V. Alternatives

V. Alternatives

1. Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Overview of Selected Alternatives

As set forth in Section II, Project Description, of this Draft EIR, the Project would include the development of a creative office campus comprised of a 10-story commercial high-rise building, a two-story commercial building, a one-story commercial building, and a one-story electrical enclosure. The Project would include 217,189 square feet of creative office space and 5,000 square feet of retail and restaurant space for a total of 222,189 square feet of new floor area. The Project would also include 711 vehicle parking spaces in up to four levels of subterranean parking and one ground floor parking level. All existing buildings and uses within the Project Site would be removed, including the three existing buildings that total 39,328 square feet of office and industrial uses. The Project would create a pedestrian environment along Bay Street and Sacramento Street, an area that currently lacks pedestrian infrastructure, by constructing new sidewalks, planting new street trees, creating ground floor commercial space with storefront glazing, and providing a lobby entrance for the office/creative office tenants along a pedestrian paseo. Vehicular access would be provided from driveways located on Bay Street and Sacramento Street and a lay-by for passenger drop-off and pick-up on Bay Street. The roof of the 10-story building would include an outdoor landscaped terrace for the building's tenants, and a pedestrian paseo would be provided on the ground level.

As indicated above, the intent of the alternatives is to avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of a project while still feasibly obtaining most of the basic project objectives.

As evaluated in Section IV, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this Draft EIR, should certain related projects be constructed (i.e., the related projects represented by receptor locations R1, R2 and R4), sensitive uses would be present in the Project vicinity. In this case, implementation of the Project would result in significant impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated with regard to on-site and off-site noise and vibration (pursuant to the

significance criteria for human annoyance) during construction, and cumulative impacts with regard to on-site and off-site noise and off-site vibration (human annoyance) during construction. The Project would also contribute to significant cumulative off-site operational noise associated with vehicular traffic. All other impacts associated with the Project would be less than significant or reduced to less than significant with mitigation.

Based on the significant environmental impacts of the Project, the underlying purpose and basic objectives established for the Project (refer to Section II, Project Description, of this Draft EIR), and the feasibility of the alternatives considered, the alternatives to the Project listed below were selected for evaluation.

- Alternative 1—No Project/No Build Alternative: Alternative 1 assumes that the Project would not be implemented, no new development would occur on the Project Site, and the existing on-site creative office, office, and light industrial uses and 0.53:1 FAR would be maintained. Thus, the physical conditions of the Project Site would remain as they are today.

- Alternative 2— Existing Zoning Compliant Alternative: Alternative 2 would include development of creative office and retail uses at the Project Site at a 1.5:1 FAR in accordance with the existing M3-1-RIO zoning and land use regulations of the Project Site.

- Alternative 3—25% Reduced Project Alternative: Alternative 3 would include development of the same creative office and retail uses at the Project Site as the Project while reducing the amount of floor area by 25 percent and FAR to 2.25:1.

Table V-1 on page V-4 provides a comparison of the Project with the three alternatives being considered. Each of these alternatives is described in the sections that follow. In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c) requires that an EIR identify any alternatives that were considered for analysis but rejected as infeasible. Such potential alternatives are described further below.

Table V-1
Summary of Development Proposed under Alternatives to the Project

	Proposed Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Development Alternative (Existing to remain)	Alternative 2: Existing Zoning Compliant Alternative	Alternative 3: 25% Reduced Project Alternative
Creative Office	217,189 sf	16,000 sf	106,095 sf	161,642 sf
Office	—	7,106 sf	—	—
Light Industrial	—	16,222 sf	—	—
Retail/Restaurant	5,000 sf	—	5,000	5,000
Total Gross Floor Area	**221,189 sf**	**39,328 sf**	**111,095 sf**	**166,642 sf**
Total Net Floor Area	**182,861 sf**	**39,328 sf**	**71,767 sf**	**127,314 sf**
FAR	3.05:1	0.53:1	1.5:1	2.25:1
Parking	711 spaces 1 ground level 4 subterranean levels	surface parking	355 spaces — 2 subterranean levels	533 spaces — 3 subterranean levels
Maximum Excavation Depth	42 ft	—	22 ft	32 ft
Number of Buildings	3[a]	3	3[a]	3[a]
Building Height	1–10 stories 190 ft	1–2 stories	1–4 stories	1–6 stories

sf = square feet

FAR = floor area ratio

ft = feet

[a] *Does not include a proposed one-story electrical enclosure which is not included as part of the proposed floor area consistent with the LAMC definition of floor area.*

Source: Eyestone Environmental, 2022. Based on the alternatives tables from Shimoda Design Group, September 8, 2021.

3. Alternatives Considered and Rejected as Infeasible

As set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), the range of potential alternatives to a proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant impacts. As further set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), the EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed as well as identify any alternatives that were considered for analysis but rejected as infeasible and briefly explain the reasons for their rejection. According to the CEQA Guidelines, among the factors that may be used to eliminate an alternative from detailed consideration are the alternative's failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, the alternative's infeasibility, or the alternative's inability to avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant environmental impacts. Based on the CEQA Guidelines, the alternatives to the Project that have been considered and rejected include the following:

Alternatives to Eliminate Significant Noise and Vibration Impacts During Construction: As discussed in Section IV.H, Noise, of this Draft EIR, the Project would result in short-term significant and unavoidable construction-related noise impacts from on-site and off-site construction activities. It is noted that the Project's construction-related noise impacts from on-site construction activities would only occur if the project proposed at 2110 Bay Street (receptor location R1) is completed and occupied prior to or during Project construction. If the 2110 Bay Street project is not completed and occupied prior to or during Project construction, the Project's significant and unavoidable on-site construction noise impact would not occur. Similarly, the Project's construction-related noise impacts from off-site construction activities would only occur if the 2110 Bay Street project (receptor location R1) was completed and occupied prior to or during Project construction. If the 2110 Bay Street project is not completed and occupied prior to or during Project construction, the Project's significant and unavoidable off-site construction noise impact at receptor location R1 would not occur (although the significant unavoidable impact at receptor location R3 would occur regardless).

The Project would also result in significant and unavoidable vibration impacts (pursuant to the significance criteria for human annoyance) related to both on-site construction activities and off-site construction traffic (with the significant unavoidable vibration impact occurring at receptor location R1 only in the event that the 2110 Bay Street project was completed and occupied prior to construction of the Project).

The following potential alternatives were considered to avoid or substantially lessen the Project's significant and unavoidable construction noise and vibration impacts:

- Potential Alternative (a)—Extended Construction Duration: This potential alternative considers extending the construction period, thus reducing the amount of daily construction activity that would occur under the Project. This alternative was evaluated and rejected as follows:

  – Construction noise levels are dependent on the number of construction equipment (on-site equipment or off-site construction trucks). With an extended construction duration, the number of on-site construction equipment and off-site construction trips would be reduced. Typically, a reduction of 50 percent in the number of construction equipment pieces or construction traffic (haul and delivery trucks trips) would reduce the construction-related noise levels by approximately 3 dBA (just perceptible).[1,2] A 50-percent reduction in construction truck trips during site grading, which is the peak period of construction with the highest number of construction trucks, from 44 to 22 truck trips per hour (refer to Table IV.H-13 of Section IV.H, Noise, of this Draft EIR), would reduce the truck noise along Bay Street to 66.8 dBA L_{eq} (a 3-dBA reduction as compared to the Project). However, when accounting for the ambient noise level (i.e., the Project plus ambient noise levels due to off-site construction trucks), the actual noise levels would only be reduced by 2.7 dBA. Thus, as analyzed, even with a 50-percent reduction in the truck trips, the off-site construction noise plus ambient noise would result in a minimal reduction in noise (i.e., less than the 3-dBA perceptible level). This approach would also be inefficient and would increase the number of days that sensitive receptors would be impacted by the off-site construction trucks, thereby prolonging the duration of the significant impact.

  – With respect to on-site construction, a reduction in the number of pieces of construction equipment would also reduce noise levels compared to the Project (depending on the amount of reduction) but would still exceed the significance threshold. In addition, the reduction would be less than 3.0 dBA, which is the level where noise is perceptible, and would not be sufficient to substantially lessen the significant and unavoidable impact. Specifically, reducing the on-site construction equipment during the demolition phase from 11 pieces to six pieces of equipment (45-percent reduction) would reduce the construction noise at the off-site receptors by 0.2 dBA L_{eq} at receptor location R1, 2.1 dBA L_{eq} at receptor location R3, and 2.2 dBA L_{eq} at receptor locations R2 and R4 (as compared to the Project). The estimated construction noise

[1] *The following equation demonstrates a reduction of 3 dBA with a 50-percent reduction in construction equipment pieces or construction traffic (haul and delivery truck trips): Noise reduction = 10xLog(0.5) = -3 dB, where 0.5 represents the 50-percent reduction.*

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

levels with a 45-percent reduction in the number of pieces of construction equipment would still exceed the significance threshold by up to 33.5 dBA L_{eq} at receptor location R1 during the site demolition phase. Therefore, on-site construction noise levels under this approach would be less than the Project (depending on the amount of reduction) but would still exceed the significance threshold. In addition, the reduction would be less than 3.0 dBA, which is the level where noise is perceptible and, therefore, would not be sufficient to avoid or substantially lessen the significant and unavoidable impact. This approach would also be inefficient and would increase the number of days that sensitive receptors would be impacted by construction activities, thereby prolonging the duration of the significant impact. Furthermore, due to the proximity of the off-site noise sensitive receptors (receptor R1 is adjacent to the Project Site), it would not be practical to reduce the construction noise levels to below the significance threshold as a single piece of equipment would result in noise levels above the significance threshold. For example, a single bulldozer operating at the property line would generate a noise level of 92 dBA L_{eq} at receptor R1, which would exceed the significance threshold by 28.4 dBA L_{eq}. As such, the on-site construction noise impacts under this approach would not be substantially less than the Project and would remain significant. In addition, the estimated noise reduction provided with the 45-percent equipment reduction (i.e., from 97.3 dBA at receptor location R1, 65.7 dBA at receptor location 2, 63.7 dBA at receptor location 3, and 58.1 dBA at receptor location 4, to 97.1 dBA, 63.6 dBA, 61.5 dBA, and 55.9 dBA, respectively) is not considered a substantial reduction because the reductions would be less than 3.0 dBA and thus barely perceptible. The post-reduction noise levels would also still be above the significance criteria.

  - The on-site construction vibration impacts (pursuant to the significance criteria for human annoyance) would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the Project, as the vibration impact analysis is based on the peak vibration level generated by individual construction equipment, and under this approach, the same construction equipment (e.g., drill rig and large bulldozer) would be used. In addition, off-site construction vibration impacts (pursuant to the significance criteria for human annoyance) due to heavy trucks traveling by sensitive receptors would also continue to be significant and unavoidable, similar to the Project, as the trucks would generate the same vibration levels for an extended construction duration.

- Alternative (b)—Central Location of Development: This potential alternative would involve moving the proposed development closer to the center of the Project Site, thus pulling back the proposed development and associated construction activities from the off-site sensitive receptors. This approach was reviewed and rejected for the following reasons:

  - Construction noise levels can be reduced by providing an additional buffer zone between the receptor and the construction equipment. Noise levels

from construction equipment would generally attenuate approximately 6 dBA per doubling of distance from the noise source (construction equipment) to the receptor over acoustically "hard" sites (e.g., asphalt and concrete surfaces) and 7.5 dBA per doubling of distance from the noise source to the receptor over acoustically "soft" sites (e.g., soft dirt, grass or scattered bushes and trees. While the on-site construction noise levels associated with the building phases for the proposed buildings placed closer to the center of the Project Site could be reduced compared to the Project, the noise level reduction, depending upon the setback from the property line, would be limited due the size of the Project Site (approximately 265 feet between the east and west property lines). In addition, noise levels during site demolition, site preparation and grading would be similar to the Project, as construction activities for these phases would be required to be up to the property line, similar to the Project, for development of the Project Site. As such, the on-site construction noise impacts under this approach would not be substantially lessened and would remain significant and unavoidable as with the Project.

  - Similar to the Project, the on-site construction vibration impacts (pursuant to the significance criteria for human annoyance) of this potential alternative would not be substantially lessened and would remain significant as heavy construction equipment (e.g., drill rig and large bulldozer) used for the site grading would still be used and operated near the property line and adjacent sensitive uses under this potential alternative. Also similar to the Project, the off-site construction vibration impacts (pursuant to the significance criteria for human annoyance) of this potential alternative would be significant as heavy trucks would similarly travel by sensitive receptors.

- Potential Alternative (c)—Reduced Development: A potential alternative that reduces the amount of development that would occur under the Project to the extent that it would avoid one or more of the significant unavoidable construction noise and vibration impacts of the Project was also considered. Specifically, this alternative would pull construction away from the off-site noise-sensitive uses by reducing the total amount of development under the Project and creating on-site buffer zones between the proposed on-site development (and associated construction activities) and the Project Site boundary and off-site noise-sensitive receptors. However, due to the close proximity of the sensitive receptors (i.e., directly across from the Project Site) and a constrained Project Site that does not have the space to create a meaningful buffer zone, it would not be practical to mitigate the on-site construction noise impacts of the Project by reducing the overall amount of development, especially at the proposed project represented by receptor location R1 immediately west and adjacent to the Project Site.[3] In

[3] *Both Alternatives 2 and 3 would include less net new development than the Project. However, neither would pull construction activities away from off-site noise-sensitive receptors.*

addition, the on-site construction vibration impacts (pursuant to the significance criteria for human annoyance) of this potential alternative would be significant since the vibration impact analysis is based on the peak vibration level generated by individual construction equipment pieces that would still be required near the perimeter of the Project Site. Off-site construction vibration impacts (pursuant to the significance criteria for human annoyance), due to heavy trucks traveling by sensitive receptors, would also be significant similar to the Project.

Based on the above, none of the above potential alternatives would avoid or substantially lessen the significant and unavoidable construction-related on- and off-site noise and vibration impacts (pursuant to the significance criteria for human annoyance) of the Project. This is because the significant and unavoidable construction-related noise and vibration impacts of the Project are heavily influenced by the close proximity of the Project Site and the proposed haul route to potential future noise- and vibration-sensitive uses rather than the amount or duration of Project construction activities. Therefore, none of these potential alternatives would avoid or substantially lessen the significant noise and vibration impacts of the Project and thus no further consideration of these approaches in the EIR is required.

Alternative Project Site: The Project's underlying purpose and objectives are intimately tied to the Project's location within the Arts District and to providing the types of uses that would be compatible in this area of the City.[4] In particular, the Project's purpose is to provide a vertical creative office campus for innovative media, entertainment, and technology companies. Development of the Project at an alternative site, especially if such a site was located outside the Arts District, would not meet the Project objectives listed below. If the alternative site were in the Arts District, it would potentially meet these objectives.

- In support of the Central City North Community Plan Objective 2-1, provide additional opportunities for new commercial development and services through the development of a creative office project with a combination of indoor and outdoor spaces that is capable of attracting high-quality media and creative office tenants to the Arts District.
- Strengthen the Arts District's economic vitality by attracting new, high skilled workers and new economy media, entertainment, and technology businesses.

[4] *The Project would be supportive of Central City North Community Plan Objective 2-1, strengthening the vitality of the Arts District, and creating sufficient office square footage and density to retain jobs in the Arts District because, rather than including simple office development, it would include creative office development which would support the types of land uses specific to the Arts District that the Community Plan encourages (i.e., high-quality media, economy media, entertainment, technology, and arts uses).*

- Create sufficient office square footage and density to retain a significant jobs component in the Arts District and facilitate a healthy job-housing balance in the Arts District area in light of both existing and pending development.

Regardless, an alternative site is not considered feasible as it is not expected that the Applicant can reasonably acquire, control, or have access to a suitable alternative site that would provide for the uses and square footage proposed by the Project. Lastly, development of the Project at an alternative site would likely not avoid any of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project. Specifically, it would be expected that if development of the Project were to occur at an alternative site within a similar urban environment where the site would similarly be located in close proximity to noise and vibration sensitive uses, the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project would also occur. Furthermore, development of the Project at an alternative site could potentially produce other environmental impacts that would otherwise not occur at the current Project Site. Therefore, an alternative site is not considered feasible as it would fail to achieve the underlying purpose and related objectives of the Project. In addition, an alternative site would likely not avoid the Project's significant impacts. Thus, in accordance with Section 15126.6(f) of the State CEQA Guidelines, this alternative was rejected from further consideration.

4. Alternatives Analysis Format

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), each alternative is evaluated in sufficient detail to determine whether the overall environmental impacts would be less, similar, or greater than the corresponding impacts of the Project, as compared against the baseline (existing conditions). Furthermore, each alternative is evaluated to determine whether the Project's basic objectives, identified in Section II, Project Description, of this Draft EIR, would be substantially attained by the alternative.[5] The evaluation of each of the alternatives follows the process described below:

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

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

[5] *State of California, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c).*

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

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

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

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

A summary matrix that compares the impacts associated with the Project with the impacts of each of the analyzed alternatives is provided in Table V-2 on page V-12.

As evaluated in the Initial Study prepared for the Project included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR, the Project would not result in significant impacts related to: aesthetics, agricultural and forestry resources, air quality (odors), biological resources, cultural resources (human remains), geology and soils (except for paleontological resources),[6] hazards and hazardous materials (routine transport/use/disposal of hazardous materials, hazardous emissions within 0.25 mile of a school, airport safety hazards, impairment of implementation of emergency response/evacuation plan, wildland fires), hydrology and water quality (100-year flood hazard area, inundation by seiche/tsunami/mudflow), land use (physical division of an established community), mineral resources, noise (airport noise), population and housing, public services (schools, parks, libraries), recreation, utilities and service systems (wastewater, telecommunications, solid waste), and wildfire. Therefore, no further analysis of these topics in this EIR is required or provided, and these topics are not considered with respect to any of the alternatives considered as similar analytic conclusions are anticipated.

[6] *In January 2018, OPR proposed comprehensive updates to the CEQA Guidelines which revised thresholds for aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, transportation, and utilities and service systems. Prior to the release of the revised thresholds, the question or threshold related to potential impacts to paleontological resources was considered under cultural resources. This threshold has since been moved and is now addressed under geology and soils.*

Table V-2
Comparison of Impacts Associated with the Alternatives

Impact Area	Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative	Alternative 2: Existing Zoning Compliant Alternative	Alternative 3: 25% Reduced Project Alternative
A. AIR QUALITY				
Regional Emissions				
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Localized Emissions				
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Toxic Air Contaminants				
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
B. CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Historical Resources	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Archaeological Resources	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
C. ENERGY				
Wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of Energy Resources				
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)

Table V-2 (Continued)
Comparison of Impacts Associated with the Alternatives

Impact Area	Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative	Alternative 2: Existing Zoning Compliant Alternative	Alternative 3: 25% Reduced Project Alternative
Operation	Less Than Significant	Greater (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Conflict with Plans for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency	Less Than Significant	Greater (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
D. GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
Paleontological Resources	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant with Mitigation)	Less (Less Than Significant with Mitigation)
E. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
F. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
G. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
Water Quality Standards/Waste Discharge Requirements	Less Than Significant	Greater (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Groundwater Supplies/Recharge	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Erosion/Siltation, Flooding, Stormwater Infrastructure Capacity	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Impede/Redirect Flood Flows	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)

Table V-2 (Continued)
Comparison of Impacts Associated with the Alternatives

Impact Area	Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative	Alternative 2: Existing Zoning Compliant Alternative	Alternative 3: 25% Reduced Project Alternative
Water Quality Control Plan/Sustainable Groundwater Plan	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
H. LAND USE AND PLANNING				
Conflict with Land Use Plans	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
I. NOISE				
Construction[a]				
On-Site Noise	Significant and Unavoidable	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)
Off-Site Noise	Significant and Unavoidable	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)
On-Site Vibration (Building Damage)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant with Mitigation)	Similar (Less Than Significant with Mitigation)
On-Site Vibration (Human Annoyance)	Significant and Unavoidable	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)
Off-Site Vibration (Building Damage)	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Off-Site Vibration (Human Annoyance)	Significant and Unavoidable	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)	Similar (Significant and Unavoidable)
Operation				
On-Site Noise	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Off-Site Noise	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)

Table V-2 (Continued)
Comparison of Impacts Associated with the Alternatives

Impact Area	Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative	Alternative 2: Existing Zoning Compliant Alternative	Alternative 3: 25% Reduced Project Alternative
Vibration (Building Damage and Human Annoyance)	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
J. PUBLIC SERVICES				
Fire Protection				
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Police Protection				
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
K. TRANSPORTATION				
Conflict with Plans	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Vehicle Miles Traveled	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less (No Impact)	Greater (Less Than Significant with Mitigation)	Greater (Less Than Significant with Mitigation)
Hazardous Design Features	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Emergency Access	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
Freeway Safety Analysis	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)

Table V-2 (Continued)
Comparison of Impacts Associated with the Alternatives

Impact Area	Project	Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative	Alternative 2: Existing Zoning Compliant Alternative	Alternative 3: 25% Reduced Project Alternative
L. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Tribal Cultural Resources	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Similar (Less Than Significant)	Similar (Less Than Significant)
M. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS				
Water Supply and Infrastructure				
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Energy Infrastructure				
Construction	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)
Operation	Less Than Significant	Less (No Impact)	Less (Less Than Significant)	Less (Less Than Significant)

[a] *In addition to the Project-level noise and vibration impacts identified for the Project and the development alternatives (i.e., Alternatives 2 and 3), cumulative noise and vibration impacts for the Project and the development alternatives would be less than significant before mitigation, except that the following cumulative noise and vibration impacts would be significant unavoidable: (1) cumulative on- and off-site construction noise; (2) cumulative off-site construction vibration (human annoyance); and (3) cumulative off-site operational noise.*

Source: Eyestone Environmental, 2022.

V. Alternatives

A. Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative

1. Description of the Alternative

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the No Project 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 development would occur on the Project Site, and the existing on-site uses would be retained. Specifically, the Project Site, which is currently developed with three buildings totaling 39,328 square feet of creative office, office and light industrial uses, as well as surface parking, would be retained in its current condition.

2. Environmental Impacts

a. Air Quality

(1) Regional Emissions

(a) Construction

Alternative 1 would not remove the existing on-site uses or require any construction activities on the Project Site. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not result in any construction emissions associated with construction worker and construction truck traffic, fugitive dust from demolition and excavation, or the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, and no construction-related regional emissions would be generated. As such, Alternative 1 would have no impact, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

Alternative 1 would not result in new development or increased operations that could generate additional operational emissions related to vehicular traffic or the consumption of electricity and natural gas beyond what is currently generated by the existing on-site uses.

Therefore, no increase in operational regional emissions would be generated under Alternative 1. As such, Alternative 1 would have no impact, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Localized Emissions

(a) Construction

Alternative 1 would not remove the existing on-site uses or require any construction activities on the Project Site. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not result in any construction emissions associated with construction worker and construction truck traffic, fugitive dust from demolition and excavation, or the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, and no construction-related localized emissions would be generated. As such, Alternative 1 would have no impact, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

Alternative 1 would not result in new development or increased operations that could generate additional operational emissions related to vehicular traffic or the consumption of electricity and natural gas beyond what is currently generated by the existing on-site uses. Therefore, no increase in operational localized emissions would be generated under Alternative 1. As such, Alternative 1 would have no impact, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project

(3) Toxic Air Contaminants

(a) Construction

Since construction activities would not occur on the Project Site under Alternative 1, this alternative would not result in any diesel particulate emissions during construction that could have associated with them substantial toxic air contaminants (TACs). Therefore, no increase in construction-related TAC emissions would occur under Alternative 1. As such, Alternative 1 would have no impact, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, the primary sources of potential TAC emissions during Project operation would include diesel particulate matter (DPM) from delivery trucks (e.g., truck traffic on local streets and idling on adjacent streets) and, to a lesser extent, facility operations (e.g., natural gas fired boilers). Typical sources of acutely and chronically hazardous TACs include industrial manufacturing processes

(e.g., chrome plating, electrical manufacturing, petroleum refinery). Since Alternative 1 would not result in new development on the Project Site, no increase in potential operational TAC emissions would occur. Therefore, Alternative 1 would have no impact, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

b. Cultural Resources

As discussed in Section IV.B, Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR, there are no historical resources on the Project Site. In addition, no demolition, grading, or other earthwork activities that could potentially affect adjacent or nearby historical resources or the nearby potential Downtown Los Angeles Industrial Historic District would occur under Alternative 1. Therefore, impacts to historical resources would not occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

With regard to archaeological resources, as discussed in Section IV.B, Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR, no archaeological resources were identified within or in the vicinity of the Project Site. In addition, Alternative 1 would not result in new development that would require grading or earthwork activities that could potentially result in the inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources or the disturbance of nearby archaeological resources (such as the historic-era Zanja network). Therefore, no impacts associated with archaeological resources would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

c. Energy

(1) Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources

(a) Construction

Construction activities would not occur under Alternative 1. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not generate a short-term demand for energy during construction which could potentially result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Thus, construction-related impacts to energy would not occur. As such, impacts under Alternative 1 would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

Alternative 1 would not alter the existing land uses or site operations on the Project Site. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not increase the long-term energy demand on the Project Site and would have no potential to result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. It is noted, however, that the Project would replace existing older buildings, which may be using energy in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner with modern buildings incorporating the latest energy-conserving City Green Building Code requirements. As such, the impacts under Alternative 1 would be greater when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Conflict with Plans for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency

Alternative 1 would not involve any new development. As such, Alternative 1 would not have the potential to conflict with plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. . However, this alternative would not bring the existing on-site development into consistency with applicable plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency, versus the Project which would replace the existing on-site uses with development that would be consistent with these energy plans. Therefore, impacts would be greater when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

d. Geology and Soils

As discussed in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR, a records search conducted at the Natural Historic Museum of Los Angeles County (NHM) for the Project Site indicates there are no previously recorded fossil vertebrate localities located within the Project Site. Alternative 1 would not result in new development that would require grading or earthwork activities. As such, Alternative 1 would not result in the potential disturbance of any un-recorded paleontological resources that may be present at the Project Site. No impacts associated with paleontological resources would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the Project's less-than-significant impacts with mitigation.

e. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Alternative 1 would not develop new uses on the Project Site. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not result in an increase in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the Project Site, and no impact would occur. Therefore, impacts associated with GHG emissions under Alternative 1 would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

f. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Alternative 1 would not include any construction/excavation activities or result in an increase in on-site operational activities. As such, Alternative 1 would not have the potential to result in upset and accident conditions (i.e., the release of hazardous materials into the environment and potential human exposure) associated with the use, handling, storage and disposal of hazardous materials and/or the potential disturbance of contaminated soil and/or features (i.e., hazardous materials storage tanks, PCB-containing infrastructure, ACM- and lead-based paint-containing buildings, etc.) or create a significant hazard to the public or the environment caused in whole or in part from the exacerbation of existing environmental conditions, beyond those that may already exist at the Project Site. By comparison, while Alternative 1 would not include new construction including excavations and other soil disturbance activities that could potentially disturb any contaminated soils which may be present and potentially release contaminants from the soil to the environment, the Project would, although such impacts under the Project would be less than significant with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements. Also, while the Project would not include new buildings that contain asbestos, PCBs, LBPs, or other hazardous materials that have since been prohibited in new construction, it would demolish the existing on-site uses which may potentially contain asbestos, PCBs, LPBs, etc., thereby potentially releasing such materials to the environment (although such impacts would be less than significant with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements). The Project also would not include the use, storage and disposal of hazardous materials during construction and operation which could potentially be greater than the use, storage and disposal of such materials currently occurring on the Project Site, thereby potentially increasing the exposure hazard (although, again, this impact would be less than significant with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements). Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in no impact with regards to hazardous materials-related upset and accident conditions, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

g. Hydrology and Water Quality

Alternative 1 would not include construction activities, dewatering activities, or the operation of new uses, would not expose soils to erosion, would not increase the deposition of pollutants to the ground surface, and would not increase the on-site use, handling, and storage of hazardous materials. As such, Alternative 1 would not have the potential to increase the flow of sediment to the municipal storm drain system, increase pollutant loading in the runoff from the Project Site, violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality or decrease groundwater supplies. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in no impact to hydrology, and hydrology impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project. However, it is noted that this alternative would not

implement BMPs that would improve surface runoff and water quality in accordance with the City's current Low Impact Development (LID) requirements whereas the Project would. Therefore, Alternative 1 would result in no impact to water quality, and water quality impacts would be greater when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

h. Land Use and Planning

Alternative 1 would not include new development or otherwise alter the existing environmental conditions at the Project Site. As such, no impacts associated with potential conflicts with land use plans or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would occur, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

i. Noise

(1) Noise

(a) Construction

No new construction activities would occur, and, thus, no on- and off-site construction noise would be generated under Alternative 1. As such, no construction noise impacts would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to those of the Project. Specifically, Alternative 1 would avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable on- and off-site construction noise impacts.

(b) Operation

Alternative 1 would not develop new uses on the Project Site, and no changes to existing site operations would occur. Thus, no new on- or off-site operational noise would be generated under Alternative 1, no impacts would occur, and the impacts of this alternative would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Vibration

(a) Construction

No new construction activities would occur, and, thus, no on- and off-site construction vibration would be generated under Alternative 1. As such, no construction vibration impacts would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less than those of the Project. Specifically, Alternative 1 would avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable on- and off-site construction vibration impacts (pursuant to the significance criteria for human annoyance); less-than-significant impact with mitigation related to on-site

construction vibration (pursuant to the significance criteria for building damage); and less-than-significant off-site construction vibration impacts (pursuant to the significance criteria for building damage).

(b) Operation

Alternative 1 would not develop new uses on the Project Site, and no changes to existing site operations would occur. Thus, no new on- or off-site operational vibration would be generated under Alternative 1, no impacts would occur, and the impacts of this alternative would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

j. Public Services

(1) Fire Protection

(a) Construction

As Alternative 1 would not include construction activities, Alternative 1 would not result in potential construction-related fire protection impacts (i.e., a temporary increase in service demand, slowing of emergency response, or hindrance of emergency access). Thus, no construction-related fire protection impacts would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

No changes to existing on-site land uses or operations would occur under Alternative 1. Therefore, there would be no potential to increase the level of activity on the Project Site or increase the service population for the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) stations that serve the Project Site. No operational impacts to fire protection facilities would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Police Protection

(a) Construction

As Alternative 1 would not include construction activities, Alternative 1 would not result in potential construction-related police protection impacts (i.e., temporary increase in service demand, slowing of emergency response, or hindrance of emergency access). Thus, no construction-related police protection impacts would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

No changes to existing on-site land uses or operations would occur under Alternative 1. Therefore, there would be no potential to increase the on-site service population and activity that could increase calls for police protection services from the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD). No impacts to police protection services would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

k. Transportation

Since Alternative 1 would not develop new or additional land uses on the Project Site or otherwise change the existing environment, Alternative 1 would not generate any additional vehicle trips or alter existing access or circulation in and around the Project Site. As such, no transportation impacts would occur under Alternative 1, including conflicts with programs, plans, ordinances, or policies addressing the circulation system; vehicle miles traveled (VMT); hazardous design features; emergency access; and freeway safety. Therefore, the transportation impacts of Alternative 1 would be less when compared to the Project's less-than-significant impacts with mitigation.

l. Tribal Cultural Resources

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

m. Utilities and Service Systems

(1) Water Supply and Infrastructure

(a) Construction

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

(b) Operation

Alternative 1 would not alter the existing land uses or site operations on the Project Site and, thus, would not increase the long-term water demand on the Project Site. No

operational impacts to water supply and water infrastructure would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Energy Infrastructure

(a) Construction

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

(b) Operation

Alternative 1 would not alter the existing land uses or operational activities at the Project Site and, thus, would not increase the long-term energy demand on the Project Site. No operational impacts related to energy infrastructure would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

3. Comparison of Impacts

Alternative 1 would avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable environmental impacts related to on- and off-site construction noise impacts, on- and off-site construction vibration (pursuant to the significance criteria for human annoyance), cumulative on- and off-site construction noise; cumulative off-site operational noise, and cumulative off-site construction vibration (human annoyance). Alternative 1 would also avoid all of the Project's remaining less-than-significant and less-than-significant impacts with mitigation as no changes to the existing on- or off-site conditions would occur under this alternative (although operational energy impacts in terms of the wasteful and inefficient use of energy, and operational water quality impacts due to the lack of existing water quality BMPs at the Project Site, would be greater under this alternative).

4. Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

Under Alternative 1, the No Project/No Build Alternative, the existing on-site uses (i.e., 39,328 square feet of creative office, office, and light industrial uses, along with surface parking) would remain on the Project Site, and no new development would occur. As such, Alternative 1 would not meet the purpose of the Project, which is to provide a

vertical creative office campus for innovative media, entertainment, and technology companies. Furthermore, Alternative 1 would not meet the Project's basic objectives, including the following:

- Reduce vehicle trips and VMT by providing employment options for a growing neighborhood residential population and creating a work destination that is easily accessible via public transportation.

- In support of the Central City North Community Plan Objective 2-1, provide additional opportunities for new commercial development and services through the development of a creative office project with a combination of indoor and outdoor spaces that is capable of attracting high-quality media and creative office tenants to the Arts District.

- Consistent with Central City North Community Plan Objective 2-1, develop a project that achieves a high level of design and quality, distinctive character, and compatibility with existing uses and development.

- Strengthen the Arts District's economic vitality by attracting new, high skilled workers and new economy media, entertainment, and technology businesses.

- Provide a pedestrian-oriented development that improves pedestrian experiences within the Arts District.[7]

- Provide a building design that allows for the use of energy-efficient technology, thereby reducing the overall reliance on energy for lighting and cooling.

- Create sufficient office square footage and density to retain a significant jobs component in the Arts District and facilitate a healthy job-housing balance in the Arts District area in light of both existing and pending development.

Alternative 1 would meet the following Project objective:

- Provide adequate parking that satisfies anticipated demand on the Project Site.[8]

---

[7] *According to the Transportation Assessment for the Project, included in Appendix M of this Draft EIR, there is currently no sidewalk on Bay Street adjacent to the Project Site, but there is a 10-foot sidewalk on Sacramento Street adjacent to the Project Site.*

[8] *The Project Site contains 39,328 square feet of existing creative office, office, and light industrial uses. Based on City parking requirements as set forth in LAMC Section 12.21 A.4(c) (i.e., 1 space per 500 square feet of office, warehouse, and light manufacturing uses), the existing on-site uses require 79 parking spaces. The Project Site contains 75 existing parking spaces so that the existing on-parking is a few spaces short of LAMC requirements. However, because the existing on-site buildings are existing, they are legal non-conforming uses. Hence, adequate existing on-site parking is available to serve the existing on-site uses.*

V. Alternatives

B. Alternative 2: Existing Zoning Compliant Alternative

1. Description of the Alternative

Alternative 2, the Existing Zoning Compliant Alternative, would include development of the Project Site in accordance with that permitted by the existing M3-1-RIO zoning designation of the Project Site. Specifically, Alternative 2 would develop 106,095 square feet of creative office uses and 5,000 square feet of retail/restaurant uses, resulting in a total gross floor area of 111,095 square feet (a reduction of 111,094 square feet of floor area compared to the Project). This alternative would provide 355 vehicular parking spaces within a two-level subterranean parking garage (a reduction of two subterranean levels compared to the Project's four levels of subterranean parking). Thirty-eight bicycle parking spaces would also be provided. As with the Project, the proposed uses would be provided within three buildings; however, the buildings would range in height from one to four stories compared to the Project's maximum building height of 10 stories. Alternative 2 would also involve removal of the existing uses on the Project Site, resulting in a total net floor area of 71,767 (with removal of the 39,328 square feet of existing on-site creative office, office, and light industrial floor area) and an FAR of 1.5:1 compared to the Project's total net floor area of 182,861 square feet and an FAR of 3.05:1.

Under Alternative 2, construction activities would be reduced in comparison to the Project due to both less net new development under this alternative (i.e., 71,767 square feet versus 182,861 square feet under the Project) and fewer subterranean levels (i.e., 2 versus 4 under the Project). Based on the reduction of two subterranean levels compared to the Project's four subterranean parking levels, Alternative 2 would result in a corresponding decrease in excavation and soil export.

2. Environmental Impacts

a. Air Quality

(1) Regional Emissions

(a) Construction

As with the Project, construction of Alternative 2 has the potential to create air quality impacts through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and through vehicle

trips generated from haul trucks and construction workers traveling to and from the Project Site. In addition, fugitive dust emissions would result from demolition and construction activities. As discussed in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of activity, the specific type of operation, and, for dust, the prevailing weather conditions.

Under Alternative 2, construction activities would be reduced in comparison to the Project due to both less net new development under this alternative (i.e., 71,767 square feet versus 182,861 square feet under the Project) and fewer subterranean levels (i.e., 2 versus 4 under the Project). However, the intensity of air emissions and fugitive dust from site preparation and construction activities would be similar on days with maximum construction activities, which is used as the basis of the significance determination. Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts associated with regional construction emissions that would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project, although such impacts would occur over a shorter construction period.

(b) Operation

As previously discussed, the development proposed under Alternative 2 would be reduced compared to the Project. As such, the number of daily vehicle trips and VMT generated by Alternative 2 operation would be less than under the Project. Specifically, as provided in Appendix R of this Draft EIR, Alternative 2 would result in a total of 1,263 net daily trips and 9,459 daily VMT.[9] This is compared to the Project's 2,119 net daily trips and 15,973 daily VMT.[10] Operational regional air pollutant emissions associated with Alternative 2 would be generated by vehicle trips and daily VMT to the Project Site, which are the largest contributors to operational air pollutant emissions, and by the consumption of natural gas.

As vehicular emissions depend on the number of trips and associated VMT, and as both would be less under Alternative 2, the overall operational pollutant emissions generated by Alternative 2 would be less than the operational emissions generated by the Project. With the reduction in overall floor area (i.e., 71,767 net square feet versus 182,861 net square feet under the Project), both area sources and stationary sources would also generate less operational on-site air emissions associated with energy consumption compared to the Project. Therefore, impacts associated with regional air pollutant

[9] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Project, VMT Calculator Run for the By Right Alternative, November 26, 2021. See Appendix R of this Draft EIR.*

[10] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Transportation Assessment, July 2020. See Appendix M of this Draft EIR.*

emissions during operation of Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Localized Emissions

(a) Construction

On-site construction activities under Alternative 2 would be located at similar distances from sensitive receptors as the Project. Given the reduction in the proposed development and fewer subterranean levels, overall construction activities and associated localized emissions from construction of Alternative 2 would be reduced compared to those of the Project. However, the intensity of air emissions and fugitive dust from site preparation and construction activities would be similar on days with maximum construction activities, which is used as the basis of the significance determination. Therefore, as with the Project, localized impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project, although such impacts would occur over a shorter construction period.

(b) Operation

Localized operational impacts are determined primarily by traffic volumes. Alternative 2 would generate fewer daily operational vehicle trips than the Project. Specifically, as provided in Appendix R of this Draft EIR, Alternative 2 would result in a total of 1,263 daily vehicle trips.[11] This is compared to the Project's 2,119 daily vehicle trips.[12] As such, total vehicular emissions would be less compared to the Project. In addition, the development proposed under Alternative 2 would be reduced compared to the Project (i.e., 71,767 net square feet versus 182,861 net square feet under the Project); therefore, area and stationary sources would also generate less on-site operational air emissions compared to the Project. Therefore, total contributions to localized air pollutant emissions during operation of Alternative 2 would be less than the Project's contribution. Accordingly, localized air quality impacts under Alternative 2 (including CO hotspot impacts) would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

---

[11] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Project, VMT Calculator Run for the By Right Alternative, November 26, 2021. See Appendix R of this Draft EIR.*

[12] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Transportation Assessment, July 2020. See Appendix M of this Draft EIR.*

(3) Toxic Air Contaminants

(a) Construction

As with the Project, construction of Alternative 2 would generate diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during grading and excavation activities. These activities represent the greatest potential for TAC emissions. As discussed in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts with regard to construction TAC emissions. Overall construction TAC emissions generated by Alternative 2 would be less than those of the Project since excavation and construction activities would be less under this alternative. Thus, Alternative 2 would result in less than significant construction-related TAC emissions, and such impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, the primary sources of potential TACs associated with Project operations would include DPM from delivery trucks. Under Alternative 2, the overall increase in the number of deliveries and associated diesel particulate matter emissions would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduction in the amount of new floor area. Similar to the Project, the land uses proposed under Alternative 2 (i.e., creative office and retail/restaurant) are not considered land uses that generate substantial TAC emissions. Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 2 operations would not release substantial amounts of TAC emissions.

As with the Project, Alternative 2 also would not include uses which are considered sensitive (e.g., residential, school, hospital). In addition, based on a search of South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD's) Facility Information Detail (FIND) database, no major sources of TACs are located within 0.25 mile of the Project Site (the Union Pacific Los Angeles Transportation Center rail yard is located approximately 1.7 miles to the northeast, which is greater than the 1-mile buffer distance recommended by California Air Resources Board (CARB), and while a Metro rail yard (Division 20) is located approximately 0.6 mile north of the Project Site, this rail yard is currently used for maintenance of Metro Red/Purple line subway trains, which are powered by electricity rather than diesel).

Based on the above, Alternative 2 would result in less than significant operational TAC impacts, and such impacts would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

b. Cultural Resources

As discussed in Section IV.B, Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR, the Project Site does not contain listed historic resources or existing on-site buildings that are eligible for designation as historic resources based on the eligibility analysis in the Historical Resources Report included in Appendix D of this Draft EIR. Therefore, as with the Project, the demolition of the existing on-site buildings under Alternative 2 would not directly impact historical resources. The Project Site is located in close proximity to one designated historic resource (the Seventh Street Bridge), three buildings identified in SurveyLA as appearing eligible for designation, and the potential Downtown Los Angeles Industrial District. However, Alternative 2 would not indirectly impact these resources/district because, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would include exterior building facades, architecture, and building sizes/scales that are compatible with the surrounding uses, such that it would not materially impair the historic significance of these resources/district; and Alternative 2 would not demolish or otherwise alter any contributing structures. Furthermore, the above-mentioned potentially eligible buildings are all located outside the potential Los Angeles Industrial District. Based on the above, Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts to historic resources that would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

With regard to archaeological resources, as discussed in Section IV.B, Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR, no archaeological resources were identified within or in the vicinity of the Project Site. Alternative 2 would include excavation activities in roughly the same areas of the Project Site as the Project, but because this alternative would include fewer subterranean levels than the Project (2 versus 4 for the Project), the depth of the excavations would be less under this alternative. Therefore, the potential for Alternative 2 to result in the inadvertent discovery and potentially impact archaeological deposits or features, including remnants of Zanja No. 2, if present, would be less than for the Project. Furthermore, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would implement Project Design Feature CUL-PDF-1, which requires Workers Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training of construction works to identify archaeological materials and adhere to the City's standard inadvertent discovery Condition of Approval for archaeological resources which has been formulated to avoid significant impacts to such resources during construction. As such, impacts to archaeological resources under Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less than the less than significant impacts of the Project due to the reduced depth of excavation.

c. Energy

(1) Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, construction activities associated with Alternative 2 would consume electricity to supply and convey water for dust control and power lighting and electrical equipment, but as with the Project, would not involve the consumption of natural gas. As with the Project, construction activities associated with Alternative 2 would also generate a demand for transportation energy associated with off-road vehicles and equipment on the Project Site, construction worker travel to and from the Project Site, and delivery and haul truck trips (e.g., hauling of demolition material to off-site reuse and disposal facilities). However, the energy consumed during construction of Alternative 2 would be reduced compared to the Project due to less development (i.e., 71,767 net square feet versus 182,861 net square feet under the Project), fewer subterranean levels (2 versus 4), and less associated construction activities. Still, as with the Project, electricity and fuel demand would cease upon completion of construction; electric equipment would be powered off when not in use so as to avoid unnecessary energy consumption; construction equipment would comply with Title 24 requirements where applicable; construction vehicles would comply with CARB's anti-idling regulations as well as the In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets regulation (which would not only reduce emissions but also reduce energy consumption); and on-road vehicles (i.e., haul trucks, worker vehicles) would be subject to Federal fuel efficiency requirements. Therefore, as with the Project, energy consumption during construction of Alternative 2 would not occur in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner. Overall, construction-related energy impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As with the Project, operation of Alternative 2 would generate an increase in the consumption of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum-based fuels. However, Alternative 2 would include less development than the Project (i.e., 71,767 net square feet versus 182,861 net square feet under the Project) and would generate less operational traffic and lower VMT (i.e., 1,263 daily vehicle trips and 9,459 daily VMT,[13] versus 2,119 daily vehicle

[13] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Project, VMT Calculator Run for the By Right Alternative, November 26, 2021. See Appendix R of this Draft EIR.*

trips and 15,973 daily VMT under the Project).[14] Hence, the operations-related consumption of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum-based fuels would be lower under Alternative 2 than under the Project. Also, similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would comply with all applicable energy conservation requirements as the Project and would implement the same energy-conserving project design features as the Project. Therefore, as with the Project, energy consumption during operation of Alternative 2 would not occur in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner. Overall, construction-related energy impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Conflict with Plans for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency

As discussed in Section IV.C, Energy, of this Draft EIR, the current City of LA Green Building Code requires compliance with CalGreen and California's Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24). As with the Project, Alternative 2 would comply with the City's Green Building Code, as well as be capable of achieving at least LEED® Silver equivalent status. In addition, Alternative 2 would implement measures to exceed Title 24 energy efficiency requirements as with the Project. Also similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would comply with applicable regulatory requirements for the design of new buildings, including the provisions set forth in the CALGreen Code and California's Building Energy Efficiency Standards in effect at the time, which will be incorporated into the City's Green Building Code.

With regard to transportation related energy usage, Alternative 2, as with the Project, would comply with goals of the SCAG's RTP/SCS, which incorporates VMT targets established by SB 375; would be developed in close proximity to major job centers and public transportation and would include mixed-use commercial development, which would serve to reduce per capacity VMT and associated transportation fuel usage within the region; vehicle trips generated during operations would comply with CAFE fuel economy standards; and would be required to comply with CARB anti-idling regulations and the In-Use Off-Road Diesel Fleet regulations during construction.

Based on the above, Alternative 2, as with the Project, would not conflict with plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, in terms of conflicts with plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency, impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

---

[14] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Transportation Assessment, July 2020. See Appendix M of this Draft EIR.*

d. Geology and Soils (Paleontological Resources)

As discussed in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR, a records search conducted at the NHMLA for the Project Site indicates there are no previously recorded fossil vertebrate localities located within the Project Site. Thus, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would not have the potential to impact previously recorded paleontological resources. Alternative 2 would involve grading and excavations in roughly the same area as the Project but would include shallower excavations due to the reduced number of proposed subterranean levels under this alternative (i.e., 2 versus 4 under the Project). Hence, while Alternative 2, as with the Project, would have the potential to disturb any previously unrecorded paleontological resources that may be present at the Project Site during grading, excavation and trenching activities, this potential would be reduced under Alternative 2. Furthermore, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would implement Mitigation Measures GEO-MM-1 through GEO-MM-5 that would avoid any significant impacts to paleontological resources should such resources be encountered during construction. Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts to paleontological resources with mitigation and would be less when compared to the Project's less-than-significant impact with mitigation.

e. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GHG emissions from a development project are determined in large part by the number of daily trips generated and associated VMT, as well as energy consumption from proposed land uses. As previously discussed, the number of daily trips and daily VMT under Alternative 2 would be reduced compared to the Project. In addition, energy and water consumption from proposed land uses would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduction in development. Thus, the amount of construction and operational GHG emissions generated by Alternative 2 would be less than the amount generated by the Project (which would be below applicable significance thresholds). Furthermore, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would be designed to comply with the requirements of the 2008 Climate Change Scoping Plan and subsequent updates, 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, CALGreen Code, City of Los Angeles Green New Deal/Sustainable City pLAn, and the Los Angeles Green Building Code and incorporate design features to reduce GHG emissions and would be designed to comply with the City's Green Building Ordinance, as applicable. With compliance with the CALGreen Code and the Los Angeles Green Building Code, and with the implementation of comparable sustainability features as the Project, Alternative 2 would be consistent with the GHG reduction goals and objectives included in adopted state, regional, and local regulatory plans. Overall, impacts related to GHG emissions under Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

f. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

As with the Project, Alternative 2 would include construction and operational activities that would include the use, handling, storage, and disposal of small quantities of hazardous materials (i.e., fuel, oils, coatings, paints, adhesives, and caustic/acidic clearers). However, as with the Project, all such use of hazardous materials would occur in accordance with manufacturing use instructions and applicable regulations/requirements such that their use would not result in reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials. Because Alternative 2 would include less development than the Project and result in less associated construction and operational activities, the amount and, thus, potential for the release of hazardous materials used under Alternative 2 would be less than under the Project.

Also, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would include demolition, excavation and grading activities during the construction period that could result in the potential disturbance of contaminated soil and/or of any hazardous materials-related features (i.e., hazardous materials storage tanks, polychlorinated biphenyl- [PCB] containing infrastructure, and asbestos- and/or lead-based paint-containing buildings), which may currently exist at the Project Site. However, as with the Project, any existing hazardous materials encountered during demolition, excavation and grading activities would be remediated in accordance with applicable regulations. In addition, because there would be less excavation under Alternative 2 due to fewer subterranean levels (i.e., 2 versus 4 under the Project), the potential to encounter contaminated soil during excavation activities would be less under this alternative than under the Project.

Based on the above, Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts, which would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

g. Hydrology and Water Quality

(1) Water Quality Standards/Waste Discharge Requirements

Similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would include construction and increased on-site operational activities, which could expose soils to erosion, require dewatering, increase the deposition of pollutants to the ground surface, and increase the on-site handling and storage of hazardous materials and the potential for associated leaks and spills. Similar to the Project, these, in turn, could temporarily (associated with construction activities) and permanently (associated with operational activities) increase the flow of sediment to the municipal storm drain system and pollutant loading in Project Site runoff. However, as with the Project, construction and operational activities under Alternative 2 would occur in accordance with all applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements (e.g., National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General

Permit, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) Erosion Control Plan, City grading permit regulations, City LID requirements [including infiltration, stormwater capture/re-use, or biofiltration].). Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts. These impacts would be less under Alternative 2 when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to less development and associated construction and operational activities and less of a potential to generate sediment and pollutants in stormwater runoff.

(2) Groundwater Supplies/Recharge

As with the Project, Alternative 2 would include construction and increased operational activities. However, as indicated in Section IV.F, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Draft EIR, the Project Site is currently comprised of approximately 100-percent impervious surfaces; therefore, minimal groundwater recharge occurs at the Project Site. In addition, groundwater levels at the Project Site are relatively deep (i.e., approximately 170 feet below ground surface), and no water supply wells are located on or within a mile of the Project Site. As with the Project, Alternative 2 would likely not require either temporary or permanent dewatering, would not increase the percentage of the Project Site in impervious surfaces, and would not include water wells. Furthermore, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would implement City LID requirements, which could potentially slightly increase rather than decrease groundwater recharge at the Project Site (if infiltration is used to meet the requirements). For all these reasons, Alternative 2, as with the Project, would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result less-than-significant impacts that would be similar than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(3) Erosion/Siltation, Flooding, Stormwater Infrastructure Capacity

As indicated previously, the Project Site is already covered with approximately 100-percent impervious surfaces. Furthermore, as indicated in Section IV.F, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Draft EIR, stormwater currently sheet flows from the Project Site, without infiltration or capturing, to existing off-site stormwater infrastructure. As with the Project, Alternative 2 would include grading, excavation, and other construction activities, which could result in erosion/siltation, minor alteration of existing drainage patterns, and on- and off-site flooding during construction. However, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would comply with applicable regulatory requirements during construction (e.g., NPDES Construction General Permit requirements, including the implementation of a SWPPP, City grading requirements), which would avoid substantial erosion/siltation and on- and off-site flooding during construction. Furthermore, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would not increase impervious surfaces at the Project Site or result in a permanent increase in stormwater runoff, would comply with applicable City LID requirements, and would

implement Project Design Feature HYD-PDF-1 requiring on-site retention of 50-year runoff in excess of 3.36 cubic feet per second, such that peak runoff flows from the Project Site to the existing off-site stormwater infrastructure would not increase. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts, which would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(4) Impede/Redirect Flood Flows

As indicated in Section IV.F, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Draft EIR, the Project Site is not located within a designated 100-year flood hazard area but may be subject to a 100-year flood due to a limitation in the capacity of the Los Angeles River channel in the vicinity of the Project Site (although the associated potential for flooding in the area is less than significant for the reasons identified in Section IV.F, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Draft EIR). As with the Project, Alternative 2 would implement Project Design Feature HYD-PDF-2, which requires raising the finished floor elevation of the proposed buildings by specified amounts above the 100-year flood elevation associated with any potential overtopping of the Los Angeles River channel during a 100-year storm event in the Project Site vicinity. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impacts, which would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(5) Water Quality Control Plan/Sustainable Groundwater Plan

As with the Project, Alternative 2 would comply with all applicable water quality control plans and sustainable groundwater management plans. As discussed above, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would implement BMPs to filter, treat, and reduce stormwater pollutants prior to discharge from the Project Site in accordance with NPDES SWPPP and City LID and grading permit requirements. Non-stormwater runoff associated with typical operations of the Project Site would also be partially filtered by the BMPs (e.g., through the use of biofiltration) provided on-site prior to discharging from the Project Site. Furthermore, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would not adversely affect compliance with Section 303 of the Clean Water Act or TMDLs relative to the nearby water bodies since no TMDL data have been recorded by USEPA for the Los Angeles River Watershed Reach 3, where the Project Site is located. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts that would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

h. Land Use and Planning

As described above, Alternative 2, the Existing Zoning Compliant Alternative, considers development of the Project Site in accordance with the parameters set forth by the existing Central City North Community Plan land use designation (Heavy Industrial) and zoning (M3-1-RIO [Heavy Industrial, Height District 1, River Improvement Overlay]) of the

Project Site. The M3-1-RIO zoning permits a wide range of industrial, manufacturing, commercial retail, and office uses; does not specify a building height limit but limits the FAR to 1.5:1; and provides for the preservation of tributaries and rivers in the City by promoting river identity, supporting local species, and providing convenient access.

By definition, Alternative 2, the Existing Zoning Compliant Alternative, would be consistent with the existing Community Plan land use designation and zoning of the Project Site. No zone change or height district change would be required. By comparison, the Project would include a Vesting Zone Change and Height District Change from M3-1-RIO to M3-2D-RIO to permit the proposed FAR.

Similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would not conflict with applicable plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, including those set forth in the Los Angeles General Plan Framework Element, Housing Element, Central City North Community Plan, and SCAG's RTP/SCS. As with the Project, Alternative 2 would also comply with City of Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) development requirements, including, but not limited to, those related to street/sidewalk improvements, landscaping, open space, and parking. However, while Alternative 2 would be more in-line with the current land use designation and zoning of the Project Site than the Project, and as with the Project, would help the City achieve many of its land use objectives (i.e., redevelop an underutilized site, create jobs, etc.), it would not be as effective as the Project in helping the City achieve some of its land use objectives (for example, would not create as many jobs within the Arts District, would not be as effective as the Project in reducing per capita VMT,[15] etc.). Regardless, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in less than significant land use impacts that would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

i. Noise

(1) Noise

(a) Construction

The types of construction activities under Alternative 2 would be substantially similar to those of the Project in that Alternative 2 would require demolition of the existing on-site uses, excavation of the Project Site for proposed subterranean parking, grading of the

[15] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Project, VMT Calculator Run for the By Right Alternative, November 26, 2021. See Appendix R of this Draft EIR.*

Project Site, and construction of three new buildings. As with the Project, construction of Alternative 2 would generate noise from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, as well as from haul truck and construction worker trips. This construction noise would be lower under Alternative 2 than under the Project on an average daily basis given the reduced amount of excavation (i.e., 2 subterranean levels versus 4 levels under the Project) and construction activities (i.e., 71,767 net square feet versus 182,861 net square feet under the Project). However, peak day construction activities and associated noise, which is used as the basis of the significance conclusions for noise, would be similar between Alternative 2 and the Project due to the same amount and location of daily demolition, excavation, grading and construction activities during peak construction days. Also, Alternative 2, as with the Project, would implement Project Design Features NOI-PDF-1 (requiring muffling of power construction equipment) and NOI-PDF-2 (prohibiting use of impact piles), and Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-1 (requiring sound barriers), which, as with under the Project, would reduce on-site construction noise impacts at receptor location R2 to less than significant. However, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would result in significant and unavoidable on-site construction noise impacts; significant and unavoidable off-site construction noise impacts; and significant and unavoidable cumulative on- and off-site construction noise impacts. Because the amount of on- and off-site construction noise would be similar between Alternative 2 and the Project during peak construction days, the on- and off-site construction noise impacts of Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the Project, although such impacts would occur over a shorter construction period.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.I, Noise, of this Draft EIR, sources of operational noise under the Project would include (a) on-site stationary noise sources, including mechanical equipment, activities within the proposed outdoor spaces, parking facilities, loading dock and trash collection areas; and (b) off-site mobile (roadway traffic) noise sources. With regards to on-site stationary noise, Alternative 2 would introduce noise from similar on-site noise sources as the Project. However, it is anticipated that with the overall reduction in total floor area and uses, the noise levels from building mechanical equipment, outdoor spaces, and parking facilities would be reduced. In addition, similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would implement Project Design Features NOI-PDF-3, NOI-PDF-4, and NOI-PDF-5 that require enclosing or screening mechanical equipment, screening loading docks, and specifying the maximum permitted sound levels of any outdoor amplified sound systems. Similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would also comply with LAMC Section 112.02, which prohibits noise from air conditioning, refrigeration, heating, pumping, and filtering equipment from exceeding the ambient noise levels on the premises of other occupied properties by more than 5 dBA. Lastly, unlike the Project, which would include ground-level parking and generate some on-site operational parking noise audible at off-site sensitive receptors, Alternative 2 would not include surface parking and, thus, would not generate such noise. Therefore, operational on-site noise impacts under Alternative 2

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

With regard to off-site operational noise, Alternative 2 would generate less operational traffic than the Project (i.e., 1,263[16] net daily trips versus 2,119[17] net daily trips under the Project) and, thus, would both generate less off-site operational noise and contribute less to cumulative off-site operational noise. Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would result in less than significant Project-level off-site operational noise impacts, and significant and unavoidable cumulative off-site operational noise impacts, which would be less than those of the Project.

(2) Vibration

(a) Construction

As noted above, the types of construction activities under Alternative 2 would be similar to the Project, although the amount and duration of construction activities would be reduced due to the reduced amount of development under this alternative. As with the Project, construction of Alternative 2 would generate on- and off-site vibration from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, as well as from truck trips. While the overall amount of construction would be reduced, on- and off-site construction activities and the associated construction vibration levels under Alternative 2 would be expected to be similar to those of the Project, as construction vibration impacts are evaluated based on the maximum (peak) vibration levels generated by each type of construction equipment. Furthermore, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would implement Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-2 for on-site construction vibration (building damage). Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would result in a less-than-significant impact with mitigation related to on-site construction vibration (building damage), a less-than-significant impact related to off-site construction vibration (building damage), and significant and unavoidable impacts related to on- and off-site construction vibration (human annoyance) and cumulative off-site construction vibration (human annoyance). Because the amount of construction vibration would be similar between Alternative 2 and the Project during peak construction days, the on- and off-site construction vibration impacts of Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the Project, although such impacts would occur over a shorter construction period.

---

[16] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Project, VMT Calculator Run for the By Right Alternative, November 26, 2021. See Appendix R of this Draft EIR.*

[17] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Transportation Assessment, July 2020. See Appendix M of this Draft EIR.*

(b) Operation

As described in Section IV.I, Noise, of this Draft EIR, sources of vibration related to operation of the Project would include vehicle circulation, delivery trucks, and building mechanical equipment. These same sources of operational vibration would occur under Alternative 2. As with the Project, on-site vehicular-induced vibration from Alternative 2, including vehicle circulation within the subterranean parking area, would not generate perceptible vibration levels at off-site sensitive uses. In addition, as with the Project, building mechanical equipment installed as part of Alternative 2 would include typical commercial-grade stationary mechanical equipment, such as air-condenser units (mounted at the roof level), that would include vibration-attenuation mounts to reduce vibration transmission such that the vibration would not be perceptible at the off-site sensitive receptors. Furthermore, because Alternative 2 would include less development than the Project, it would generate less operational traffic and include less mechanical equipment than the Project and, thus, generate less on- and off-site operational vibration. Therefore, the operational vibration impacts of Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

j. Public Services

(1) Fire Protection

(a) Construction

As previously discussed, the types of construction activities required for Alternative 2 would be similar to that of the Project. However, the overall amount and duration of construction activities would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduction in overall development. Thus, the potential for fire and hazardous materials releases during construction would be less under Alternative 2. As with the Project, construction would occur in compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local requirements for construction sites, including those related to fire minimalization and the handling, disposal, use, storage, and management of hazardous waste (i.e., 29 CFR Part No. 1926, OSHA, Cal OSHA, etc.). Thus, as with the Project, compliance with regulatory requirements would effectively reduce the potential for construction activities to expose people to the risk of fire or explosion related to hazardous materials under Alternative 2.

Additionally, while construction activities would generally be contained within the boundaries of the Project Site, access to the Project Site and the surrounding vicinity could be impacted by temporary lane closures, roadway/access improvements, and the construction of utility line connections. However, construction-related traffic, including hauling activities and construction worker trips, which would be lower under Alternative 2 compared to the Project, would occur outside the typical weekday commuter A.M. and P.M. peak periods to the extent feasible, thereby reducing the potential for traffic-related

conflicts. Furthermore, similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would be required to implement Project Design Feature TR-PDF-1, which would require the implementation of a Construction Management Plan that, among other things, ensures the provision of adequate and safe access during the construction period. Additionally, drivers of emergency vehicles have the ability to avoid traffic by using sirens and flashing lights to clear a path of travel, pursuant to California Vehicle Code Section 21806. As such, emergency access to the Project Site and surrounding uses would be maintained at all times.

Based on the above, construction-related impacts related to fire protection services under Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.I.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, of this Draft EIR, the Project Site is located within the required 1.0-mile engine company and 1.5-mile truck company response distances the LAFD considers fire protection to be adequate; hence, as with the Project, the development under Alternative 2 would meet LAFD response distance requirements. Also, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would not include the development of residential units, which typically have a higher demand for fire protection services, or industrial uses, which sometimes have a greater potential for fires or serious accidents involving hazardous materials; or include the installation of barriers that could impede emergency vehicle access. Additionally, drivers of emergency vehicles have the ability to avoid traffic by using sirens and flashing lights to clear a path of travel, pursuant to California Vehicle Code Section 21806. As such, emergency access to the Project Site and surrounding uses would be maintained at all times.

Similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would result in a net increase in the on-site population, which would result in an increase in the demand for fire protection and emergency medical service from LAFD. However, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would comply with all applicable City Building and Fire Code requirements regarding structural design, building materials, site access, fire flow, storage and management of hazardous materials, fire/smoke alarm and communications systems, and automatic fire sprinkler systems within the proposed building, etc., and would undergo the same LAFD fire/life safety plan review as the Project. Service demand would also be lower under Alternative 2 due to the reduced amount of development and on-site population (i.e., 71,767 net square feet versus 182,861 net square feet under the Project).

Lastly, as indicated in Section IV.I.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, of this Draft EIR, the existing water infrastructure in the area would be adequate to provide the required fire flow for the Project. Because Alternative 2 would include roughly the same types of

uses (i.e., creative office and retail/restaurant) as the Project but would otherwise include less development and lower maximum building heights, fire flow demand would be less under Alternative 2. Therefore, as with the Project, existing fire flow would be adequate to service Alternative 2.

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

(2) Police Protection

(a) Construction

As discussed in Section IV.I.2, Public Services—Police Protection, of this Draft EIR, Project construction activities could generate some temporary service demand associated with potential theft from and vandalism at the construction site and generate construction worker and truck traffic on area streets which could potentially temporarily slow LAPD emergency response and/or interfere with emergency access. These same temporary impacts could occur during construction of Alternative 2. However, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would implement Project Design Feature POL-PDF-1, which includes temporary security measures such as security fencing, lighting, locked entry to secure the Project Site during construction, which would reduce the construction-related service demand, as well as implement Project Design Feature TR-PDF-1, Construction Management Plan, which would ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and near the Project Site during construction activities. Furthermore, Alternative 2 would include less development and associated construction activities than the Project and, thus, would generate less temporary on-site service demand and off-site construction traffic. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts, which would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

Alternative 2, as with the Project, would not include residential uses and, thus, would not generate a new residential population requiring police protection services. Therefore, as with the Project, while Alternative 2 could generate some indirect operational service demand (i.e., service calls) from LAPD associated with its new employee and visitor population, it would not cause a direct change to the current officer-to-resident ratio within LAPD's Newton Area. Also, Alternative 2 would include less development than the Project (i.e., 71,767 net square feet versus 182,861 net square feet under the Project) and, thus, would result in lower operational service demand than the Project. In addition, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would be required to implement Project Design Feature POL-PDF-2 through POL-PDF-6, which require the provision of on-site security, alarm systems, closed circuit camera system, keycard entry for the creative office building and parking, proper lighting of buildings and walkways, and the prevention of concealed spaces. As with the

Project, these design features would help offset the increase in operational service demand under Alternative 2. Furthermore, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would not include the installation of barriers (e.g., perimeter fencing, fixed bollards) that could impede emergency access within the vicinity of the Project Site. Lastly, while Alternative 2 operation, as with the Project, would result in increased traffic on area streets which could potentially affect LAPD emergency response times, pursuant to California Vehicle Code Section 21806, LAPD vehicles have a variety of options for avoiding or circumventing traffic (i.e., use of sirens and flashing lights, driving in the lanes of opposing traffic, etc.). Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts that would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

k. Transportation

Alternative 2 would feature similar vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle access as the Project (e.g. vehicular driveways from Bay Street and Sacramento Street, drop-off zone on Bay Street, trash pickup and loading dock within the parking garage.). As with the Project, all circulation improvements under Alternative 2 would adhere to LAMC construction and design requirements. Alternative 2 would also promote pedestrian activity and reduce vehicle trips and VMT by providing newly constructed sidewalks on Bay Street and Sacramento Street, a pedestrian paseo through the Project Site, and ground-level retail and restaurant spaces with access from the sidewalks and paseo. Alternative 2 would similarly be developed within walking distance to other commercial businesses and creative loft spaces in the Arts District and within a Transit Priority Area (TPA) in close proximity to transit. Alternative 2 would also implement transportation demand management (TDM) measures under Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1, which would satisfy LAMC TDM requirements and reduce traffic. As such, Alternative 2, as with the Project, would be consistent with applicable transportation plans, including Mobility Plan 2035; LADOT Manual of Policies and Procedures Section 321; LAMC; Central City North Community Plan; Vision Zero; and SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. Therefore, Alternative 2, as with the Project, would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts related to conflicts with applicable transportations plan that would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

Regarding VMT, Alternative 2 operations would generate 1,263 daily vehicle trips, 9,459 daily VMT, and a per capita work VMT of 9.2.[18] This is compared to the Project's

[18] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Project, VMT Calculator Run for the By Right Alternative, November 26, 2021. See Appendix R of this Draft EIR.*

2,119 daily vehicle trips, 15,973 daily VMT, and a per capita work VMT of 9.1.[19] Both Alternative 2 and the Project would result in per capita work VMT above the 7.6 per capita work VMT threshold for the Central Area Planning Commission (APC) area prior to mitigation. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1, requiring the implementation of specific TDM measures, the per capita work VMT would be 7.5 under the Project and 7.6 under Alternative 2. Therefore, similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would not exceed the applicable VMT threshold (i.e., conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)) after mitigation. Therefore Alternative 1 would result in less-than-significant VMT impacts with mitigation, which would be slightly greater than the Project's less-than-significant impact with mitigation.

Regarding hazardous design features, Alternative 2 would be developed on the same site as the Project which, as discussed in Section IV.J, Transportation, of this Draft EIR, does not currently contain and is not located in the immediate vicinity of sharp curves, dangerous intersections, or other geometric design-related hazards. Alternative 2 would have roughly the same access plan as the Project (i.e., vehicular driveways from Bay Street and Sacramento Street, drop-off zone on Bay Street, trash pickup and loading dock within the parking garage, etc.). Similar to the Project, the driveways under Alternative 2 would be perpendicular to the street with no sharp curves or visibility issues, and all circulation improvements would be designed in accordance with LADOT requirements. Also, similar to the Project, the final design of the driveways under Alternative 2 would be reviewed by the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, City Department of Building and Safety, Bureau of Engineering (BOE), and LADOT during the building permit process to ensure code compliance and safe pedestrian and vehicular design. Lastly, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would include the development of creative office and retail/restaurant uses, which would not generate incompatible traffic (e.g., farm equipment, etc.). Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in less than significant hazardous design feature impacts that would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

Regarding emergency access, similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would not interfere with emergency access. Similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would be required to implement Project Design Feature TR-PDF-1, which would require a Construction Management Plan to be implemented to ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and near the Project Site during construction activities. With regard to operation, all driveways and internal circulation would be designed to meet all applicable City Building Code and Fire Code requirements regarding emergency access and would not include the installation of barriers that could impede emergency vehicle access. Lastly, pursuant to California Vehicle Code Section 21806, the drivers of emergency vehicles are

[19] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Transportation Assessment, July 2020. See Appendix M of this Draft EIR.*

generally able to avoid traffic in the event of an emergency by using sirens to clear a path of travel or by driving in the lanes of opposing traffic. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in less than significant emergency access impacts that would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

Regarding freeway off-ramp safety, as required by LADOT's Interim Guidance for Freeway Safety Analysis, if a development project adds 25 or more trips to any freeway off-ramp in either the morning or afternoon peak hour, then that ramp should be studied for potential queueing impacts following the identified steps in the guidelines. If the project is not expected to generate more than 25 or more peak hour trips at any freeway off-ramps, then a freeway ramp analysis is not required. The Project would add less than 25 trips to all the freeway off-ramps in both the morning and afternoon peak hours such that further analysis was not required, and the Project would result in less than significant freeway off-ramp safety impacts.[20] As indicated previously, Alternative 2 would generate less traffic than the Project. Therefore, Alternative 2 would similarly add less than 25 trips to the freeway off-ramps and no further analysis is required. Impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than significant and would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

I. Tribal Cultural Resources

As with the Project, Alternative 2 would include excavations for subterranean parking and trenching for utilities. Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would have the potential to uncover subsurface tribal cultural resources should such resources be present. However, as discussed in Section IV.K, Tribal Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR, no Native American resources that would be impacted by the Project were identified on or within 0.5 mile of the Project Site during the SCCIC and NAHC SLF records searches or the required Assembly Bill (AB) 52 consultation process with the applicable Native American tribes. Furthermore, the City's standard condition of approval for the inadvertent discovery of tribal cultural resources would also be implemented as part of Alternative 2 in the event that tribal cultural resources are encountered during construction. Overall, Alternative 2 would be developed on the same site as the Project, would include the same spatial extent of grading, and would be subject to the same standard condition of approval for the inadvertent discovery of tribal cultural resources. While Alternative 2 would include a shallower maximum excavation depth than the Project as a result of the fewer number of proposed subterranean parking levels (2 versus 4 under the Project), tribal cultural resources are typically found in the first six to ten feet of excavation. As such, the potential for Alternative 2 to uncover subsurface tribal cultural resources would be similar compared

[20] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Transportation Assessment, July 2020. See Appendix M of this Draft EIR.*

to that of the Project. Hence, Alternative 2 would have less of a potential to encounter/disturb tribal cultural resources than the Project. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts to tribal cultural resources that would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

m. Utilities and Service Systems

(1) Water Supply and Infrastructure

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, construction activities associated with Alternative 2 would generate a short-term demand for water. As evaluated in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, the Project's temporary and intermittent demand for water during construction would be offset by the water demand associated with the existing on-site uses to be removed and could be met by the City's available supplies during normal, single-dry and multiple-dry years. Since the construction-related water demand under Alternative 2 would be lower than under the Project due to the reduced amount of development and associated construction activities, City water supplies would also be adequate to meet construction-related water demand under Alternative 2.

Regarding water infrastructure impacts during construction, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would require new connections to the existing off-site water mains but no improvements to those water mains, with associated construction activities primarily involving on-site trenching and off-site connection work. However, because Alternative 2 would generate lower operational water demand than the Project due to the reduced amount of development under this alternative, the number and sizes of the required on-site water distribution lines, and the number of required connections to the off-site water mains during construction would potentially be reduced under this alternative. Also, as with the Project, the design and installation of new service connections under Alternative 2 would be required to meet applicable City standards; prior to ground disturbance, construction contractors would coordinate with LADWP to identify the locations and depths of all lines; LADWP would be notified in advance of proposed ground disturbance activities to avoid disruption of water service; LADWP would review and approve all appropriate connection requirements, pipe depths, and connection location(s); a Construction Management Plan would be implemented pursuant to Project Design Feature TR-PDF-1 to ensure continued adequate and safe access in and around the Project Site during construction; and any associated construction impacts would be temporary in nature and would not result in significant environmental effects.

Based on the above, Alternative 2 construction-related water supply and infrastructure impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

Similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would result in a net increase in long-term demand for water during operation for domestic and fire protection purposes. As indicated in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, adequate City water supplies would be available to serve the Project over the next 20 years and beyond during normal, single-dry, and multi-dry years, and the existing water infrastructure is adequate to serve the Project and that new/upgraded water mains and fire hydrants are not required. Alternative 2 would generate less operational water demand than the Project due to the reduced amount of development under this alternative (i.e., 71,767 net square feet versus 182,861 net square feet under the Project). Thus, water supplies and water infrastructure would also be adequate to serve Alternative 2. Lastly, similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would construct the necessary on-site water infrastructure and off-site connections to the LADWP water system pursuant to applicable City requirements and implement applicable water conservation requirements and the additional water conservation measures outlined in Project Design Feature WAT-PDF-1. Therefore, Alternative 2 operational water supply and infrastructure impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Energy Infrastructure

(a) Construction

As with the Project, construction activities under Alternative 2 would require minor quantities of electricity for lighting, power tools and support equipment, and fuel (including diesel) for construction equipment, construction trucks and construction worker vehicles (construction activities do not typically include the consumption of natural gas). As indicated in Section IV.L.2, Utilities and Services System—Energy Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, LADWP electricity infrastructure and supplies, and local fuel supplies, would be adequate to meet the construction-related demand associated with the Project. Alternative 2 would include less development than the Project and, thus, require less construction activities and construction energy than the Project, such that energy supplies and infrastructure would also be adequate to serve Alternative 2 construction activities. As with the Project, Alternative 2 would require construction of a new 34.5-kV electrical line along Bay Street and a new power pole, which would represent an upgrade to the existing electrical infrastructure along Bay Street in the Project Site vicinity; however, as concluded in Section IV.L.2, Utilities and Services System—Energy Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, the construction of this infrastructure would not result in major disruptions of electrical service in the area. Lastly, natural gas infrastructure already adjacent to the Project Site,

and as concluded in Section IV.L.2, Utilities and Services System—Energy Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, extensive off-site natural gas infrastructure improvements would not be required to serve the Project (and thus Alternative 2). Therefore, Alternative 2 impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As with the Project, operation of Alternative 2 would generate an increased demand for electricity and natural gas relative to existing conditions. However, as indicated in Section IV.L.2, Utilities and Services System—Energy Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, both LADWP and SoCalGas have issued "will-serve" letters for the Project, and existing energy supplies and infrastructure are adequate to serve the Project (or in the case of electricity infrastructure, would be made adequate). Because Alternative 2 would include less development than the Project (i.e., 71,767 net square feet versus 182,861 net square feet under the Project), Alternative 2 would generate less operational energy demand than the Project, and, as such, existing energy supplies and infrastructure would also be adequate to serve Alternative 2. Therefore, Alternative 2 would result in less-than-significant impacts that would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

3. Comparison of Impacts

Alternative 2 would not avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. Specifically, Alternative 2 would not avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable on- and off-site construction noise, on- and off-site construction vibration (human annoyance), cumulative on- and off-site construction noise, cumulative off-site operational noise, and cumulative off-site construction vibration (human annoyance). However, Alternative 2 would reduce the Project's significant and unavoidable cumulative off-site operational noise due to the reduced amount of development (and associated operational traffic) under this alternative. Alternative 2 would also reduce many of the Project's less than significant and less-than-significant impacts with mitigation for the same reason. Overall, Alternative 2 would be less impactful than the Project.

4. Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

Alternative 2 would not meet the purpose of the Project, which is to provide a vertical creative office campus for innovative media, entertainment, and technology companies, to the same extent as the Project. This is because, while Alternative 2 would provide the same types of uses as the Project, the amount of development and urban density under

Alternative 2 would be less than under the Project. Furthermore, Alternative 2 would not be as effective as the Project in meeting the following Project objectives for the same reason:

- Reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles travelled by providing employment options for a growing neighborhood residential population and creating a work destination that is easily accessible via public transportation.
- In support of the Central City North Community Plan Objective 2-1, provide additional opportunities for new commercial development and services through the development of a creative office project with a combination of indoor and outdoor spaces that is capable of attracting high-quality media and creative office tenants to the Arts District.
- Strengthen the Arts District's economic vitality by attracting new, high skilled workers and new economy media, entertainment, and technology businesses.
- Create sufficient office square footage and density to retain a significant jobs component in the Arts District and facilitate a healthy job-housing balance in the Arts District area in light of both existing and pending development.

Alternative 2 would fully meet the following Project objectives:

- Consistent with Central City North Community Plan Objective 2-1, develop a project that achieves a high level of design and quality, distinctive character, and compatibility with existing uses and development.
- Provide adequate parking that satisfies anticipated demand on the Project Site.
- Provide a pedestrian-oriented development that improves pedestrian experiences within the Arts District.
- Provide a building design that allows for the use of energy-efficient technology, thereby reducing the overall reliance on energy for lighting and cooling.

V. Alternatives

C. Alternative 3: 25% Reduced Project Alternative

1. Description of the Alternative

Alternative 3, the 25% Reduced Project Alternative, would reduce the new development proposed under the Project by approximately 25 percent. Specifically, Alternative 3 would develop 161,642 square feet of creative office uses and 5,000 square feet of retail/restaurant, resulting in a total gross floor area of 166,642 square feet (a reduction of 54,547 square feet of floor area compared to the Project). Alternative 3 would include 533 vehicular parking spaces within a three-level subterranean parking garage (a reduction of one level compared to the Project's four levels of subterranean parking). Fifty-five bicycle parking spaces would also be provided. As with the Project, the proposed uses would be provided within three buildings ranging in height from one to six stories (also a reduction from the Project's building heights, which would range from one to up to 10 stories). Alternative 3 would also involve removal of the existing uses on the Project Site, resulting in a total net floor area of 127,314 square feet (with removal of the 39,328 square feet of existing on-site creative office, office, and light industrial floor area), and an FAR of 2.25:1 (a reduction from the Project's net floor area of 182,861 square feet and an FAR of 3.05:1).

Under Alternative 3, construction activities would be reduced in comparison to the Project due to both less net new development under this alternative (i.e., 127,314 square feet versus 182,861 square feet under the Project) and fewer subterranean levels (i.e., 3 versus 4 under the Project). Based on the reduction of one subterranean parking level compared to the Project's four subterranean parking levels, Alternative 3 would result in a corresponding decrease in excavation and soil export.

2. Environmental Impacts

a. Air Quality

(1) Regional Emissions

(a) Construction

As with the Project, construction of Alternative 3 has the potential to create air quality impacts through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and through vehicle

trips generated from haul trucks and construction workers traveling to and from the Project Site. In addition, fugitive dust emissions would result from demolition and construction activities. As discussed in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of activity, the specific type of operation, and, for dust, the prevailing weather conditions.

Under Alternative 3, construction activities would be reduced in comparison to the Project due to both approximately 25 percent less development under this alternative and fewer subterranean levels (i.e., 3 versus 4 under the Project). However, the intensity of air emissions and fugitive dust from site preparation and construction activities would be similar on days with maximum construction activities, which is used as the basis of the significance determination. Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts associated with regional construction emissions that would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project, although such impacts would occur over a shorter construction period.

(b) Operation

As previously discussed, the development proposed under Alternative 3 would be reduced compared to the Project. As such, the number of daily vehicle trips and VMT generated by Alternative 3 operation would be less than under the Project. Specifically, as provided in Appendix R of this Draft EIR, Alternative 3 would result in a total of 1,695 net daily trips and 12,789 daily VMT.[21] This is compared to the Project's 2,119 net daily trips and 15,973 daily VMT.[22] Operational regional air pollutant emissions associated with Alternative 3 would be generated by vehicle trips and daily VMT to the Project Site, which are the largest contributors to operational air pollutant emissions, and by the consumption of natural gas.

As vehicular emissions depend on the number of trips and associated VMT, and as both would be less under Alternative 3, the overall operational pollutant emissions generated by Alternative 3 would be less than the operational emissions generated by the Project. With the approximately 25 less development under this alternative, both area sources and stationary sources would also generate less operational on-site air emissions associated with energy consumption compared to the Project. Therefore, impacts associated with regional air pollutant emissions during operation of Alternative 3 would be

[21] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Project, VMT Calculator Run for the 25% Reduced Project Alternative, November 26, 2021. See Appendix R of this Draft EIR.*

[22] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Transportation Assessment, July 2020. See Appendix M of this Draft EIR.*

less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Localized Emissions

(a) Construction

On-site construction activities under Alternative 3 would be located at similar distances from sensitive receptors as the Project. Given the reduction in the proposed development and fewer subterranean levels, overall construction activities and associated localized emissions from construction of Alternative 3 would be reduced compared to those of the Project. However, the intensity of air emissions and fugitive dust from site preparation and construction activities would be similar on days with maximum construction activities, which is used as the basis of the significance determination. Therefore, as with the Project, localized impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project, although such impacts would occur over a shorter construction period.

(b) Operation

Localized operational impacts are determined primarily by traffic volumes. Alternative 3 would generate fewer daily operational vehicle trips than the Project. Specifically, as provided in Appendix R of this Draft EIR, Alternative 3 would result in a total of 1,695 daily vehicle trips.[23] This is compared to the Project's 2,119 daily vehicle trips.[24] As such, total vehicular emissions would be less compared to the Project. In addition, the development proposed under Alternative 3 would be reduced by approximately 25 percent compared to the Project; as such, area and stationary sources would also generate less on-site operational air emissions compared to the Project. Therefore, total contributions to localized air pollutant emissions during operation of Alternative 3 would be less than the Project's contribution. Accordingly, localized air quality impacts under Alternative 3 (including CO hotspot impacts) would be less than significant and less when compared to the less than significant impacts of the Project.

---

[23] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Project, VMT Calculator Run for the 25% Reduced Project Alternative, November 26, 2021. See Appendix R of this Draft EIR.*

[24] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Transportation Assessment, July 2020. See Appendix M of this Draft EIR.*

(3) Toxic Air Contaminants

(a) Construction

As with the Project, construction of Alternative 3 would generate diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during grading and excavation activities. These activities represent the greatest potential for TAC emissions. As discussed in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts with regard to construction TAC emissions. Overall construction TAC emissions generated by Alternative 3 would be less than those of the Project since excavation and construction activities would be less under this alternative. Thus, Alternative 3 would result in less than significant construction-related TAC emissions which would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.A, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR, the primary sources of potential TACs associated with Project operations would include DPM from delivery trucks. Under Alternative 3, the overall increase in the number of deliveries and associated diesel particulate matter emissions would be reduced compared to the Project due to the approximately 25 percent reduction in development under this alternative. Similar to the Project, the land uses proposed under Alternative 3 (i.e., creative office and retail/restaurant) are not considered land uses that generate substantial TAC emissions. Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 operations would not release substantial amounts of TAC emissions.

As with the Project, Alternative 3 also would not include uses which are considered sensitive (e.g., residential, school, hospital). In addition, based on a search of SCAQMD's FIND database, no major sources of TACs are located within 0.25 mile of the Project Site (the Union Pacific Los Angeles Transportation Center rail yard is located approximately 1.7 miles to the northeast, which is greater than the 1-mile buffer distance recommended by CARB, and while a Metro rail yard (Division 20) is located approximately 0.6 mile north of the Project Site, this rail yard is currently used for maintenance of Metro Red/Purple line subway trains which are powered by electricity rather than diesel).

Based on the above, Alternative 3 would result in a less than significant operational TAC impacts, which would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

b. Cultural Resources

As discussed in Section IV.B, Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR, the Project Site does not contain listed historic resources or existing on-site buildings that are eligible for designation as historic resources based on the eligibility analysis in the Historical Resources Report included as Appendix D of this Draft EIR. Therefore, as with the Project, the demolition of the existing on-site buildings under Alternative 3 would not directly impact historical resources. The Project Site is located in close proximity to one designated historic resource (the Seventh Street Bridge), three buildings identified in SurveyLA as appearing eligible for designation, and the potential Downtown Los Angeles Industrial District. However, Alternative 3 would not indirectly impact these resources/district because, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would include exterior building facades, architecture, and building sizes/scales that are compatible with the surrounding uses such that it would materially impair the historic significance of these resources/district; and Alternative 3 would not demolish or otherwise alter any contributing structures. Furthermore, the above-mentioned potentially eligible buildings are all located outside the potential Los Angeles Industrial District. Based on the above, Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts to historic resources that would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

With regard to archaeological resources, as discussed in Section IV.B, Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR, no archaeological resources were identified within or in the vicinity of the Project Site. Alternative 3 would include excavation activities in roughly the same areas of the Project Site as the Project, but because this alternative would include fewer subterranean levels than the Project (3 versus 4 for the Project), the depth of the excavations would be less under this alternative. Therefore, the potential for Alternative 3 to result in the inadvertent discovery and potentially impact archaeological deposits or features, including remnants of Zanja No. 2, if present, would be less than for the Project. Furthermore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would implement Project Design Feature CUL-PDF-1, which requires Workers Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training of construction works to identify archaeological materials and adhere to the City's standard inadvertent discovery Condition of Approval for archaeological resources which has been formulated to avoid significant impacts to such resources during construction. As such, impacts to archaeological resources under Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less than significant impacts of the Project due to reduced depth of excavation.

c. Energy

(1) Wasteful, Inefficient, or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy Resources

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, construction activities associated with Alternative 3 would consume electricity to supply and convey water for dust control and power lighting and electrical equipment, but as with the Project, would not involve the consumption of natural gas. As with the Project, construction activities associated with Alternative 3 would also generate a demand for transportation energy associated with off-road vehicles and equipment on the Project Site, construction worker travel to and from the Project Site, and delivery and haul truck trips (e.g., hauling of demolition material to off-site reuse and disposal facilities). However, the energy consumed during construction of Alternative 3 would be reduced compared to the Project due to the approximately 25 percent less development and fewer subterranean levels (3 versus 4 under the Project) and less associated construction activities. Still, as with the Project, electricity and fuel demand would cease upon completion of construction; electric equipment would be powered off when not in use so as to avoid unnecessary energy consumption; construction equipment would comply with Title 24 requirements where applicable; construction vehicles would comply with CARB's anti-idling regulations as well as the In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets regulation (which would not only reduce emissions but also reduce energy consumption); and on-road vehicles (i.e., haul trucks, worker vehicles) would be subject to Federal fuel efficiency requirements. Therefore, as with the Project, energy consumption during construction of Alternative 3 would not occur in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner. Overall, construction-related energy impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As with the Project, operation of Alternative 3 would generate an increase in the consumption of electricity, natural gas, and petroleum-based fuels. However, Alternative 3 would include approximately 25 percent less development than the Project and would generate less operational traffic and lower VMT (i.e., 1,695 daily vehicle trips and 12,789 daily VMT,[25] versus 2,119 daily vehicle trips and 15,973 daily VMT under the Project).[26] Hence, the operations-related consumption of electricity, natural gas, and

---

[25] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Project, VMT Calculator Run for the 25% Reduced Project Alternative, November 26, 2021. See Appendix R of this Draft EIR.*

[26] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Transportation Assessment, July 2020. See Appendix M of this Draft EIR.*

petroleum-based fuels would be lower under Alternative 3 than under the Project. Also, similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would comply with all applicable energy conservation requirements as the Project and would implement the same energy-conserving project design features as the Project. Therefore, as with the Project, energy consumption during operation of Alternative 3 would not occur in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary manner. Overall, construction-related energy impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Conflict with Plans for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency

As discussed in Section IV.C, Energy, of this Draft EIR, the current City of LA Green Building Code requires compliance with CalGreen and California's Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24). As with the Project, Alternative 3 would comply with the City's Green Building Code, as well as be capable of achieving at least LEED® Silver equivalent status. In addition, similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would implement measures to exceed Title 24 energy efficiency requirements and would comply with applicable regulatory requirements for the design of new buildings including the provisions set forth in the CALGreen Code and California's Building Energy Efficiency Standards in effect at the time, which will be incorporated into the City's Green Building Code.

With regard to transportation related energy usage, Alternative 3, as with the Project, would comply with goals of the SCAG's RTP/SCS which incorporates VMT targets established by SB 375; would be developed in close proximity to major job centers and public transportation and would include mixed-use commercial development, which would serve to reduce per capacity VMT and associated transportation fuel usage within the region; vehicle trips generated during operations would comply with CAFE fuel economy standards; and would be required to comply with CARB anti-idling regulations and the In-Use Off-Road Diesel Fleet regulations during construction.

Based on the above, Alternative 3, as with the Project, would not conflict with plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, in terms of conflicts with plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency, impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than significant and similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

d. Geology and Soils (Paleontological Resources)

As discussed in Section IV.D, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR, a records search conducted at the NHM for the Project Site indicates there are no previously recorded fossil vertebrate localities located within the Project Site. Thus, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would not have the potential to impact previously recorded paleontological resources. Alternative 3 would involve grading and excavations in roughly the same area as the Project, but would include shallower excavations owing to the reduced number of proposed

subterranean levels under this alternative (i.e., 3 versus 4 under the Project). Hence, while Alternative 3, as with the Project, would have the potential to disturb any previously unrecorded paleontological resources that may be present at the Project Site during grading, excavation and trenching activities, this potential would be reduced under Alternative 3. Furthermore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would implement Mitigation Measures GEO-MM-1 through GEO-MM-5 that would avoid any significant impacts to paleontological resources should such resources be encountered during construction. Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts to paleontological resources with mitigation and would be less when compared to the Project's less-than-significant impact with mitigation.

e. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GHG emissions from a development project are determined in large part by the number of daily trips generated and associated VMT, as well as energy consumption from proposed land uses. As previously discussed, the number of daily trips and daily VMT under Alternative 3 would be reduced compared to the Project. In addition, energy and water consumption from proposed land uses would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduction in development. Thus, the amount of construction and operational GHG emissions generated by Alternative 3 would be less than the amount generated by the Project (which would be below applicable significance thresholds). Furthermore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would be designed to comply with the requirements of the 2008 Climate Change Scoping Plan and subsequent updates, 2020-2045 RTP/SCS, CALGreen Code, City of Los Angeles Green New Deal/Sustainable City pLAn, and the Los Angeles Green Building Code, and incorporate design features to reduce GHG emissions and would be designed to comply with the City's Green Building Ordinance, as applicable. With compliance with the CALGreen Code and the Los Angeles Green Building Code, and with the implementation of comparable sustainability features as the Project, Alternative 3 would be consistent with the GHG reduction goals and objectives included in adopted state, regional, and local regulatory plans. Overall, impacts related to GHG emissions under Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

f. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

As with the Project, Alternative 3 would include construction and operational activities that would include the use, handling, storage, and disposal of small quantities of hazardous materials (i.e., fuel, oils, coatings, paints, adhesives, and caustic/acidic clearers). However, as with the Project, all such use of hazardous materials would occur in accordance with manufacturing use instructions and applicable regulations/requirements such that their use would not result in reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials. Because Alternative 3 would

include less development than the Project, and result in less associated construction and operational activities, the amount and thus potential for the release of hazardous materials used under Alternative 3 would be less than under the Project.

Also, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would include demolition, excavation and grading activities during the construction period that could result in the potential disturbance of contaminated soil and/or of any hazardous materials-related features (i.e., hazardous materials storage tanks, PCB containing infrastructure, and asbestos- and/or lead-based paint-containing buildings) which may currently exist at the Project Site. However, as with the Project, any existing hazardous materials encountered during demolition, excavation and grading activities would be remediated in accordance with applicable regulations. In addition, because there would be less excavation under Alternative 3 due to fewer subterranean levels (i.e., 3 versus 4 under the Project), the potential to encounter contaminated soil during excavation activities would be less under this alternative than under the Project.

Based on the above, Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts, which would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

g. Hydrology and Water Quality

(1) Water Quality Standards/Waste Discharge Requirements

Similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would include construction and increased on-site operational activities, which could expose soils to erosion, require dewatering, increase the deposition of pollutants to the ground surface, and increase the on-site handling and storage of hazardous materials and the potential for associated leaks and spills. Similar to the Project, these, in turn, could temporarily (associated with construction activities) and permanently (associated with operational activities) increase the flow of sediment to the municipal storm drain system and pollutant loading in Project Site runoff. However, as with the Project, construction and operational activities under Alternative 3 would occur in accordance with all applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements (i.e., NPDES Construction General Permit, SWPPP Erosion Control Plan, City grading permit regulations, City LID requirements [including infiltration, stormwater capture/re-use, or biofiltration], etc.). Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts. These impacts would be less under Alternative 3 when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project due to less development and associated construction and operational activities and less of a potential to generate sediment and pollutants in stormwater runoff.

(2) Groundwater Supplies/Recharge

As with the Project, Alternative 3 would include construction and increased operational activities. However, as indicated in Section IV.G, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Draft EIR, the Project Site is currently comprised of approximately 100-percent impervious surfaces; therefore, minimal groundwater recharge occurs at the Project Site. In addition, groundwater levels at the Project Site are relatively deep (i.e., approximately 170 feet below ground surface), and no water supply wells are located on or within a mile of the Project Site. As with the Project, Alternative 3 would likely not require either temporary or permanent dewatering, would not increase the percentage of the Project Site in impervious surfaces, and would not include water wells. Furthermore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would implement City LID requirements which could potentially slightly increase rather than decrease groundwater recharge at the Project Site (if infiltration is used to meet the requirements). For all these reasons, Alternative 3, as with the Project, would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result less-than-significant impacts that would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(3) Erosion/Siltation, Flooding, Stormwater Infrastructure Capacity

As indicated previously, the Project Site is already covered with approximately 100 percent impervious surfaces. Furthermore, as indicated in Section IV.G, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Draft EIR, stormwater currently sheet flows from the Project Site, without infiltration or capturing, to existing off-site stormwater infrastructure. As with the Project, Alternative 3 would include grading, excavation and other construction activities which could result in erosion/siltation, minor alteration of existing drainage patterns, and on- and off-site flooding during construction. However, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would comply with applicable regulatory requirements during construction (e.g., NPDES Construction General Permit requirements, including the implementation of a SWPPP, City grading requirements.) which would avoid substantial erosion/siltation and on- and off-site flooding during construction. Furthermore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would not increase impervious surfaces at the Project Site or result in a permanent increase in stormwater runoff, would comply with applicable City LID requirements, and would implement Project Design Feature HYD-PDF-1 requiring on-site retention of 50-year runoff in excess of 3.36 cubic feet per second (cfs), such that peak runoff flows from the Project Site to the existing off-site stormwater infrastructure would not increase. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts, which would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(4) Impede/Redirect Flood Flows

As indicated in Section IV.G, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Draft EIR, the Project Site is not located within a designated 100-year flood hazard area but may be

subject to a 100-year flood due to a limitation in the capacity of the Los Angeles River channel in the vicinity of the Project Site (although the associated potential for flooding in the area is less than significant for the reasons identified in Section IV.F, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Draft EIR). Furthermore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would implement Project Design Feature HYD-PDF-2, which requires raising the finished floor elevation of the proposed buildings by specified amounts above the 100-year flood elevation associated with any potential overtopping of the Los Angeles River channel during a 100-year storm event in the Project Site vicinity. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impacts, which would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(5) Water Quality Control Plan/Sustainable Groundwater Plan

As with the Project, Alternative 3 would comply with all applicable water quality control plans and sustainable groundwater management plans. As discussed above, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would implement BMPs to filter, treat, and reduce stormwater pollutants prior to discharge from the Project Site in accordance with NPDES SWPPP and City LID and grading permit requirements. Non-stormwater runoff associated with typical operations of the Project Site would also be partially filtered by the BMPs (e.g., through the use of biofiltration) provided on-site prior to discharging from the Project Site. Furthermore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would not adversely affect compliance with Section 303 of the Clean Water Act or TMDLs relative to the nearby water bodies since no TMDL data have been recorded by USEPA for the Los Angeles River Watershed Reach 3, where the Project Site is located. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts which would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

h. Land Use and Planning

Alternative 3, the 25% Reduced Project Alternative, would include development of the same creative office and retail/restaurant uses as the Project but would include approximately 25 percent less of these uses, along with fewer subterranean parking levels and parking spaces (i.e., 3 and 533, versus 4 and 711 under the Project), a lower FAR (i.e., 2.25 versus 3.05:1 under the Project), and a lower maximum building height (i.e., 6 stories versus 10 stories under the Project). Still, because the existing Central City North Community Plan land use designation (Heavy Industrial) and zoning (M3-1-RIO [Heavy Industrial, Height District 1, River Improvement Overlay]) of the Project Site limits the FAR at the Project Site to 1.5:1, and because Alternative 3, as with the Project, would exceed this FAR, Alternative 3, as with the Project, would require a Vesting Zone Change and Height District Change from M3-1-RIO to M3-2D-RIO to permit the proposed development. However, similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would not conflict with applicable plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, including those set forth in the Los Angeles General Plan Framework Element,

Housing Element, Central City North Community Plan, and SCAG's RTP/SCS, as it would include the same uses as the Project, while generally providing the same community benefits. As with the Project, Alternative 3 would also comply with LAMC development requirements, including, but not limited to, those related to street/sidewalk improvements, landscaping, open space, and parking. Overall, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in less than significant land use impacts that would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

i. Noise

(1) Noise

(a) Construction

The types of construction activities under Alternative 3 would be substantially similar to those of the Project in that Alternative 3 would require demolition of the existing on-site uses, excavation of the Project Site for proposed subterranean parking, grading of the Project Site, and construction of three new buildings. As with the Project, construction of Alternative 3 would generate noise from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, as well as from haul truck and construction worker trips. This construction noise would be lower under Alternative 3 than under the Project on an average daily basis given the 25 percent reduction in development and fewer subterranean levels (i.e., 3 subterranean levels versus 4 levels under the Project). However, peak day construction activities and associated noise, which is used as the basis of the significance conclusions for noise, would be similar between Alternative 3 and the Project due to the same amount and location of daily demolition, excavation, grading and construction activities during peak construction days. Alternative 3, as with the Project, would also implement Project Design Features NOI-PDF-1 (requiring muffling of power construction equipment) and NOI-PDF-2 (prohibiting use of impact piles), and Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-1 (requiring sound barriers), which, like under the Project, would reduce on-site construction noise impacts at receptor location R2 to less than significant. However, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would result in significant and unavoidable on-site construction noise impacts; significant and unavoidable off-site construction noise impacts; and significant and unavoidable cumulative on- and off-site construction noise impacts. Because the amount of on- and off-site construction noise would be similar between Alternative 3 and the Project during peak construction days, the on- and off-site construction noise impacts of Alternative 3 would be similar to those of the Project, although such impacts would occur over a shorter construction period.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.H, Noise, of this Draft EIR, sources of operational noise under the Project would include (a) on-site stationary noise sources, including mechanical equipment, activities within the proposed outdoor spaces, parking facilities, loading dock and trash collection areas; and (b) off-site mobile (roadway traffic) noise sources. With regards to on-site stationary noise, Alternative 3 would introduce noise from similar on-site noise sources as the Project. However, it is anticipated that with the overall reduction in total floor area and uses, the noise levels from building mechanical equipment, outdoor spaces, and parking facilities would be reduced. In addition, similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would implement Project Design Features NOI-PDF-3, NOI-PDF-4 and NOI-PDF-5 that require enclosing or screening mechanical equipment, screening loading docks, and specifying the maximum permitted sound levels of any outdoor amplified sound systems. Similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would also comply with LAMC Section 112.02, which prohibits noise from air conditioning, refrigeration, heating, pumping, and filtering equipment from exceeding the ambient noise levels on the premises of other occupied properties by more than 5 dBA. Lastly, unlike the Project which would include ground-level parking and generate some on-site operational parking noise audible at off-site sensitive receptors, Alternative 3 would not include surface parking and thus would not generate such noise. Therefore, on-site operational noise impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

With regard to off-site operational noise, Alternative 3 would generate less operational traffic than the Project (i.e., 1,695[27] net daily trips versus 2,119[28] net daily trips under the Project) and, thus, would both generate less off-site operational noise and contribute less to cumulative off-site operational noise. However, such cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would result in less than significant Project-level off-site operational noise impacts, and significant and unavoidable cumulative off-site operational noise impacts, which would be less than those of the Project.

---

[27] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Project, VMT Calculator Run for the 25% Reduced Project Alternative, November 26, 2021. See Appendix R of this Draft EIR.*

[28] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Transportation Assessment, July 2020. See Appendix M of this Draft EIR.*

(2) Vibration

(a) Construction

As noted above, the types of construction activities under Alternative 3 would be similar to the Project, although the amount and duration of construction activities would be reduced owing to the reduced amount of development and fewer number of subterranean levels under this alternative. As with the Project, construction of Alternative 3 would generate on- and off-site vibration from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment as well as from truck trips. While the overall amount of construction would be reduced, on- and off-site construction activities and the associated construction vibration levels under Alternative 3 would be expected to be similar to those of the Project as construction vibration impacts are evaluated based on the maximum (peak) vibration levels generated by each type of construction equipment. Also, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would implement Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-2 for on-site construction vibration (building damage). Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact with mitigation related to on-site construction vibration (building damage); a less than significant off-site construction vibration (building damage); and significant and unavoidable impacts related to on- and off-site construction vibration (human annoyance) cumulative off-site construction vibration (human annoyance). Because the amount of construction vibration would be similar between Alternative 3 and the Project during peak construction days, the on- and off-site construction vibration impacts of Alternative 3 would be similar to those of the Project, although such impacts would occur over a shorter construction period.

(b) Operation

As described in Section IV.H, Noise, of this Draft EIR, sources of vibration related to operation of the Project would include vehicle circulation, delivery trucks, and building mechanical equipment. These same sources of operational vibration would occur under Alternative 3. As with the Project, on-site vehicular-induced vibration from Alternative 3, including vehicle circulation within the subterranean parking area, would not generate perceptible vibration levels at off-site sensitive uses. In addition, as with the Project, building mechanical equipment installed as part of Alternative 3 would include typical commercial-grade stationary mechanical equipment, such as air-condenser units (mounted at the roof level), that would include vibration-attenuation mounts to reduce vibration transmission such that the vibration would not be perceptible at the off-site sensitive receptors. Furthermore, because Alternative 3 would include less development than the Project, it would generate less operational traffic and include less mechanical equipment than the Project and, thus, generate less on- and off-site operational vibration. Therefore, the operational vibration impacts of Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

j. Public Services

(1) Fire Protection

(a) Construction

As previously discussed, the types of construction activities required for Alternative 3 would be similar to that of the Project. However, the overall amount and duration of construction activities would be reduced compared to the Project due to the reduction in overall development. Thus, the potential for fire and hazardous materials releases during construction would be less under Alternative 3. As with the Project construction would occur in compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local requirements for construction sites, including those related to fire minimalization and the handling, disposal, use, storage, and management of hazardous waste (i.e., 29 CFR Part No. 1926, OSHA, Cal OSHA, etc.). Thus, as with the Project, compliance with regulatory requirements would effectively reduce the potential for construction activities to expose people to the risk of fire or explosion related to hazardous materials under Alternative 3.

Additionally, while construction activities would generally be contained within the boundaries of the Project Site, access to the Project Site and the surrounding vicinity could be impacted by temporary lane closures, roadway/access improvements, and the construction of utility line connections. However, construction-related traffic, including hauling activities and construction worker trips, which would be lower under Alternative 3 than under the Project, would occur outside the typical weekday commuter A.M. and P.M. peak periods to the extent feasible, thereby reducing the potential for traffic-related conflicts. Furthermore, similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would be required to implement Project Design Feature TR-PDF-1, which would require the implementation of a Construction Management Plan that, among other things, ensures the provision of adequate and safe access during the construction period. Additionally, drivers of emergency vehicles have the ability to avoid traffic by using sirens and flashing lights to clear a path of travel, pursuant to California Vehicle Code Section 21806. As such, emergency access to the Project Site and surrounding uses would be maintained at all times.

Based on the above, construction-related impacts related to fire protection services under Alternative 3 would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As discussed in Section IV.I.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, of this Draft EIR, the Project Site is located within the required 1.0-mile engine company and 1.5-mile truck company response distances the LAFD considers fire protection to be adequate; hence, as

with the Project, the development under Alternative 3 would meet LAFD response distance requirements. Also, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would not include the development of residential units, which typically have a higher demand for fire protection services, or industrial uses, which sometimes have a greater potential for fires or serious accidents involving hazardous materials; or include the installation of barriers that could impede emergency vehicle access. Additionally, drivers of emergency vehicles have the ability to avoid traffic by using sirens and flashing lights to clear a path of travel, pursuant to California Vehicle Code Section 21806. As such, emergency access to the Project Site and surrounding uses would be maintained at all times.

Similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would result in a net increase in the on-site population which would result in an increase in the demand for fire protection and emergency medical service from LAFD. However, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would comply with all applicable City Building and Fire Code requirements regarding structural design, building materials, site access, fire flow, storage and management of hazardous materials, fire/smoke alarm and communications systems, and automatic fire sprinkler systems within the proposed building, etc., and would undergo the same LAFD fire/life safety plan review as the Project. Service demand would also be lower under Alternative 3 owing to the reduced amount of development and associated on-site population.

Lastly, as indicated in Section IV.I.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, of this Draft EIR, the existing water infrastructure in the area would be adequate to provide the required fire flow for the Project. Because Alternative 3 would include roughly the same types of uses (i.e., creative office and retail/restaurant) as the Project but would otherwise include less development and lower maximum building heights, fire flow demand would be less under Alternative 3. Therefore, as with the Project, existing fire flow would be adequate to service Alternative 3.

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

(2) Police Protection

(a) Construction

As discussed in Section IV.I.2, Public Services—Police Protection, of this Draft EIR, Project construction activities could generate some temporary service demand associated with potential theft from and vandalism at the construction site and generate construction worker and truck traffic on area streets which could potentially temporarily slow LAPD emergency response and/or interfere with emergency access. These same temporary impacts could occur during construction of Alternative 3. However, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would implement Project Design Feature POL-PDF-1, which includes

temporary security measures such as security fencing, lighting, locked entry to secure the Project Site during construction, which would reduce the construction-related service demand, as well as implement Project Design Feature TR-PDF-1, Construction Management Plan, which would ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and near the Project Site during construction activities. Furthermore, Alternative 3 would include less development and associated construction activities than the Project and, thus, would generate less temporary on-site service demand and off-site construction traffic. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts, which would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

Alternative 3, as with the Project, would not include residential uses and, thus, would not generate a new residential population requiring police protection services. However, as with the Project, while Alternative 3 could generate some indirect operational service demand (i.e., service calls) from LAPD associated with its new employee and visitor population, it would not cause a direct change to the current officer-to-resident ratio within LAPD's Newton Area. Also, Alternative 3 would include less development than the Project and, thus, would result in lower operational service demand than the Project. In addition, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would be required to implement Project Design Feature POL-PDF-2 through POL-PDF-6 which require the provision of on-site security, alarm systems, closed circuit camera system, keycard entry for the creative office building and parking, proper lighting of buildings and walkways, and the prevention of concealed spaces. As with the Project, these design features would help offset the increase in operational service demand under Alternative 3. Furthermore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would not include the installation of barriers (e.g., perimeter fencing, fixed bollards, etc.) that could impede emergency access within the vicinity of the Project Site. Lastly, while Alternative 3 operation, as with the Project, would result in increased traffic on area streets which could potentially affect LAPD emergency response times, pursuant to California Vehicle Code Section 21806, LAPD vehicles have a variety of options for avoiding or circumventing traffic (i.e., use of sirens and flashing lights, driving in the lanes of opposing traffic, etc.). Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts that would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

k. Transportation

Alternative 3 would feature similar vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle access as the Project (e.g., vehicular driveways from Bay Street and Sacramento Street, drop-off zone on Bay Street, trash pickup and loading dock within the parking garage). As with the Project, all circulation improvements under Alternative 3 would adhere to LAMC construction and design requirements. Alternative 3 would also promote pedestrian activity and reduce

vehicle trips and VMT by providing newly constructed sidewalks on Bay Street and Sacramento Street, a pedestrian paseo through the Project Site, and ground-level retail and restaurant spaces with access from the sidewalks and paseo. Alternative 3 would similarly be developed within walking distance to other commercial businesses and creative loft spaces in the Arts District and within a TPA in close proximity to transit. Alternative 3 would also implement TDM measures under Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1 which would satisfy LAMC TDM requirements and reduce traffic. As such, Alternative 3, as with the Project, would be consistent with applicable transportation plans, including Mobility Plan 2035; LADOT Manual of Policies and Procedures Section 321; LAMC; Central City North Community Plan; Vision Zero; and SCAG's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. Therefore, Alternative 3, as with the Project, would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts related to conflicts with applicable transportations plan that would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

Regarding VMT, Alternative 3 operations would generate 1,695 daily vehicle trips, 12,789 daily VMT, and a per capita work VMT of 9.3.[29] This is compared to the Project's 2,119 daily vehicle trips, 15,973 daily VMT, and a per capita work VMT of 9.1.[30] Both Alternative 3 and the Project would result in per capita work VMT above the 7.6 per capita work VMT threshold for the Central APC prior to mitigation. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-MM-1, requiring the implementation of specific TDM measures, the per capita work VMT would be 7.5 under the Project and 7.6 under Alternative 3. Therefore, similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would not exceed the applicable VMT threshold (i.e., conflict with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)) after mitigation. Therefore Alternative 3 would result in less than significant VMT impacts with mitigation which would be greater than the Project's less-than-significant impacts with mitigation.

Regarding hazardous design features, Alternative 3 would be developed on the same site as the Project which, as discussed in Section IV.J, Transportation, of this Draft EIR, does not currently contain and is not located in the immediate vicinity of sharp curves, dangerous intersections, or other geometric design-related hazards. Alternative 3 would have roughly the same access plan as the Project (i.e., vehicular driveways from Bay Street and Sacramento Street, drop-off zone on Bay Street, trash pickup and loading dock within the parking garage, etc.). Similar to the Project, the driveways under Alternative 3 would be perpendicular to the street with no sharp curves or visibility issues, and all

[29] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Project, VMT Calculator Run for the 25% Reduced Project Alternative, November 26, 2021. See Appendix R of this Draft EIR.*

[30] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Transportation Assessment, July 2020. See Appendix M of this Draft EIR.*

circulation improvements would be designed in accordance with LADOT requirements. Also, similar to the Project, the final design of the driveways under Alternative 3 would be reviewed by the Department of City Planning, BOE and LADOT during the building permit process to ensure code compliance and safe pedestrian and vehicular design. Lastly, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would include the development of creative office and retail/restaurant uses, which would not generate incompatible traffic (e.g., farm equipment, etc.). Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in less than significant hazardous design feature impacts that would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

Regarding emergency access, similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would not interfere with emergency access. Similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would be required to implement Project Design Feature TR-PDF-1 which would require a Construction Management Plan to be implemented to ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and near the Project Site during construction activities. With regard to operation, all driveways and internal circulation would be designed to meet all applicable City Building Code and Fire Code requirements regarding emergency access and would not include the installation of barriers that could impede emergency vehicle access. Lastly, pursuant to California Vehicle Code Section 21806, the drivers of emergency vehicles are generally able to avoid traffic in the event of an emergency by using sirens to clear a path of travel or by driving in the lanes of opposing traffic. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant emergency access impacts that would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

Regarding freeway off-ramp safety, as required by LADOT's Interim Guidance for Freeway Safety Analysis, if a development project adds 25 or more trips to any freeway off-ramp in either the morning or afternoon peak hour, then that ramp should be studied for potential queueing impacts following the identified steps in the guidelines. If the project is not expected to generate more than 25 or more peak hour trips at any freeway off-ramps, then a freeway ramp analysis is not required. The Project would add less than 25 trips to all the freeway off-ramps in both the morning and afternoon peak hours such that further analysis was not required and the Project would result in less than significant freeway off-ramp safety impacts.[31] As indicated previously, Alternative 3 would generate less traffic than the Project. Therefore, Alternative 3 would similarly add less than 25 trips to the freeway off-ramps, and no further analysis is required. Impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than significant and would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

[31] *The Mobility Group, 2159 Bay Street Transportation Assessment, July 2020. See Appendix M of this Draft EIR.*

l. Tribal Cultural Resources

As with the Project, Alternative 3 would include excavations for subterranean parking and trenching for utilities. Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would have the potential to uncover subsurface tribal cultural resources should such resources be present. However, as discussed in Section IV.K, Tribal Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR, no Native American resources that would be impacted by the Project were identified on or within 0.5-mile of the Project Site during the SCCIC and NAHC SLF records searches, nor did the required AB 52 consultation process with the applicable Native American tribes. Furthermore, the City's standard condition of approval for the inadvertent discovery of tribal cultural resources would also be implemented as part of Alternative 3 in the event that tribal cultural resources are encountered during construction. Overall, Alternative 3 would be developed on the same site as the Project, would include the same spatial extent of grading, and would be subject to the same standard condition of approval for the inadvertent discovery of tribal cultural resources. While Alternative 3 would include a shallower maximum excavation depth than the Project as a result of the fewer number of proposed subterranean parking levels (3 versus 4 under the Project), tribal cultural resources are typically found in the first six to ten feet of excavation. As such, the potential for Alternative 2 to uncover subsurface tribal cultural resources would be similar compared to that of the Project. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts to tribal cultural resources that would be similar to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

m. Utilities and Service Systems

(1) Water Supply and Infrastructure

(a) Construction

Similar to the Project, construction activities associated with Alternative 3 would generate a short-term demand for water. As evaluated in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, the Project's temporary and intermittent demand for water during construction would be offset by the water demand associated with the existing on-site uses to be removed and could be met by the City's available supplies during normal, single-dry and multiple-dry years. Since the construction-related water demand under Alternative 3 would be lower than under the Project, owing to the reduced amount of development and associated construction activities, City water supplies would also be adequate to meet construction-related water demand under Alternative 3.

Regarding water infrastructure impacts during construction, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would require new connections to the existing off-site water mains but no improvements to those water mains, with associated construction activities primarily

involving on-site trenching and off-site connection work. However, because Alternative 3 would generate lower operational water demand than the Project, due to the reduced amount of development under this alternative, the number and sizes of the required on-site water distribution lines, and the number of required connections to the off-site water mains during construction, would potentially be reduced under this alternative. Also, as with the Project: the design and installation of new service connections under Alternative 3 would be required to meet applicable City standards; prior to ground disturbance, construction contractors would coordinate with LADWP to identify the locations and depths of all lines; LADWP would be notified in advance of proposed ground disturbance activities to avoid disruption of water service; LADWP would review and approve all appropriate connection requirements, pipe depths, and connection location(s); a Construction Management Plan would be implemented pursuant to Project Design Feature TR-PDF-1 to ensure continued adequate and safe access in and around the Project Site during construction; and any associated construction impacts would be temporary in nature and would not result in significant environmental effects.

Based on the above, Alternative 3 construction-related water supply and infrastructure impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

Similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would result in a net increase in long-term demand for water during operation for domestic and fire protection purposes. As indicated in Section IV.L.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, adequate City water supplies would be available to serve the Project over the next 20 years and beyond during normal, single-dry, and multi-dry years and the existing water infrastructure is adequate to serve the Project and that new/upgraded water mains and fire hydrants are not required. Alternative 3 would generate less operational water demand than the Project due to the approximately 25 percent reduction in floor area under this alternative. Thus, water supplies and water infrastructure would also be adequate to serve Alternative 3. Lastly, similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would: construct the necessary on-site water infrastructure and off-site connections to the LADWP water system pursuant to applicable City requirements and implement applicable water conservation requirements and the additional water conservation measures outlined in Project Design Feature WAT-PDF-1. Therefore, Alternative 3 operational water supply and infrastructure impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(2) Energy Infrastructure

(a) Construction

As with the Project, construction activities under Alternative 3 would require minor quantities of electricity for lighting, power tools and support equipment, and fuel (including diesel) for construction equipment, construction trucks and construction worker vehicles (construction activities do not typically include the consumption of natural gas). As indicated in Section IV.L.2, Utilities and Services System—Energy Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, LADWP electricity infrastructure and supplies, and local fuel supplies, would be adequate to meet the construction-related demand associated with the Project. Alternative 3 would include less development than the Project and, thus, require less construction activities and construction energy than the Project, such that energy supplies and infrastructure would also be adequate to serve Alternative 3 construction activities. As with the Project, Alternative 3 would require construction of a new 34.5-kV electrical line along Bay Street and a new power pole, which would represent an upgrade to the existing electrical infrastructure along Bay Street in the Project Site vicinity; however, as concluded in Section IV.L.2, Utilities and Service Systems—Energy Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, the construction of this infrastructure would not result in major disruptions of electrical service in the area. Lastly, natural gas infrastructure already adjacent to the Project Site, and as concluded in Section IV.L.2, Utilities and Service Systems—Energy Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, extensive off-site natural gas infrastructure improvements would not be required to serve the Project (and thus Alternative 3). Therefore, Alternative 3 impacts would be less than significant and less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

(b) Operation

As with the Project, operation of Alternative 3 would generate an increased demand for electricity and natural gas relative to existing conditions. However, as indicated in Section IV.L.2, Utilities and Service Systems—Energy Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, both LADWP and SoCalGas have issued “will-serve” letters for the Project, and existing energy supplies and infrastructure are adequate to serve the Project (or in the case of electricity infrastructure, would be made adequate). Because Alternative 3 would include less development than the Project, Alternative 3 would generate less operational energy demand than the Project and as such, existing energy supplies and infrastructure would also be adequate to serve Alternative 3. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in less-than-significant impacts that would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

3. Comparison of Impacts

Alternative 3 would not avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. Specifically, Alternative 3 would not avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable on- and off-site construction noise, on- and off-site construction vibration (human annoyance), cumulative on- and off-site construction noise, cumulative off-site operational noise, and cumulative off-site construction vibration (human annoyance). However, Alternative 3 would reduce the Project's significant unavoidable cumulative off-site operational noise due to the reduced amount of development (and associated operational traffic) under this alternative. Alternative 3 would also reduce many of the Project's less than significant and less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. Overall, Alternative 3 would be less impactful than the Project.

4. Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

With the same uses at a reduced scale compared to the Project, Alternative 3 would not meet the purpose of the Project to provide a vertical creative office campus for innovative media, entertainment, and technology companies to the same extent as the Project. Furthermore, Alternative 3 would meet all of the objectives of the Project, although it would not be as effective as the Project in meeting some of these objectives because of the reduced amount of development under this alternative. Specifically, Alternative 3 would not be as effective as the Project in meeting the following Project objectives:

- Reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles travelled by providing employment options for a growing neighborhood residential population and creating a work destination that is easily accessible via public transportation.
- In support of the Central City North Community Plan Objective 2-1, provide additional opportunities for new commercial development and services through the development of a creative office project with a combination of indoor and outdoor spaces that is capable of attracting high-quality media and creative office tenants to the Arts District.
- Strengthen the Arts District's economic vitality by attracting new, high skilled workers and new economy media, entertainment, and technology businesses.
- Create sufficient office square footage and density to retain a significant jobs component in the Arts District and facilitate a healthy job-housing balance in the Arts District area in light of both existing and pending development

Alternative 3 would fully meet the following Project objectives:

- Consistent with Central City North Community Plan Objective 2-1, develop a project that achieves a high level of design and quality, distinctive character, and compatibility with existing uses and development.[32]

- Provide adequate parking that satisfies anticipated demand on the Project Site.

- Provide a pedestrian-oriented development that improves pedestrian experiences within the Arts District.

- Provide a building design that allows for the use of energy-efficient technology, thereby reducing the overall reliance on energy for lighting and cooling.

[32] *Alternative 3 would include the same development of the Project, including the same site plan, architecture, public paseo, outdoor terrace, other outdoor open spaces, sidewalks, street trees, and landscaping, just 25 percent less floor area. Furthermore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would: (1) be designed to convey a classic industrial architecture that draws from elements of the surrounding neighborhood; (2) include the use of building materials such as glass, masonry, and concrete, that blend with the Arts District's industrial context;(3) activate the Project Site's street frontages and the proposed public paseo by maximize the visual connection to these and introducing retail/restaurant uses with storefront glazing at the ground level; (4) continue the area trend of redeveloping blighted and underutilized industrial sites within the Arts District while remaining compatible with the industrial, warehouse commercial, and residential uses in the surrounding area; and (5) undergo City design review to ensure consistency with applicable design requirements and high quality design, architecture, and aesthetics. Given the above, and for the same reasons discussed for the Project in Section IV.G, Land Us, of this Draft EIR, Alternative 3 would also be consistent with the City's Citywide Design Guidelines. Therefore, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would develop a project that achieves a high level of design and quality, distinctive character, and compatibility with existing uses and development as called for by Central City North Community Plan Objective 2-1.*

V. Alternatives

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, the No Project/No Build Alternative; Alternative 2, the Existing Zoning Compliant Alternative; and Alternative 3, the 25% Reduced Project Alternative. Table V-2 on page V-12 provides a comparative summary of the environmental impacts anticipated under each alternative with the environmental impacts associated with the Project. A more detailed description of the potential impacts associated with each alternative is provided above. Pursuant to Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines, the analysis below addresses the ability of the alternatives to "avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects" of the Project.

Of the alternatives analyzed in this Draft EIR, Alternative 1, the No Project/No Build Alternative, would avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. Alternative 1 would also avoid all the Project's remaining less-than-significant impacts and less-than-significant impacts with mitigation(with the exception of the wasteful and inefficient use of energy, and operational water quality impacts, which would be greater) as no changes to the existing on- or off-site conditions would occur under this alternative. However, Alternative 1 would also not provide the community benefits proposed under the Project (i.e., outdoor courtyard, street trees and pedestrian improvements along the Project Site's Bay Street and Sacramento Street frontages, pedestrian paseo with gathering zones through the Project Site, etc.); meet the purpose of the Project (i.e., provide a vertical creative office campus for innovative media, entertainment, and technology companies); or meet any of the Project objectives.

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 2, the Existing Zoning Compliant Alternative, would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative. None of the development alternatives (i.e., Alternatives 2 and 3) would avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts

of the Project. Both Alternative 2 and 3 would reduce (but not avoid) the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project, and both would reduce the majority of the Project's less-than-significant impacts and less-than-significant impacts with mitigation. However, Alternative 2 would reduce these impacts to a greater extent than Alternative 3 due to the lesser amount of development, fewer subterranean levels, and less associated environmental effects under Alternative 2. It is noted, however, that while Alternative 2 would provide most of the community benefits of the Project, it would not be as effective in meeting the underlying purpose or objectives of the Project as it would be less intensive than the Project (and, thus, not provide the same number of jobs, not reduce per capita VMT within the Central APC, not strengthen the Art District's economic vitality, etc., to the same degree as the Project).