Community Plan and the Central City Community Plan, whose areas together make up Downtown Los Angeles (sometimes known as DTLA), in a combined planning process referred to as the DTLA 2040 Plan. The purpose of the DTLA 2040 Plan is to create and implement a future vision for Downtown Los Angeles. On May 3, 2023, the Los Angeles City Council voted unanimously to approve the DTLA 2040 Plan. Following City Council approval, the implementing ordinances are now being reviewed and finalized by the City Attorney for form and legality. After the City Attorney has completed their review of the implementing ordinances for form and legality, the DTLA 2040 Plan will be presented to PLUM and City Council and will be brought into effect when the implementing ordinances are adopted.

The RIO in the property's zoning designation refers to the Project Site's location within the Los Angeles River Improvement Overlay Zone. The RIO does not impose any use, FAR, height, or setback restrictions or standards. Pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 13.17, projects in the Los Angeles River's outer core, including the Project, are required to comply with various screening standards and requires that new landscaping utilize native species. The Project would comply with all landscaping, screening and fencing requirements as set forth in Section 13.17 of the LAMC.

¹ FAR and height restrictions can be found in LAMC Section 12.21.1 A.1.

The Project Site is also identified as being in a Transit Priority Area (TPA) as defined by Senate Bill (SB) 743 and the City Zoning Information (ZI) File No. 2452.² The Project Site is served by a variety of public transit options, including a number of local and regional bus lines serviced by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) and the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), that provide connections to Downtown subway stations. In particular, the Project Site is located within 0.5 mile of Metro Line 53 and 50 at the intersection of 7th Street and Central Avenue and Metro Line 53 and 720 at the intersection of East 6th Street and Central Avenue.

The Project Site is also located within the Metro ROW Project Area as defined by the City Zoning Information File No. 1117. Consultation with Metro is required prior to the issuance of any building permit for projects within 100 feet of Metro-owned rail or bus rapid transit (BRT) right-of-way (ROW).³ The Project would undergo the required Metro review and clearance process.

Additionally, per Assembly Bill (AB) 2097, the Project is not required to provide parking. Specifically, on September 22, 2022, AB 2097 was adopted by the State of California and subsequently added to California Government Code Section 65863.2. AB 2097 prohibits a public agency from imposing or enforcing any minimum automobile parking requirement on any residential, commercial, or other development project that is within one-half mile of a Major Transit Stop.⁴

5. Description of the Proposed Project

The Project includes the development of a new production studio campus at the southeastern corner of 6th Street and Alameda Street. The Project would include 16 studios, which would be grouped together within five studio buildings; three covered production

² SB 743 established new rules for evaluating aesthetic and parking impacts under CEQA for certain types of projects. Specifically, Public Resources Code Section 21099(d) states: “Aesthetic and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center on an infill site within a TPA shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.” TPAs are areas within 0.5 mile of a major transit stop that are existing or planned. Thus, in accordance with SB 743 and the City’s ZI No. 2452, the Project’s aesthetic and parking impacts are not considered significant as a matter of law.

³ City of Los Angeles Zoning Information and Map Access System, Inter-Departmental Correspondence, September 1, 2021.

⁴ AB 2097 defines a Major Transit Stop as a site containing any of the following: i) an existing rail or bus rapid transit station; ii) a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or ii) the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods. As summarized in Table 2 of the Transportation Assessment included in Appendix I of this Draft EIR, Metro Lines 16 and 18, which run along 6th Street adjacent to the Project Site, have headways of between six and seven minutes during the morning and afternoon peak periods. Metro Lines 53 and 720 with bus stops along 6th Street and Central Avenue have headways of between five minutes and 11 minutes during the morning and afternoon peak periods.

support areas adjacent to the studio buildings; and two new office buildings. The Project could also include up to 8,000 square feet of retail, inclusive of up to 4,000 square feet of restaurant space. If included, the proposed retail area would be located within the ground level lobbies of the proposed office buildings. If this area is not used by a retailer, the area would be used as additional common area for the office tenants. Overall, the Project would comprise a total floor area of 675,611 square feet with a FAR of 1.06:1. The two existing warehouse structures, consisting of approximately 311,000 square feet, would be demolished as part of the Project.

Vehicular access to the Project Site would be provided from two main gated driveways along 6th Street (referred to as the West Gate and the East Gate), and two additional driveways on Mill Street. An Emergency Vehicle only lane would also be located along the southern boundary of the Project Site, with access driveways at Mill Street and Alameda Street. In addition, the Project would install a passenger loading area on 6th Street, which would be designed in compliance with LADOT's standards. Due to the unique security requirements of production studio campuses, pedestrian access to the campus would not be available to the general public. However, the proposed office buildings would include large lobbies at the ground level to enhance pedestrian activity along those street frontages while maintaining essential security. Should a retail or restaurant use be implemented in either office building, public access would be provided via the lobby entrances.

The Project would provide up to 800 parking spaces within a five-story parking structure located along Mill Street and in surface parking areas located in the center of the Project Site that would be shielded from public view by the studio and office buildings. Overall, the Project is anticipated to provide a minimum of 759 and up to 800 vehicular parking spaces. Additionally, the Project would provide 173 bicycle parking stalls in accordance with LAMC requirements. Short-term bicycle parking would be located on Mill Street adjacent to a pedestrian gate and delivery driveway, while long-term bicycle parking would be provided adjacent to the office lobby. Lockers and showers associated with the long-term bicycle parking would be provided on the ground level of the office building at the corner of 6th Street and Mill Street.

Light sources would be shielded and/or directed inward to minimize light spill-over to neighboring properties and the surrounding area while utilizing low-level exterior lights at the site perimeter, as needed, for aesthetic, security, and wayfinding purposes. Additionally, new street and pedestrian lighting within the public right-of-way would provide appropriate and safe lighting levels on both sidewalks and roadways, while minimizing light and glare on adjacent properties, in compliance with applicable City regulations and with approval by the Bureau of Street Lighting. Glass in building façades would be selected for qualities, such as low reflectivity, to reduce glare; energy efficiency to limit solar heat gain; high visibility for adequate light transmission; and acoustic performance to reduce noise from outside.

New signage would be integrated with and complement the overall aesthetic character of the proposed on-site development and the surrounding areas. Project signage could include general ground-level and wayfinding pedestrian signage along the Project Site perimeter; building identification signs; marquee and monument signs; pillar and pole signs; banners; and other sign types, such as on-site wall signs, internal digital on-site signage, murals, and studio graphics that are typical on production studios. Project signage may include both externally and internally lit signs, which would be required to comply with LAMC illumination regulations.

6. Areas of Controversy

Based on the NOP comment letters provided in Appendix A of this Draft EIR, issues known to be of concern included, but were not limited to, Project impacts associated with air quality, traffic, and utilities. In addition, agencies such as Caltrans, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), and the Native American Heritage Commission submitted NOP comment letters that provided input for evaluating the impacts of the Project. Refer to Appendix A of this Draft EIR for copies of the NOP comment letters received during the NOP comment period.

7. Public Review Process

The City prepared an Initial Study and circulated an NOP for public comment to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, responsible agencies, and other interested parties on February 9, 2023, for a 30-day review period. In addition, a public scoping meeting for the Project was held on February 23, 2023. The Initial Study, NOP, and NOP comment letters are included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR.

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

8. Summary of Environmental Impacts

Table I-1 on page I-10 summarizes the environmental impacts of the Project evaluated in this Draft EIR. Based on the analysis in Section IV, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this Draft EIR, implementation of the Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts regarding on- and off-site noise sources during construction and on- and off-site vibration during construction (pursuant to the significance threshold for human annoyance). Cumulative impacts associated with on- and off-site noise during construction and off-site vibration during construction (pursuant to the significance threshold for human annoyance) would also be significant and unavoidable.

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

Environmental Topic	Project Impact Determination
A. AIR QUALITY	
<i>Regional Emissions</i>	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Localized Emissions</i>	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Toxic Air Contaminants</i>	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
B. CULTURAL RESOURCES	
<i>Historical Resources</i>	Less Than Significant
C. ENERGY	
<i>Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources</i>	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Conflict with Plans for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency</i>	Less Than Significant
D. GEOLOGY AND SOILS (PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES)	
<i>Paleontological Resources</i>	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
E. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	
<i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i>	Less Than Significant
F. LAND USE AND PLANNING	
<i>Conflict with Land Use Plans</i>	Less Than Significant
G. NOISE	
<i>Construction</i>	
<i>On-Site Noise</i>	Significant and Unavoidable
<i>Off-Site Noise</i>	Significant and Unavoidable
<i>On-Site Vibration (Building Damage)</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>On-Site Vibration (Human Annoyance)</i>	Significant and Unavoidable
<i>Off-Site Vibration (Building Damage)</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Off-Site Vibration (Human Annoyance)</i>	Significant and Unavoidable
<i>Operation</i>	
<i>On-Site Noise</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Off-Site Noise</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Vibration</i>	Less Than Significant

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

Environmental Topic	Project Impact Determination
H. PUBLIC SERVICES	
<i>Fire Protection</i>	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Police Protection</i>	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
K. TRANSPORTATION	
<i>Conflict with Transportation Plans</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Vehicle Miles Traveled</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Freeway Safety Analysis</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Emergency Access</i>	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
L. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	
<i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i>	Less Than Significant
M. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	
<i>Water Supply and Infrastructure</i>	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Wastewater</i>	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Energy Infrastructure</i>	
<i>Construction</i>	Less Than Significant
<i>Operation</i>	Less Than Significant
<hr/> <i>Source: Eyestone Environmental, 2024.</i>	

9. Project Design Features

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

a. Air Quality

Project Design Feature AQ-PDF-1: Prior to demolition, a Project representative shall make available to the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 25 horsepower. The inventory shall include the horsepower rating, engine production year, and certification of the specified Tier standard. A copy of each unit's certified tier specification, Best Available Control Technology documentation, and California Air Resources Board (CARB) or SCAQMD operating permit shall be available on-site at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment to allow a Construction Monitor to compare the on-site equipment with the inventory and certified Tier specification and operating permit.

Off-road diesel-powered equipment within the construction inventory list described above shall meet the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Tier 4 Final standards.

b. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Project Design Feature GHG-PDF-1: The Project will prohibit the use of natural gas during Project operations and will include all-electric uses, with exceptions for: (1) water heaters; (2) food operations (e.g., restaurant/commissary uses); and (3) building heating for studio uses. The proposed office buildings will use electricity for building heating.

c. Noise

Project Design Feature NOI-PDF-1: Outdoor mounted mechanical equipment will be enclosed or screened by the building design (e.g., a roof parapet) from view of off-site noise-sensitive receptors at the street level.

Project Design Feature NOI-PDF-2: Outdoor amplified sound systems, if any, will be designed so as not to exceed the maximum noise level of 75 dBA (L_{eq-1hr}) at a distance of 15 feet from the amplified speaker sound systems at the East and West Buildings Level 2 (Amenity level), and 80 dBA (L_{eq-1hr}) at a distance of 20 feet from the amplified speaker sound systems at the East and West Buildings roof level. A qualified noise consultant will provide written documentation that the design of the system complies with this maximum noise level.

d. Public Services—Police Protection

Project Design Feature POL-PDF-1: During construction, the Applicant will implement temporary security measures, including security fencing, lighting, and locked entry.

Project Design Feature POL-PDF-2: During operation, the Project will incorporate a 24/7 security plan to ensure the safety of its employees and visitors. The Project's security plan will include, but will not be limited to, the following design features:

- Secured points of entry, involving the use of key card passes and other pedestrian and vehicular access controls, where not manned;
- A 24-hour security camera network to provide visual surveillance of outdoor areas, parking facilities, and other activity areas, such as the lounges and auditorium;
- Private on-site security staff and regular security patrols of the Project Site; and
- Appropriate staff training on security protocols, including site and building access control and managing and monitoring fire/life/safety systems.

Project Design Feature POL-PDF-3: The Project will provide proper lighting of buildings and walkways to provide for pedestrian orientation and clearly identify a secure route between parking areas and points of entry into the buildings.

Project Design Feature POL-PDF-4: The Project will provide sufficient lighting of parking areas to maximize visibility and reduce areas of concealment.

Project Design Feature POL-PDF-5: The Project will design entrances to and exits from the buildings and open spaces around the buildings to be open and in view of surrounding sites.

Project Design Feature POL-PDF-6: The Applicant will consult with LAPD regarding the incorporation of feasible crime prevention features. Upon completion of construction of the Project and prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the Applicant will submit a diagram of the Project Site to the LAPD's Central Area Commanding Officer that includes access routes and any additional information that might facilitate police response.

e. Transportation

Project Design Feature TR-PDF-1: A detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), including haul routes and a staging plan, will be prepared and submitted to the City for review and approval, prior to commencing construction. The Construction Management Plan will formalize how

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

- Advance, bilingual notification of adjacent property owners and occupants of upcoming construction activities, including durations and daily hours of operation.
- Prohibition of construction worker or equipment parking on adjacent streets.
- Prohibition of haul staging on any streets adjacent to the Project, unless specifically approved as a condition of an approved haul route.
- Containment of construction activity within the Project Site boundaries, as feasible.
- Implementation of safety precautions for pedestrian and bicyclists through such measures as alternate routing and protection barriers.
- Scheduling of construction-related deliveries, haul trips, etc., to occur outside the commuter peak hours.
- Spacing of trucks so as to discourage a convoy effect.
- Identification of a construction manager and provision of a telephone number for any inquiries or complaints from residents regarding construction activities posted at the site readily visible to any interested party during site preparation, grading, and construction.

f. Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure

Project Design Feature WAT-PDF-1: The Project design shall incorporate the following water conservation features to support water conservation in addition to those measures required by the City's current codes and ordinances:

- ENERGY STAR Certified Residential Dishwashers – standard with 3.0 gallons/cycle or less.
- High Efficiency Toilets with a flush volume of 1.1 gallons per flush, or less.
- California Friendly® plants or native plants.

- Drip/Subsurface Irrigation (Mirco-Irrigation).
- Proper Hydro-Zoning/Zoned Irrigation (groups plants with similar water requirements together).

10. Mitigation Measures

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

a. Geology and Soils (Paleontological Resources)

Mitigation Measure GEO-MM-1: The Project Applicant shall retain a Qualified Professional Paleontologist (Qualified Paleontologist/Project Paleontologist/Principal Paleontologist), who meets or exceeds the SVP definition, to carry out all regulatory compliance measures and protocols related to paleontological resources. The Qualified Paleontologist shall obtain a curatorial arrangement with a qualified repository (e.g., LACM) prior to construction in the event of significant paleontological resource discoveries during construction.

Mitigation Measure GEO-MM-2: The Qualified Paleontologist shall develop Worker Environmental Awareness Program training to educate the construction crew on the legal requirements for preserving fossil resources, as well as the procedures to follow in the event of a fossil discovery. This training program shall be given to the crew before ground-disturbing work commences and shall include handouts to be given to new workers as needed.

Mitigation Measure GEO-MM-3: Full-time paleontological monitoring shall occur during ground-disturbing activities that impact previously undisturbed sediments at depths of 5 feet bgs or greater that have relatively higher paleontological sensitivity, including late to middle Pleistocene older alluvial fan deposits, early Pleistocene to Pliocene Fernando Formation, and/or early Pliocene to late Miocene Puente Formation. Monitoring shall not be required when ground-disturbing activities are less than 5 feet bgs or when impacting only previously disturbed sediments and/or Recent artificial fill regardless of depth. Monitoring shall be conducted by a qualified paleontological monitor who meets the standards of the SVP (2010) and who shall be supervised by the Qualified Paleontologist. The Qualified Paleontologist may periodically inspect construction activities to adjust the level of monitoring in response to subsurface conditions. Monitoring efforts can be increased, reduced, or ceased entirely if determined adequate by the Qualified Paleontologist. Paleontological monitoring shall include inspection of exposed sedimentary units during active excavations within sensitive geologic sediments. The monitor shall have authority to temporarily divert activity away from exposed fossils to evaluate the significance of the find and,

should the fossils be determined significant, professionally and efficiently recover the fossil specimens and collect associated data. The monitor shall record pertinent geologic data and collect appropriate sediment samples from any fossil localities. Recovered fossils shall be prepared to the point of curation, identified by qualified experts, listed in a database to facilitate analysis, and deposited in a designated paleontological repository (e.g., NHMLA).

Mitigation Measure GEO-MM-4: Upon conclusion of ground-disturbing activities, the Qualified Paleontologist overseeing paleontological monitoring shall prepare a final monitoring report that documents the paleontological monitoring efforts for the Project and describes any paleontological resources discoveries observed and/or recorded during the life of the Project. If paleontological resources are curated, the final monitoring report and any associated data pertinent to the curated specimen(s) shall be submitted to the designated repository. A copy of the final monitoring report shall be filed with the Department of City Planning.

b. Noise

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

- Along the north property line of the Project Site between the construction areas and the residential uses along the north side of 6th Street (receptor locations R1 and R2). The temporary sound barrier shall be designed to provide a minimum 11-dBA noise reduction at the ground level of receptors R1 and R2.
- Along the eastern property line of the Project Site between the construction areas and the potential future residential uses along the east side of Mill Street (receptor location R3), the temporary sound barrier shall be designed to provide a minimum 14-dBA noise reduction at the ground level of receptor location R3. In the event the proposed mixed-use conversion at receptor location R3 is not completed and occupied prior to or during Project construction, this mitigation measure shall not be required because impacts on the existing (i.e., non-residential non-sensitive use) would be less than significant without mitigation.
- In the event the proposed mixed-use development at receptor location R6 is completed and occupied prior to or during the course of Project construction - Along the southern property line of the Project Site between the construction areas and the potential future residential uses adjacent to the Project Site to the south, the

temporary sound barrier shall be designed to provide a minimum 20-dBA noise reduction at the ground level of receptor location R6.

- In the event the proposed mixed-use development at receptor location R6 is not constructed, a temporary sound barrier shall be provided along the southern property line between the Project Site and the recently completed apartments building (AVA Arts District) (receptor location R6A). The temporary sound barrier at this location shall be designed to provide a minimum 11-dBA noise reduction at the ground level of receptor location R6A.
- Along the western property lines of the Project Site between the construction areas and the Produce Hotel Apartments located at the northeast corner of Central Avenue and 7th Avenue (receptor location R7), the temporary sound barrier shall be designed to provide a minimum 5-dBA noise reduction at the ground level of receptor location R7.

Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-2: A temporary and impermeable moveable sound barrier shall be provided at the locations listed below. At plan check, building plans shall include documentation prepared by a noise consultant verifying compliance with this measure.

- During construction of the off-site utility connections along Alameda Street, 6th Street, and Mill Street, the Project shall provide a temporary moveable noise barrier between the construction equipment and receptor locations R1, R2, R3, and R6, where feasible. The temporary noise barrier shall be designed to provide a minimum 5-dBA noise reduction at the ground levels of receptor locations R1 and R6, and a 10-dBA noise reduction at the ground level of receptor locations R2 and R3.

11. Summary of Alternatives

This Draft EIR examined three alternatives to the Project in detail, which include Alternative 1: the No Project/No Build Alternative, Alternative 2: the Reduced Development Alternative, and Alternative 3: the Increased Setback Alternative. A general description of these alternatives is provided below. Refer to Section V, Alternatives, of this Draft EIR for a more detailed description of these alternatives, a comparative analysis of the impacts of these alternatives with those of the Project, and a description of the alternatives considered but rejected as infeasible.

a. Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, Alternative 1, the No Project/No Build Alternative for a development project on an identifiable property consists of the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines

states in part 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 the Project would not be approved, no new permanent development would occur within the Project Site, and the existing environment would be maintained. Thus, the physical conditions of the Project Site would generally remain as they are today. Specifically, the existing buildings as well as the surface parking areas would remain on the Project Site, and no new construction would occur.

Alternative 1 would eliminate the Project’s significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to on- and off-site noise sources during construction and on- and off-site vibration during construction (pursuant to the significance threshold for human annoyance). Alternative 1 would also avoid the Project’s significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts with respect to on- and off-site noise during construction and off-site vibration during construction (pursuant to the significance threshold for human annoyance). In addition, Alternative 1 would avoid the Project’s less than significant impacts with mitigation. Impacts associated with the remaining environmental issues would be less than those of the Project.

b. Alternative 2: Reduced Development Alternative

Alternative 2, the Reduced Development Alternative, would develop the same mix of uses as the Project but would reduce the total amount of new floor area by approximately 25 percent. This alternative would include the development of 506,708 square feet of total floor area comprised of 224,259 square feet of studios, 51,894 square feet of production support space, and 230,555 square feet of office space. As with the Project, the proposed uses would be provided in 16 studios, which would be grouped together within five studio buildings; three covered production support areas adjacent to the studio buildings; and two new office buildings. This alternative could also include retail space within the lobby spaces of the proposed office buildings. The potential retail space could comprise approximately 6,000 square feet of the proposed office space. Alternative 2 would include a total of 600 vehicular parking spaces within a five-story parking structure. As with the Project, Alternative 2 would require limited grading and excavation activities which would extend to a maximum depth of approximately 11 feet below ground surface. It is estimated that approximately 34,000 cubic yards of export would be hauled from the Project Site.

Alternative 2 would not avoid the Project’s significant and unavoidable noise and vibration impacts. However, Alternative 2 would reduce the overall amount of construction activities compared to the Project such that the impacts above related to construction noise and vibration would occur for a shorter duration as compared to the Project. In addition, Alternative 2 would also reduce some of the less than significant impacts of the Project (i.e., construction TACs, construction-related energy, construction-related fire protection, construction-related police protection, and construction-related water supply/infrastructure),

while all other impacts would be similar to those of the Project. Alternative 2 would not result in greater impacts than the Project in terms of any of the environmental issues evaluated in this Draft EIR.

c. Alternative 3: Increased Setback Alternative

Alternative 3, the Increased Setback Alternative, would include the same uses as the Project. However, Alternative 3 would incorporate a 75-foot setback along the Project Site's southern boundary to address the Project's significant and unavoidable construction-related noise and vibration impacts. With the increased setback, the number of studios would be reduced from 16 studios to 11 studios. As with the Project, these studios would be grouped together within five studio buildings. Like the Project, three covered production support areas adjacent to the studio buildings would also be included. Similarly, two new office buildings are also proposed as part of this alternative. Overall, Alternative 3 would comprise a total floor area of 512,611 square feet with a floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.81:1. Like the Project, approximately 800 vehicular parking spaces would be provided for the proposed uses within a five-story parking structure and surface parking areas. As with the Project, Alternative 3 would require limited grading and excavation activities which would extend to a maximum depth of 11 feet below ground surface. It is estimated that approximately 34,000 cubic yards of export would be hauled from the Project Site.

Alternative 3 would not avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable noise and vibration impacts. However, Alternative 3 would reduce the amount of construction activities compared to the Project due to the 75-foot setback along the southern boundary of the Project Site such that the impacts above related to construction noise and vibration would be lessened but not to level of less than significant after application of all feasible mitigation. In addition, Alternative 3 would reduce several of the other construction-related less than significant impacts associated with the Project (i.e., TACs during construction, energy efficiency during construction, police and fire protection services during construction, water and energy infrastructure during construction) while all other impacts would be similar to those of the Project. Alternative 3 would not result in greater impacts than the Project in terms of any of the environmental issues evaluated in this Draft EIR.

d. Environmentally Superior Alternative

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

With respect to identifying an Environmentally Superior Alternative among those analyzed in this Draft EIR, the range of feasible alternatives includes: Alternative 1—No Project/No Build Alternative; Alternative 2—Reduced Development Alternative; and Alternative 3—Increased Setback Alternative.

Of the alternatives analyzed in this Draft EIR, Alternative 1, the No Project/No Build Alternative, would avoid all of the Project's impacts (i.e., would avoid the Project's significant unavoidable impacts, less than significant impacts w/mitigation, and less than significant impacts).

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines requirement to identify an Environmentally Superior Alternative other than the No Project Alternative, a comparative evaluation of the remaining alternatives indicates that Alternative 3, the Increased Setback Alternative, would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative. As detailed in Section V, Alternatives, of this Draft EIR, while Alternative 3 would not avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts, Alternative 3 would reduce these impacts to a greater extent than would Alternative 2. Furthermore, Alternative 3 would reduce more of the Project's other impacts than would Alternative 2. Lastly, Alternative 3 would not result in greater impacts than the Project. Therefore, of the range of alternatives analyzed, Alternative 3, the Increased Setback Alternative, would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative.