2.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Section 15088(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines states that the “lead agency shall evaluate comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the draft EIR and shall prepare a written response. The Lead Agency shall respond to comments that were received during the noticed comment period and any extensions and may respond to late comments.” In accordance with these requirements, this Chapter of this Final EIR provides responses to each of the written comments on the Draft EIR received during the public comment period. Table 2-1, Summary of Comments on the Draft EIR, which starts on page 2-2, provides a list of the comment letters received and a summary of the issues raised in response to the Draft EIR.

Section 2.A, Responses to Individual Comments, presents comments submitted during the public comment period on the Draft EIR from State, Native American Organizations, County, and City agencies, as well as from individuals and organizations. The individual letters are organized by State, Regional, City, organization, and then individuals, as indicated in Table 2-1; any letters received after the comment period were added to the end of the comment letters. Each comment that requires a response is also assigned a number. For example, the first letter received from a State agency was from the Department of Transportation and is labeled “Letter No. 1”. Accordingly, the first comment from the Department of Transportation is labeled “Comment No. 1-1” and the corresponding response provided is labeled “Response No. 1-1”. A copy of each comment letter is provided in Appendix A, Original Comment Letters, of this Final EIR.

As required by the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088 (c), the focus of the responses to comments is on “the disposition of significant environmental issues raised.” Therefore, detailed responses are not provided to comments that do not relate to environmental issues.
# Table 2-1

Summary of Comments on the 5750 Hollywood Boulevard Project Draft EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER NO.</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>AIR QUALITY/GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</th>
<th>PALEONTOLOGICAL/ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</th>
<th>HISTORICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>HAZARDS</th>
<th>HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY</th>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>NOISE</th>
<th>POPULATION/HOUSING/EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION/PARKING</th>
<th>PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Department of Transportation District 7 Office of Transportation Planning Dianna Watson, Branch Chief 100 S. Main Street, MS 16 Los Angeles, CA 90012</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>South Coast Air Quality Management District Jillian Wong, Ph.D., Program Supervisor 21865 Copley Drive Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4178</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) Development Review Elizabeth Carvajal, Transportation Planning Manager One Gateway Plaza Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) Office of Environmental Health and Safety Eimon Smith, CEQA Project Manager <a href="mailto:eimon.smith@lausd.net">eimon.smith@lausd.net</a></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-1 (Continued)

**Summary of Comments on the 5750 Hollywood Boulevard Project Draft EIR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER NO.</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>AIR QUALITY/GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</th>
<th>PALEONTOLOGICAL/ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</th>
<th>HISTORICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>HAZARDS</th>
<th>HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY</th>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>NOISE</th>
<th>POPULATION/HOUSING/EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION/PARKING</th>
<th>PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles Department of Sanitation Wastewater Management Services Division Ali Poosti, Division Manager</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hollywood Chamber of Commerce Leron Gubler, President &amp; CEO 7018 Hollywood Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Friends of the Hollywood Central Park Laurie Goldman 1680 N. Vine Street, Suite 1000 Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hollywood Adventist Church Andrew Froemming, Director of Administration 1711 North Van Ness Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hollywood/Western Business Improvement District Jeff Zarrinnam, Chair HWBID Steering Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-1 (Continued)

Summary of Comments on the 5750 Hollywood Boulevard Project Draft EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER NO.</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>AIR QUALITY/GREENHOUSE GASEMISSIONS</th>
<th>PALEONTOLOGICAL/ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</th>
<th>HISTORICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>HAZARDS</th>
<th>HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY</th>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>NOISE</th>
<th>POPULATION/HOUSING/EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION/PARKING</th>
<th>PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hollywood Heritage, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Cooper, President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 2586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hollywood United Neighborhood Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Van Dusen, Chair: Planning, Land Use &amp; Management Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Swan, President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 3972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My Friend's Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heather Carmichael, LCSW, Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 3867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Joyce Dillard</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 31377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Messiah Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mjjua@yahoo.com">mjjua@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Osmara Soriano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1740 N. Taft Avenue, #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-1 (Continued)

**Summary of Comments on the 5750 Hollywood Boulevard Project Draft EIR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER NO.</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Angelo N—[Surname illegible] 1817 Taft Ave. Apt. 3 Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Grigor Garsevanian 1845 N. Van Ness Ave. #7 Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Anna Babayan 1845 N. Van Ness Ave. #7 Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Armine Garsevanian 1845 N. Van Ness Ave. #7 Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>D.A. Jones 1825 N. Wilton Place Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Michelle M. Perdue 1733 N. Wilton Place Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Robert Arteaga 1733 N. Wilton Place Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LETTER NO.</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Houhannes Agvazyan 1733 Wilton Place #10 Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kaapet Jerejian 1806 N. Wilton Place Apt. 8 Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Misar Blueyan 1745 N. Wilton Place Apt. 5 Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Arsen Atshemyan 1802 N. Wilton Place Apt. 7 Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Manik Pirumyan 1802 N. Wilton Place Apt. 7 Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Juanita Alvarez 1745 N. Wilton Place #3 Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Marine Hakobyan 1806 N. Wilton Place #2 Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-1 (Continued)

**Summary of Comments on the 5750 Hollywood Boulevard Project Draft EIR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER NO.</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AESTHETICS / VISUAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>AIR QUALITY / GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</th>
<th>PALEONTOLOGICAL / ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>GEOLGY AND SOILS</th>
<th>HISTORICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>HAZARDS</th>
<th>HYDROLOGY / WATER QUALITY</th>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>NOISE</th>
<th>POPULATION / HOUSING / EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION / PARKING</th>
<th>PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Flora Aydinyan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1802 N. Wilton Place #7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mary Boules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1812 N. Wilton Place #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Rima Horhannesyan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1812 N. Wilton Place #?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Not provided]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Zaren Karapetyan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1812 N. Wilton Place #?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Not provided]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kayren Burke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1755 N. Wilton Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Danielle Deltardt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1719 N. Wilton Place #22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Juliana Ossa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1724 N. Wilton Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Comments on the 5750 Hollywood Boulevard Project Draft EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER NO.</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AESTHETICS / VISUAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>AIR QUALITY / GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</th>
<th>PALEONTOLOGICAL / ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</th>
<th>HISTORICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>HAZARDS</th>
<th>HYDROLOGY / WATER QUALITY</th>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>NOISE</th>
<th>POPULATION / HOUSING / EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION / PARKING</th>
<th>PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Emmanuel Romera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1722 N. Wilton Place</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Leonard Ullrich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1733 N. Wilton Place</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Michele Rozell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1733 N. Wilton Place</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mher Tormasyan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1844 N. Taft Ave. #11</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Lusine Tormasyan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1844 N. Taft Ave. #11</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Anait Adzhemyan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1844 N. Taft Ave. #9</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Marine Adzhemyan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1844 N. Taft Ave. #9</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-1 (Continued)

Summary of Comments on the 5750 Hollywood Boulevard Project Draft EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER NO.</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Mariam Babityan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1836 N. Gramercy Place #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Sargis Berberyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1806 N. Wilton Place #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Oganes Berberyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1806 N. Wilton Place #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Gagik Hovmanolsyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1719 N. Wilton Place Apt #? [Not provided]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Semagyul Berberyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1806 N. Wilton Place #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Asatur Kocharyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1802 N. Wilton Place #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Chris Dollinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1803 N. Gramercy Place #14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-1 (Continued)

Summary of Comments on the 5750 Hollywood Boulevard Project Draft EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER NO.</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>AIR QUALITY/GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</th>
<th>PALEONTOLOGICAL/ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</th>
<th>HISTORICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>HAZARDS</th>
<th>HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY</th>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>NOISE</th>
<th>POPULATION/HOUSING/EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION/PARKING</th>
<th>PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Debbie Choxan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1801 N. Gramercy Place #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Aaron Batts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1801 N. Gramercy Place #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Kelsi McKeown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1801 N. Gramercy Place #9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Anthony Campos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1803 N. Gramercy Place Apt. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Wilfredo Sanchez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1724 N. Gramercy Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Quinta A. Avila</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1720 N. Gramercy Place Apt. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Mary T. Avila</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1720 N. Gramercy Place Apt. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2-1 (Continued)

Summary of Comments on the 5750 Hollywood Boulevard Project Draft EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER NO.</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AESTHETICS / VISUAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>AIR QUALITY / GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</th>
<th>PALEONTOLOGICAL / ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</th>
<th>HISTORICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>HAZARDS</th>
<th>HYDROLOGY / WATER QUALITY</th>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>NOISE</th>
<th>POPULATION / HOUSING / EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION / PARKING</th>
<th>PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Sergey Zaikin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740 Taft Ave. #? [Not provided]</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Boris Akunts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740 Taft Ave. #7</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Marco Badaraco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2426 W. Berkeley Ave.</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 90026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor’s Office of Planning and Research</td>
<td>State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit</td>
<td>1400 Tenth Street</td>
<td>P.O. Box 3044</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95812-3044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Joseph Ontiveros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resource Director</td>
<td>Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians</td>
<td>P.O. Box 487</td>
<td>San Jacinto, CA 92581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-1 (Continued)

**Summary of Comments on the 5750 Hollywood Boulevard Project Draft EIR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER NO.</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>AIR QUALITY/GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</th>
<th>PALEONTOLOGICAL/ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</th>
<th>HISTORICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>HAZARDS</th>
<th>HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY</th>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>NOISE</th>
<th>POPULATION/HOUSING/EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION/PARKING</th>
<th>PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>OTHER COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Dianna Watson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Branch Chief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Planning &amp; LD / IGR Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Duplicate of Letter No. 1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Dianna Watson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Branch Chief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Planning &amp; LD / IGR Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Duplicate of Letter No. 1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LETTER NO. 1

Dianna Watson
Branch Chief
Community Planning & LD / IGR Review
Department of Transportation
100 S. Main Street, MS 16
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 897-9140
www.dot.ca.gov

COMMENT NO. 1-1

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above referenced project. The project would redevelop the properties at 5732 to 5766 Hollywood Boulevard and construct 161 apartment units and 6,000 square feet of ground floor commercial uses. The existing commercial buildings on site have been vacant for over two years.

The project is estimated to generate a net increase of 1,180 daily trips, 88 trips in the a.m. peak hour, and 106 trips in the p.m. peak hour. At the time of the preparation of the traffic study, there are 64 related projects in the project vicinity. Currently, there are more than 70 related projects in the Hollywood community.

RESPONSE NO. 1-1

This introductory comment is a summary of the Project Description provided in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are responded to below.

The Draft EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.G, Transportation and Traffic, and is based on the detailed Traffic Study for the 5750 Hollywood Boulevard Residential Project, prepared by Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., July 2015 (“Traffic Study”) included in Appendix G of the Draft EIR. It should be noted that the proposed ground-floor commercial square footage is approximately 5,723 square feet, not 6,000 square feet as cited in the comment. The comment correctly states the net new Project trip generation as outlined in Table 4.G-4 on page 4.G-24 of the Draft EIR.

Estimates of future traffic conditions both with and without the Project, representing cumulative conditions, were developed as part of the traffic analysis. In accordance with procedures outlined in Section 15130 of Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act [CEQA], Chapter 3, Title 14, California Code of Regulations (California Natural Resources Agency, amended July 27, 2007), the Draft EIR considered the effects of the Project in relation to other developments either proposed, approved or under construction (collectively, the related projects). As shown in Figure 5 and outlined in Table 5 of the Traffic Study (pages 33 and 36, respectively), 64 related projects were identified at the time of the preparation of the traffic study and issuance of the Project’s NOP. Traffic generated by all of the related projects was used in the analysis although the buildout years of many of the related projects are uncertain and may be beyond the buildout year of the Project. It is recognized that more development projects continue to be proposed. Therefore, as described on page 4.G-18 of the Draft EIR [Cumulative Analysis (Future Conditions)], and in Chapter 3, Future without Project Condition, of the Traffic Study, in addition to the related projects, increases
in traffic due to regional growth and development outside the traffic analysis study area, were considered and accounted for in the Traffic Study through application of an ambient growth factor. This growth factor accounts for increases in traffic due to potential projects not yet proposed or projects outside the study area. The use of ambient growth combined with traffic growth resulting from related projects results in a highly conservative estimate of future cumulative conditions.

COMMENT NO. 1-2
Caltrans is aware that addressing cumulative traffic impacts on the State highway system is challenging. In the spirit of mutual cooperation, Caltrans would like to partner with the City to evaluate cumulative traffic impacts, identify potential improvements, and establish a funding mechanism to mitigate cumulative transportation impacts from future development on the regional highway network.

RESPONSE NO. 1-2
This comment suggests that Caltrans and the City of Los Angeles work together to address traffic on the regional highway network. This is not a comment on the adequacy of the Draft EIR and no further response is required. The comment is noted and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

COMMENT NO. 1-3
On Caltrans [sic] NOP letter dated February 26, 2015, we request [sic] a study location at US-101 off-ramp at N Wilton Pl. and Harold Way. Traffic study did not include this location.

RESPONSE NO. 1-3
The Draft EIR and Traffic Study considered all comments received during the NOP and Initial Study comment period, including the Caltrans NOP comment letter referenced. The Caltrans NOP comment letter listed elements of what is “generally expected in the traffic study or may include in the screening study” and requested presentation of assumptions such as assignment of trips to the Hollywood Freeway and ramps. The analysis of Caltrans facilities, including freeway mainline segments and ramps, is included in Section 4.G of the Draft EIR and Traffic Study, with supplemental analyses provided in Appendix E of the Traffic Study. As shown on Table E-2, the Project traffic is not anticipated to utilize the referenced off-ramps at Wilton Place and Harold Way (referred to as the US 101 Southbound Off-Ramp to Sunset Boulevard at Van Ness Avenue and US 101 Northbound Off-Ramp to Sunset Boulevard). Therefore, as there is no Project-related increase at these off-ramps, the Caltrans screening criteria would not be met and no further analysis was required. Accordingly, these off-ramps and unsignalized intersections were not evaluated.

A detailed description of the traffic analysis study area is provided in Chapter 2, Existing Conditions, of the Traffic Study. The traffic analysis study area is generally comprised of locations that have the greatest potential to experience significant traffic impacts as defined by the lead agency. The study locations were selected in part based on the Project vehicle trip generation, the anticipated distribution of Project trips, existing intersection/corridor operations, and travel routes/patterns to and from the Project and proposed access scheme. Vehicular access to the Project site would be provided via a single driveway along Hollywood Boulevard, which would be limited to right-turn only ingress traveling eastbound and right-turn only egress onto Hollywood Boulevard (per the request of Los Angeles Department of Transportation), as shown in Figure 8 of the Traffic Study. As the Hollywood Freeway northbound and southbound off-ramps at
Hollywood Boulevard are located just west of the Project Site, they offer the primary direct and most convenient way from the Hollywood Freeway to the Project Site. The use of the above referenced off-ramps would require motorists to travel a greater distance and less direct route to the Project site. For example, the use of the Hollywood Freeway southbound off-ramp at Harold Way-Van Ness Avenue would require a vehicle to travel past the Project site to exit the freeway, traveling along several roadways and intersections to reach Hollywood Boulevard at a point farther west than the more convenient Hollywood Freeway southbound off-ramps at Hollywood Boulevard.

**COMMENT NO. 1-4**

The project Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was prepared on 7/9/14. However, the traffic study 2012 freeway data was used per Table 10 CMP Freeway Segment Analysis Existing With Project Operating Conditions (page 63 of Traffic Study) and per Table 4 Freeway Segment Screening Process Existing Operating Conditions (Year 2014) with ambient growth of 1%. The 2014 Traffic volume or data should be used since the MOU is [sic] prepared in 2014. In this area, the US-101 freeway is operating at LOS E/F. When calculating LOS using traffic volume, the results need to match with the existing driver experience. When the traffic speed is low due to freeway traffic congestion, traffic volume is low; therefore, LOS should be based on speed, not volume.

**RESPONSE NO. 1-4**

The comment refers to the freeway segment analysis contained in Chapter 8, Congestion Management Program Analysis, of the Traffic Study. The volumes shown in the “Existing Volume” column of Table 10, CMP Freeway Segment Analysis Existing With Project Operating Conditions, was based on Caltrans data, specifically, the officially published traffic volume data (*2012 Traffic Volumes on California State Highways*), prepared by Caltrans annually. The 2012 volumes were increased at a rate of one percent per year to reflect the existing traffic conditions. The Caltrans traffic publications include a compilation of the traffic volumes for the entire year. The published data for year 2014 was not yet available at the time of the preparation of the traffic analysis Memorandum of Understanding that was approved by the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT). Caltrans published the year 2014 volumes in May 2015 (*2014 Traffic Volumes on California State Highways*) and updated 2014 peak hour volume data in December 2015 (*Caltrans Traffic Volumes Latest Traffic Year Selected Peak Hour Volume Data*), which shows slightly higher traffic volumes than the forecast volumes based on the 2012 data. The 2014 volumes are not high enough to change the results of the CMP Freeway Segment Analysis; however, Table 4.G-7 in the Draft EIR has been modified to show the 2014 volume data, as further discussed and presented below.

**Modified Table 4.G-7, CMP Freeway Segment Analysis Existing With Project Operating Conditions**, below, represents a modified version of Table 4.G-7 in the Draft EIR (and Table 10 in the Traffic Study), which originally presented the CMP freeway segment analysis for forecast 2014 volumes from 2012 data. Modified Table 4.G-7 is based on 2014 volume data. It shows that the changes in the demand-to-capacity ratio (D/C) ratio during either the AM or PM peak hours would not exceed the CMP significance threshold of 0.02 or more under Existing or Future Conditions. Therefore, consistent with the conclusions in Table 4.G-7 in the Draft EIR and Table 10 in the Traffic Study, the Project would result in a less than significant impact on the freeway segments.

It should be noted that this conclusion would be the same regardless of the LOS operating conditions. Nonetheless, a supplemental analysis, contained in Appendix E of the Traffic Study, was conducted using *2010 Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board, 2010) methodology, which accounts for...
### Modified Table 4.G-7

**CMP Freeway Segment Analysis**  
**Existing With Project Operating Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway Segment</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Number of Lanes</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Existing Volume</th>
<th>Existing D/C Ratio</th>
<th>Existing LOS</th>
<th>Project Traffic</th>
<th>Existing with Project Volume</th>
<th>Existing with Project D/C Ratio</th>
<th>Significant Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 south of</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>6,077</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,083</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica Boulevard</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>10,817</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>F(2)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10,834</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>F(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM Peak Hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 south of</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>5,038</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5,055</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica Boulevard</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>10,701</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>F(1)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10,711</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>F(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**
- Auxiliary lanes and high-occupancy vehicle (carpool) lanes are not counted toward number of lanes.
- Capacity reflects a lane capacity is 2,000 vehicles per hour per lane.
- Existing with Project traffic volumes reflect Existing traffic volumes plus the Project traffic volume.
- Change in demand to capacity (D/C) ratio based on Existing with Project D/C ratio - Existing D/C ratio.
- Significant impact based on freeway segment analysis as outlined in Appendix D, subsection D.8.3 and corresponding significance thresholds outlined in subsection D.9.1 of 2010 Congestion Management Plan.

**Source:** Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc., 2016
freeway speed and density in accordance with the *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies* (Caltrans, December 2002). The supplemental Caltrans analysis shows that the Project would not add traffic to on-ramps that would exceed Caltrans’ guidelines, nor would the Project traffic cause any queue length increases on off-ramps that would result in a back-up of traffic onto the freeway mainlines.

**COMMENT NO. 1-5**

For Table 5, Freeway Off-Ramp Screening Process Existing Operating Conditions (Year 2014), the traffic study uses 1,500 vehicles as off-ramp capacity. For off-ramp screening, the 1,500 vehicle/hour/lane that is referenced in section 3.1 of the October 2013 agreement with the City of Los Angeles is based on the free-flow speed without any traffic controls, per the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). However, the capacity for interrupted flow such as signal or stop controlled ramp is reduced. As analysis is needed to determine appropriate ramp capacity since the level of service is based on the ramp capacity. Once the true ramp capacity is determined, screening criteria as per agreement will be applied.

**RESPONSE NO. 1-5**

Appendix E, Caltrans Screening Process, of the Traffic Study provided in Appendix G of the Draft EIR includes the Caltrans screening analysis for freeway segments and ramps according to the requirements of *Agreement Between City of Los Angeles and Caltrans District 7 on Freeway Impact Analysis Procedures* (State of California and City of Los Angeles 2013) (the “Caltrans Agreement”), which stipulates an assumed ramp capacity of 1,500 vehicles per hour per lane for all off-ramps regardless of traffic control type at the intersection. As shown in Table E-2 of the Traffic Study, the Project trips result in less than a one percent increase in capacity at the study freeway off-ramps. This one percent threshold is the screening criteria for a ramp operating at LOS E or F. This negligible increase does not exceed the Caltrans screening criteria threshold, regardless of the LOS, and, therefore, no further analysis is required. The Project’s increase does not exceed the screening criteria regardless of the LOS. As described in Response No. 1-4, a supplemental analysis of Caltrans facilities, which included the analysis requested in the comment, was conducted based on Caltrans traffic study guidelines and HCM 2010 methodology. As detailed in Tables E-11 and E-12 of the Traffic Study, the Project will not cause either of the freeway off-ramps to exceed capacity.

**COMMENT NO. 1-6**

On page 44 of the traffic study, there is only inbound traffic. There is no outbound traffic disclosed. Location #4 (US 101 SB Ramp Hollywood Blvd) and Location #5 (US 101 NB Ramps/Van Ness Avenue & Hollywood Blvd.) Project-Only traffic volume is not consistent between those two locations. In location #5, please justify left-turn lane volume 3(2) trips to on-ramp/Van Ness as the in-bound traffic is not going toward the project site. Cumulative traffic impact may occur at Location #4 and #5. The lead agency should consider proposing feasible traffic improvements at both location [sic]. Additional lane [sic] at both off-ramps may be needed.

**RESPONSE NO. 1-6**

The comment is incorrect. Figure 9, Project-Only Intersection Peak Hour Traffic Volumes, shown on page 44 of the Traffic Study shows both the inbound and outbound traffic to and from the Project site during both the AM and PM peak hours, as evidenced by the arrows which describe traffic turning into and out of the Project driveway. As described on pg. 4.G-23 in Section 4.G, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR, the Project driveway accommodates right-turn only ingress from Hollywood Boulevard and right-turn only egress onto Hollywood Boulevard. Figure 8, Project Trip Distribution, on page 43 of the Traffic Study better describes
the inbound and outbound percentages at the study intersections. As shown on Figure 8, Intersection 4 (US 101 Southbound Ramps & Hollywood Boulevard) accommodates 35% inbound and 5% outbound Project traffic in the eastbound through direction on Hollywood Boulevard and 20% inbound making a southbound left turn. This distribution correlates to eastbound approach traffic at intersection No. 5 (US 101 Northbound Ramps/Van Ness Avenue and Hollywood Boulevard), which includes 5% outbound traffic making an eastbound left-turn and 55% inbound traffic traveling in the eastbound through direction. The eastbound left-turn volume at intersection No. 5 (i.e., to the 101 Northbound On-Ramp at Hollywood Boulevard and Van Ness Avenue) accounts for a portion of the outbound, not inbound traffic as referenced by the comment. This portion of outbound traffic represents Project traffic volume destined to the north that must first turn right onto eastbound Hollywood Boulevard and travel around the block to Hollywood Boulevard via Bronson Avenue as there are no northbound on-ramps provided from Sunset Boulevard.

As discussed in Section 4.G, Transportation and Traffic of the Draft EIR, the cumulative transportation impacts at both intersections referred to in this comment (Intersections 4 and 5) were analyzed as part of the Traffic Study. As shown in Table 9, Future With Project Conditions (Year 2019) Significant Impact Analysis, of the Traffic Study, the Project contribution to the cumulative conditions would be less than significant according to the City’s impact threshold criteria. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required. Furthermore, based on the supplemental analysis described in Appendix E of the traffic study, the Project will not add traffic to on-ramps that exceed Caltrans’ guidelines, nor does the Project traffic cause any queue length increases on off-ramps that would result in a backup of traffic onto the freeway mainline lanes. Thus, further improvements are not required.

**COMMENT NO. 1-7**
Storm water run-off is a sensitive issue for Los Angeles and Ventura counties. Please be mindful that projects should be designed to discharge clean run-off water. Additionally, discharge of storm water run-off is not permitted onto State highway facilities without any storm water management plan.

**RESPONSE NO. 1-7**
The Initial Study prepared for the Project and provided in Appendix A of the Draft EIR addresses proposed stormwater management features and practices as part of Project implementation. As stated therein, stormwater generated on the Project Site would be captured and conveyed to the underground municipal storm drain network. No overland or uncontrolled flows would be discharged to State highway facilities.

**COMMENT NO. 1-8**
Transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials, which requires the use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways, will require a transportation permit from Caltrans. It is recommended that large size truck trips be limited to off-peak commute periods.

**RESPONSE NO. 1-8**
The comment provides a recommendation regarding construction-related truck trips on the State highways. As indicated on pg. 4.G-27 in Section 4.G, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR, the Project would implement a Construction Management Plan that would limit construction truck traffic during peak traffic periods to the extent feasible. The comment is noted and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
**COMMENT NO. 1-9**

Caltrans would like to work with the City in an effort to evaluate traffic impacts, identify potential improvements, and establish a funding mechanism that helps mitigate cumulative transportation impacts in the Hollywood area.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Alan Lin the project coordinator at (213) 897-8391 and refer to IGR/CEQA No. 151052AL-DEIR.

**RESPONSE NO. 1-9**

This comment suggests that Caltrans and the City of Los Angeles work together to address traffic on the regional highway network. This is not a comment on the adequacy of the Draft EIR and no further response is required. The comment is noted and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
LETTER NO. 2

Jillian Wong, Ph. D.
Program Supervisor
Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources
South Coast Air Quality Management District
21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4178
(909) 396-2000
www.aqmd.gov

COMMENT NO. 2-1

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) staff appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. The SCAQMD staffs comments are recommendations regarding the analysis of potential air quality impacts from the proposed project that should be included in the draft CEQA document. Please send the SCAQMD a copy of the CEQA document upon its completion. Note that copies of the Draft EIR that are submitted to the State Clearinghouse are not forwarded to the SCAQMD. Please forward a copy of the Draft EIR directly to SCAQMD at the address in our letterhead. In addition, please send with the draft EIR all appendices or technical documents related to the air quality and greenhouse gas analyses and electronic versions of all air quality modeling and health risk assessment files. These include original emission calculation spreadsheets and modeling files (not Adobe PDF files). Without all files and supporting air quality documentation, the SCAQMD will be unable to complete its review of the air quality analysis in a timely manner. Any delays in providing all supporting air quality documentation will require additional time for review beyond the end of the comment period.

RESPONSE NO. 2-1

The comment regarding documents that the SCAQMD needs in order to complete its review of the air quality analysis is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers. Electronic versions of air quality and greenhouse gas modeling files used in preparation of the DEIR were sent to the SCAQMD via email on October 28th, 2015.

COMMENT NO. 2-2

Air Quality Analysis

The SCAQMD adopted its California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Handbook in 1993 to assist other public agencies with the preparation of air quality analyses. The SCAQMD recommends that the Lead Agency use this Handbook as guidance when preparing its air quality analysis. Copies of the Handbook are available from the SCAQMD's Subscription Services Department by calling (909) 396-3720. More recent guidance developed since this Handbook was published is also available on SCAQMD's website here: http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/ceqa-air-quality-analysis-handbook-(1993). SCAQMD staff also recommends that the lead agency use the CalEEMod land use emissions software. This software has recently been updated to incorporate up-to-date state and locally approved emission factors and methodologies for estimating pollutant emissions from typical land use development. CalEEMod
is the only software model maintained by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) and replaces the now outdated URBEMIS. This model is available free of charge at: www.caleemod.com.

**RESPONSE NO. 2-2**

The comment provides an introduction to the SCAQMD’s usage of the CEQA Handbook and CalEEMod. The analyses were conducted in accordance with SCAQMD guidance (see response 2-3 for more details). As this comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

**COMMENT NO. 2-3**

The Lead Agency should identify any potential adverse air quality impacts that could occur from all phases of the project and all air pollutant sources related to the project. Air quality impacts from both construction (including demolition, if any) and operations should be calculated. Construction-related air quality impacts typically include, but are not limited to, emissions from the use of heavy-duty equipment from grading, earth-loading/unloading, paving, architectural coatings, off-road mobile sources (e.g., heavy-duty construction equipment) and on-road mobile sources (e.g., construction worker vehicle trips, material transport trips). Operation-related air quality impacts may include, but are not limited to, emissions from stationary sources (e.g., boilers), area sources (e.g., solvents and coatings), and vehicular trips (e.g., on- and off-road tailpipe emissions and entrained dust). Air quality impacts from indirect sources, that is, sources that generate or attract vehicular trips should be included in the analysis.

**RESPONSE NO. 2-3**

The comment provides guidance on preparing an air quality analysis consistent with SCAQMD recommendations. As shown in Chapter 4.B, Air Quality and Chapter 4.C, Greenhouse Gas of the DEIR, emissions were calculated for Project-related construction and operational activities using the latest SCAQMD recommended CalEEMod model. Project-related construction emissions were calculated for heavy duty equipment, on-road mobile sources, and fugitive dust. Operational emissions were calculated for area sources, energy usage, and vehicular trips.

**COMMENT NO. 2-4**

The SCAQMD has also developed both regional and localized significance thresholds. The SCAQMD staff requests that the lead agency quantify criteria pollutant emissions and compare the results to the recommended regional significance thresholds found at this link: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/cega/handbook/scagmd-air-quality-significance-thresholds.pdf?sfvrsn=2. In addition to analyzing regional air quality impacts, the SCAQMD staff recommends calculating localized air quality impacts and comparing the results to localized significance thresholds (LSTs). LSTs can be used in addition to the recommended regional significance thresholds as a second indication of air quality impacts when preparing a CEQA document. Therefore, when preparing the air quality analysis for the proposed project, it is recommended that the lead agency perform a localized analysis by either using the LSTs developed by the SCAQMD or performing dispersion modeling as necessary. Guidance for performing a localized air quality analysis can be found at: http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/cegalair-quality-analysis-handbook/localized-significance-thresholds.
RESPONSE NO. 2-4

The comment provides guidance on preparing an air quality analysis consistent with SCAQMD CEQA recommendations. The air quality analysis in the DEIR (Chapter 4.B) assessed localized impacts using SCAQMD’s Localized Significance Threshold (LST) methodology.

COMMENT NO. 2-5

In the event that the proposed project generates or attracts vehicular trips, especially heavy-duty diesel-fueled vehicles, it is recommended that the lead agency perform a mobile source health risk assessment. Guidance for performing a mobile source health risk assessment ("Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risk from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis") can be found at: http://www.agmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/mobile-source-toxics-analysis. An analysis of all toxic air contaminant impacts due to the use of equipment potentially generating such air pollutants should also be included.

RESPONSE NO. 2-5

The comment provides guidance on preparing an air quality analysis consistent with SCAQMD CEQA recommendations. A mobile health risk assessment (HRA) was performed to address impacts to on-site receptors due to toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions from the Hollywood Freeway located adjacent to the site. The mobile source health risk assessment was presented in Chapter 4.E, Land Use and Planning of the DEIR.

With respect to Project-related sources of TACs, as stated in Section 4.E, Land Use & Planning (Table 4.E-3 on page 4.E-31), and Appendix E, Health Risk Assessment Technical Report, of the Draft EIR, the health risk assessment concluded that although the Project would place residential uses near the Hollywood Freeway, residents would be located at an adequate distance from the freeway such that exposure to freeway-generated TACs would not pose a significant health risk. Additionally, the Draft EIR evaluated the potential Project-related TAC emissions during construction and operations. As stated in Section 4.B, Air Quality (see pp. 4.B-37 through -39), heavy equipment operation during Project construction (e.g., during demolition, grading, and trenching activities) would result in potentially significant TAC impacts on residents immediately south of the Project Site due to the generation of diesel particulate matter; impacts would be reduced but would remain significant even after the implementation of construction mitigation measures. Project operations were determined to result in less than significant impacts related to TAC emissions as the Project would not introduce stationary or mobile sources of particulates in excess of SCAQMD’s thresholds of significance.

COMMENT NO. 2-6

In addition, guidance on siting incompatible land uses (such as placing homes near freeways) can be found in the California Air Resources Board’s Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Perspective, which can be found at the following internet address: http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf. CARB’s Land Use Handbook is a general reference guide for evaluating and reducing air pollution impacts associated with new projects that go through the land use decision-making process.
RESPONSE NO. 2-6

Please refer to Response No. 2-5, above. Due to the Project's proximity to the Hollywood Freeway, a detailed health risk assessment was performed consistent with recommendations contained in the City of Los Angeles Advisory Notice for Freeway-Adjacent projects as well as the CARB Air Quality and Land Use Handbook. As stated in Response No. 2-5, the Draft EIR concluded that proximity to the Hollywood Freeway would not pose a significant health risk for Project residents.

COMMENT NO. 2-7

Mitigation Measures

In the event that the project generates significant adverse air quality impacts, CEQA requires that all feasible mitigation measures that go beyond what is required by law be utilized during project construction and operation to minimize or eliminate these impacts. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15126.4 (a)(l)(D), any impacts resulting from mitigation measures must also be discussed. Several resources are available to assist the Lead Agency with identifying possible mitigation measures for the project, including:

- Chapter 11 of the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook
- SCAQMD’s Rule 403- Fugitive Dust, and the Implementation Handbook for controlling construction-related emissions
- Other measures to reduce air quality impacts from land use projects can be found in the SCAQMD’s Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning. This document can be found at the following internet address: http://www.agmd.gov/docs/default-source/planning/air-quality-guidance/complete-guidance-document.pdf?sfvrsn=4.

RESPONSE NO. 2-7

Section 2.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR incorporates a number of mitigation measures which reduce Project-related construction and operational emissions. Mitigation measures recommended by the SCAQMD were considered when selecting appropriate emissions reduction measures for the Project. Construction mitigation measures for the project would reduce emissions from on-site construction equipment to the extent possible. Although the Project’s operational emissions were determined to result in a less than significant impact, mitigation measures were added to further reduce operational impacts. Please refer to Chapter 4.B, Air Quality and Chapter 4.C, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of the Draft EIR for details regarding mitigation measures, and to Section 6.0, Other CEQA Considerations (Subsection F, Potential Secondary Effects, on page 6-17), for discussion of potential secondary effects that could occur as a result of implementation of the required mitigation measures. As stated therein, the Project's air quality mitigation measures are not anticipated to result in secondary environmental impacts.
COMMENT NO. 2-8

Data Sources

SCAQMD rules and relevant air quality reports and data are available by calling the SCAQMD’s Public Information Center at (909) 396-2039. Much of the information available through the Public Information Center is also available via the SCAQMD’s webpage (http://www.aqmd.gov).

RESPONSE NO. 2-8

Chapter 4.B, Air Quality of the Draft EIR incorporates relevant air quality data from the SCAQMD webpage. As this comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

COMMENT NO. 2-9

The SCAQMD staff is available to work with the Lead Agency to ensure that project emissions are accurately evaluated and mitigated where feasible. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at Jwongl@aqmd.gov or call me at (909) 396-3176.

RESPONSE NO. 2-9

The comment is noted. As this comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.
LETTER NO. 3

Elizabeth Carvajal
Transportation Planning Manager

Haylee Madfis
Strategic Initiatives, Countywide Planning & Development

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Authority
One Gateway Plaza MS 99-23-4
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

COMMENT NO. 3-1


RESPONSE NO. 3-1

The comment serves as an introduction to the comments provided in this letter. Responses to these comments are provided in Responses to Comments 3-3 through 3-19, below.

COMMENT NO. 3-2

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed 5750 Hollywood Boulevard mixed use project located at 5732-5766 Hollywood Boulevard in the City of Los Angeles. The proposed project consists of the demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the 1.10 acres project site within the Vermont/Wilshire Transit Oriented District Specific Plan Area as a seven story mixed-use development. This letter conveys recommendations from the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) concerning issues that are germane to our agency’s statutory responsibility in relation to our facilities and services that may be affected by the proposed project.

RESPONSE NO. 3-2

The commenter provides a summary of the Project Description provided in Section 2.0 of the Draft EIR and a summary of the comments provided in this letter. Responses to these comments are provided in Responses to Comments 3-3 through 3-15, below.

COMMENT NO. 3-3

It is noted that the project site is in close proximity to the Metro Red Line subway tunnel. While LACMTA strongly supports development near transit, the following concerns related to the project's proximity to the subway tunnel should be addressed:

1. The project sponsor should be advised that the Metro Red Line subway may operate peak service as often as every four minutes in both directions and that trains may operate, in and out of revenue service, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, in the tunnel below the proposed project.
RESPONSE NO. 3-3

This comment notes the frequency of Metro Red Line service in the Project vicinity, but does not comment on a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR. No further response is necessary.

COMMENT NO. 3-4

2. The construction and operation of the proposed project must not disrupt the operation and maintenance activities of the Metro Red Line or the structural and systems integrity of Metro’s Red Line subway tunnels.

RESPONSE NO. 3-4

As discussed in Section 4.F, Noise, of the Draft EIR, Project-related excavation would extend to a depth of approximately 30 feet below grade, to accommodate subterranean parking and the building's foundations. As the Metro Red Line tracks are approximately 80 feet below the ground surface within the Hollywood Boulevard right-of-way north of the Project Site, Project construction is not anticipated to adversely affect subway operations or maintenance or the structural or systems integrity of the subway tunnels.

With respect to Project operations, the Draft EIR confirms on Page 4.G-32 of Section 4.G, Transportation and Traffic that the Project would not exceed regional transit capacity and impacts with respect to transit would be less than significant. This comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR; no further response is warranted.

COMMENT NO. 3-5

3. Considering the proximity of the proposed project to the subway tunnel, it is expected that rail operations will produce noise and vibration. A recorded Noise Easement Deed in favor of LACMTA is required prior to the completion and/or occupancy of the project, a form of which is attached. The easement recorded in the Deed will extend to successors and tenants, as well. In addition, any noise mitigation required for the Project must be borne by the developers of the Project and not LACMTA.

RESPONSE NO. 3-5

According to the Los Angeles Rail Rapid Transit Project EIS and EIR, the Metro Redline Subway Tunnel is located approximately 80 feet underground within the Hollywood Boulevard right-of-way north of the Project Site. As indicated on page 4.F-31 of the Draft EIR, with that separation distance, it is not anticipated that subway operations noise would significantly impact the Project. Nonetheless, the Applicant will coordinate with LACMTA concerning the need for a recorded Noise Easement Deed in order to develop a mutually acceptable solution prior to the completion and/or occupancy of the Project.

COMMENT NO. 3-6

4. Consistent with Zl No.1117, prior to the City issuing a building permit within 100 feet of the Metro Rail construction area, clearance shall be obtained from LACMTA. LACMTA will need to review the geotechnical report, structural foundation plans, sections, shoring plan sections and calculations. Please refer to the

---

attached LACMTA “Design Criteria and Standards, Volume III- Adjacent Construction Design Manual” for more details regarding submitting drawings and calculations to LACMTA for review. Please note that LACMTA requires an Engineering Review Fee for evaluation of any impacts based on adjacency and relationship of the proposed building to the Metro existing structures.

RESPONSE NO. 3-6
The comment regarding building permits obtained from LACMTA is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers. However, as this comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

COMMENT NO. 3-7
5. LACMTA staff shall be permitted to monitor construction activity to ascertain any impact to the subway tunnel.

RESPONSE NO. 3-7
The comment regarding coordination with LACMTA is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers. The Construction Traffic Management Plan (PDF-TRAF-1) is included in Appendix G, Traffic Study and LADOT Assessment Letter, of the Draft EIR, and includes a number of provisions to reduce Project-related construction traffic impacts. Additional construction monitoring by LACMTA staff would be at the discretion of the Applicant. The comment regarding the requirement for LACMTA staff to monitor construction activity is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.

COMMENT NO. 3-8
6. The project sponsor should be advised that LACMTA may request reimbursement for costs incurred as a result of project construction/operation issues that cause delay or harm to Metro service delivery or infrastructure.

RESPONSE NO. 3-8
While it does not comment on a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR, the comment regarding reimbursement for costs incurred as a result of project construction/operation is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.

COMMENT NO. 3-9
7. The project sponsor will be required to notify LACMTA of any changes to the construction/building plans that may or may not impact the subway tunnel.

RESPONSE NO. 3-9
While it does not comment on a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR, the comment regarding notification to LACMTA regarding changes to project construction/building plans is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
COMMENT NO. 3-10

8. Aspet Davidian, Director, Project Engineering Facilities, should be contacted at 213-922-5258 regarding the project’s potential impacts on Metro’s Red Line station and tunnels.

RESPONSE NO. 3-10

This comment does not raise any substantive issues in the Draft EIR and no response is required.

COMMENT NO. 3-11

Beyond impacts to Metro facilities and operations, LACMTA must also notify the applicant of state requirements. A Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA), with roadway and transit components, is required under the State of California Congestion Management Program (CMP) statute. The CMP TIA Guidelines are published in the 112010 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County”, Appendix D (attached). The geographic area examined in the TIA must include the following, at a minimum:

1. If CMP arterial segments are being analyzed rather than intersections, the study area must include all segments where the proposed project will add 50 or more peak hour trips (total of both directions). Within the study area, the TIA must analyze at least one segment between monitored CMP intersections.

2. If CMP arterial segments are being analyzed rather than intersections, the study area must include all segments where the proposed project will add 50 or more peak hour trips (total of both directions). Within the study area, the TIA must analyze at least one segment between monitored CMP intersections.

3. Mainline freeway-monitoring locations where the project will add 150 or more trips, in either direction, during either the a.m. or p.m. weekday peak hour.

4. Caltrans must also be consulted through the NOP process to identify other specific locations to be analyzed on the state highway system.

The CMP TIA requirement also contains two separate impact studies covering roadways and transit, as outlined in Sections D.8.1 - D.9.4. If the TIA identifies no facilities for study based on the criteria above, no further traffic analysis is required. However, projects must still consider transit impacts. For all CMP TIA requirements please see the attached guidelines.

RESPONSE NO. 3-11

The Draft EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.G, Transportation and Traffic, with supporting data provided in the Traffic Study contained in Appendix G of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR and Traffic Study were prepared consistent with the State-mandated Congestion Management Program administered by Metro. As further described in Chapter 9, CMP Analysis, of the Traffic Study, impact analyses covering roadways, freeways and transit were conducted in accordance with the procedures outlined in the CMP Appendix D, “Guidelines for CMP Transportation Impact Analysis”, which are described in Comments 3-11 through 3-15. As detailed on pages 4.G-30 through 4.G-32 in Section 4.G, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR, fewer than 50 Project trips – specifically, eight or fewer trips – would utilize the arterial monitoring intersections. Thus, no further analysis was warranted and the impact was concluded to be less than significant. Moreover, the Project would not add 150 trips to freeway lanes in either direction during either peak hour. Therefore, no CMP mainline freeway impact would occur and no additional freeway analysis is required under the CMP
criteria for existing or future conditions. Although the Project would not add 150 trips in either direction, further CMP analysis under Future Conditions was undertaken, which concluded that the incremental impacts would not exceed the CMP significance thresholds under either Existing or Future Conditions and, therefore, would result in a less than significant impact on the freeway segments. Potential public transit CMP impacts were considered on page 4.G-32 in Section 4.G, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR, which concluded that the Project would not exceed regional transit capacity and impacts with respect to transit would be less than significant.

**COMMENT NO. 3-12**

If you have any questions regarding this response, please contact Elizabeth Carvajal at 213-922-3084 or by email at DevReview@metro.net. LACMTA looks forward to reviewing the Final EIR. Please send it to the following address:

LACMTA Development Review
One Gateway Plaza MS 99-23-4
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

**RESPONSE NO. 3-12**

This comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR and no response is warranted.

**COMMENT NO. 3-13**

**Placeholder - Appendix D – Guidelines for CMP Transportation Impact Analysis**

**RESPONSE NO. 3-13**

A copy of this attachment to Letter No. 3 is provided in Appendix A, Original Comment Letters, of this Final EIR.

**COMMENT NO. 3-14**

**Placeholder - Noise Easement Deed**

**RESPONSE NO. 3-14**

A copy of this attachment to Letter No. 3 is provided in Appendix A, Original Comment Letters, of this Final EIR.

**COMMENT NO. 3-15**

**Placeholder - Adjacent Construction Design Manual**

**RESPONSE NO. 3-15**

A copy of this attachment to Letter No. 3 is provided in Appendix A, Original Comment Letters, of this Final EIR.
LETTER NO. 4

Eimon Smith  
CEQA Project Manager/Contract Professional  
Los Angeles Unified School District, Office of Environmental Health & Safety  
333 South Beaudry Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
eimon.smith@lausd.net

COMMENT NO. 4-1

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the 5750 Hollywood Boulevard Project. LAUSD previously submitted a comment letter dated February 10, 2015 in which we identified two of our campuses that are currently operating within 0.25 mile of the proposed project site: Grant Elementary School and Helen Bernstein High School. Please note that Helen Bernstein High School is located south of the proposed project site and was omitted from the environmental analysis completed for the proposed project.

RESPONSE NO. 4-1

The Draft EIR acknowledges the location of both Grant Elementary School and Helen Bernstein High School, which currently operate within a 0.25-mile radius of the proposed Project Site. Page 4.G-28, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR recognizes the receipt of LAUSD’s comment letter dated February 10, 2015 to the Project’s NOP and that LAUSD’s Safe Routes to School website (http://lausd-oehs.org/saferoutestoschools.asp) shows that students and parents may pass by the Project Site safely, use street crossings in the Project vicinity, and use the aforementioned roadways for vehicular pick-up and drop-off at schools. Accordingly, the Draft EIR did not omit Helen Bernstein School from analysis.


COMMENT NO. 4-2

LAUSD further identified air quality, noise, and transportation/traffic environmental resource areas as issues of particular concern. While the environmental assessments (i.e. IS/EIR) for the proposed project did not identify potential impacts associated with sensitive resources located outside of a 500 foot radius from the proposed project site, LAUSD is satisfied with the mitigation measures incorporated into the EIR for the aforementioned environmental resource areas. Implementation of the applicable mitigation measures would also help to mitigate potential impacts at LAUSD’s identified campuses. However, if additional issues are identified by LAUSD, we will bring them to the attention of the City.

RESPONSE NO. 4-2

The Draft EIR evaluated air quality, noise and transportation/traffic impacts in the Draft EIR. With respect to each of these environmental issues, the Draft EIR assessed the potential for impacts within the appropriate geographic radii in accordance with the respective analytical methodologies. For air quality, both localized impacts and contributions to regional emissions were evaluated, which takes into account impacts beyond a
500-foot radius. Since noise attenuates (decreases) with distance, noise impacts were not evaluated beyond the point at which Project-related noise would be indistinguishable from ambient or background noise. For transportation/traffic, the Traffic Study prepared for the Project evaluated impacts within the study area defined in consultation with the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation, as well as impacts on the pedestrian and motorist routes to the nearby schools, as identified by LAUSD. LAUSD’s satisfaction with the proposed mitigation measures contained in the Draft EIR is noted and this comment will be communicated to decision-makers for their consideration.
LETTER NO. 5

Ali Poosti  
Division Manager  
City of Los Angeles Department of Sanitation  
Wastewater Management Services Division  
1149 S. Broadway, 9th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90015

COMMENT NO. 5-1

This is in response to your January 28, 2015 letter requesting a review of your proposed residential project located at 5732-5766 Hollywood Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90028. The Bureau of Sanitation has conducted a preliminary evaluation of the potential impacts to the wastewater and stormwater systems for the proposed project.

RESPONSE NO. 5-1

The commenter provides an introduction and summary of the comments provided in this letter. Responses to these comments are provided in Responses to Comments 5-2 through 5-10, below.

COMMENT NO. 5-2

WASTEWATER REQUIREMENT

The Bureau of Sanitation, Wastewater Engineering Services Division (WESD) is charged with the task of evaluating the local sewer conditions and to determine if available wastewater capacity exists for future developments. The evaluation will determine cumulative sewer impacts and guide the planning process for any future sewer improvements projects needed to provide future capacity as the City grows and develops.

Projected Wastewater Discharges for the Proposed Project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Description</th>
<th>Average Daily Flow per Type Description (GPD/UNIT)</th>
<th>Proposed No. of Units</th>
<th>Average Daily Flow (GPD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential: Studio</td>
<td>75/DU</td>
<td>32DU</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential: Loft</td>
<td>75/DU</td>
<td>18DU</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential: 1-BDRM</td>
<td>110/DU</td>
<td>65DU</td>
<td>7,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential: 2-BDRMS</td>
<td>150/DU</td>
<td>46DU</td>
<td>6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESPONSE NO. 5-2

This comment restates data contained in Table B-4 (Estimated Project Wastewater Generation) in Section XVII, Utilities and Services Systems, on page B-55 of the Initial Study, Attachment B: Explanation of Checklist Determinations, prepared for the Project and publicly circulated in January 2015. The data in Table B-4 was, in turn, based on calculations provided by the Bureau of Sanitation’s Wastewater Engineering Services Division.
Division in 2015 as part of the approved Sewer Capacity Availability Request (SCAR) and will-serve letter issued by the Division for the Project. As this comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

COMMENT NO. 5-3
SEWER AVAILABILITY

The sewer infrastructure in the vicinity of the proposed project includes an existing 8-inch line on Hollywood Blvd. The sewage from the 8-inch line feeds into a 24-inch line on Sunset Blvd before discharging into a 33-inch sewer line on Vine St. Figure 1 shows the details of the sewer system within the vicinity of the project. The current flow level (d/I) in the 8-inch line cannot be determined at this time without additional gauging.

RESPONSE NO. 5-3

This comment reiterates sewer line information contained in Section XVII, Utilities and Services Systems, in Attachment B: Explanation of Checklist Determinations of the Initial Study prepared for the Project and publicly circulated in January 2015. Based on the Preliminary Sewer Study prepared as part of the Initial Study, which included submittal of a Sewer Capacity Availability Request (SCAR) to the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation, the Initial Study concluded that there are no known deficiencies in the existing sewer system serving the Project Site and therefore the City's sewer system would be able to accommodate the Project’s estimated wastewater flows at Project buildout. After the publication of the Initial Study, the Bureau of Sanitation's Wastewater Engineering Services Division issued an approved SCAR in February 2015 for the Project, confirming capacity for Project wastewater flows, based on data collection and research performed by the Division in response to the SCAR request by the Project civil engineer. This data collection and research included but was not limited to field observation upstream and downstream of the Project Site, reviewing recent gauging data, and performing gauging.\textsuperscript{12} The Division also provided a will-serve letter in February 2015 confirming its ability to serve the Project Site.\textsuperscript{13} Moreover, as stated in the will-serve letter, a Sewer Connection permit will be required at the time of plan check and issuance of the building permit, as which time sewer capacity to serve the Project is reconfirmed.

COMMENT NO. 5-4

The current approximate flow level (d/D) and the design capacities at d/D of 50 percent in the sewer system are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pipe Diameter (in)</th>
<th>Pipe Location</th>
<th>Current Gauging of d/D (%)</th>
<th>50% Design Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hollywood Blvd</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>229,323 GPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Saint Andrews Pl.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.93 MGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sunset Blvd.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.84 MGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>El Centro Ave.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.03 MGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Vine St.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.11 MGD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* no gauging available

\textsuperscript{12} Kwasi Berko, Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation, Wastewater Engineering Services Division, Sewer Capacity Availability Request (SCAR), February 10, 2015.

\textsuperscript{13} James Kho, Civil Engineering Associate III, Central District, Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation, Wastewater Engineering Services Division, Sewer Availability: 5732-5766 Hollywood Boulevard, February 10, 2015.
Based on the estimated flows, it appears the sewer system might be able to accommodate the total flow for your proposed project. Further detailed gauging and evaluation will be needed as part of the permit process to identify a specific sewer connection point. If the public sewer has insufficient capacity then the developer will be required to build sewer lines to a point in the sewer system with sufficient capacity. A final approval for sewer capacity and connection permit will be made at that time. Ultimately, this sewage flow will be conveyed to the Hyperion Treatment Plant, which has sufficient capacity for the project.

If you have any questions, please call Kwasi Berko of my staff at (323) 342-1562.

RESPONSE NO. 5-4

See Response No. 5-3. This comment, as with Comment Nos. 5-2 and 5-3, reiterates sewer line information provided in Section XVII, Utilities and Services Systems, of the Initial Study's Attachment B: Explanation of Checklist Determinations, which was prepared and circulated in January 2015, and in the Bureau of Engineering's SCAR and will-serve letters of February 2015. The Initial Study determined that the sewer system would be able to accommodate the Project's estimated wastewater flows at buildout, and the February 2015 SCAR and will-serve letters from the division confirmed these conclusions. Moreover, as also stated in Response No. 5-3, the will-serve letter reiterates that a Sewer Connection permit will be required at the time of plan check and issuance of the building permit, as which time sewer capacity to serve the Project will be reconfirmed.

COMMENT NO. 5-5

STORMWATER REQUIREMENTS

The Bureau of Sanitation, Watershed Protection Division (WPD) is charged with the task of ensuring the implementation of the Municipal Stormwater Permit requirements within the City of Los Angeles. We anticipate the following requirements would apply for this project.

RESPONSE NO. 5-5

The comment is an introduction to the Bureau of Sanitation, Watershed Protection Division. Since this comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

COMMENT NO. 5-6

POST-CONSTRUCTION MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS

The project requires implementation of stormwater mitigation measures. These requirements are based on the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) and the recently adopted Low Impact Development (LID) requirements. The projects that are subject to SUSMP/LID are required to incorporate measures to mitigate the impact of stormwater runoff. The requirements are outlined in the guidance manual titled "Development Best Management Practices Handbook -Part B: Planning Activities". Current regulations prioritize infiltration, capture/use, and then biofiltration as the preferred stormwater control measures. The relevant documents can be found at: www.lastormwater.org. It is advised that input regarding SUSMP requirements be received in the early phases of the project from WPD’s plan-checking staff.
RESPONSE NO. 5-6

The Project Site’s stormwater drainage plans are discussed in Section IX, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Project’s Initial Study, Attachment B: Explanation of Checklist Determinations. As stated therein, runoff would be collected and diverted to three catch basins serving the Project Site which are owned and operated by the City. Runoff would be captured and treated on-site in accordance with the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits and the City of Los Angeles Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan. Pages B-27 and B-28 of the Initial Study state that Low Impact Development (LID) measures and practices to reduce the volume and intensity of stormwater runoff leaving the Project Site have been incorporated into the Project design in accordance with the City’s Best Management Practices Handbook, Part B: Planning Activities. Notwithstanding, this comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT NO. 5-7

GREEN STREETS

The City is developing a Green Street[s] Initiative that will require projects to implement Green Street elements in the parkway areas between the roadway and sidewalk of the public right-of-way to capture and retain stormwater and urban runoff to mitigate the impact of stormwater runoff and other environmental concerns. The goals of the Green Street elements are to improve the water quality of stormwater runoff, recharge local ground water basins, improve air quality, reduce the heat island effect of street pavement, enhance pedestrian use of sidewalks, and encourage alternate means of transportation. The Green Street elements may include infiltration systems, biofiltration swales, and permeable pavements where stormwater can be easily directed from the streets into the parkways and can be implemented in conjunction with the SUSMP/LID requirements.

RESPONSE NO. 5-7

This comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR. In addition, the City has not yet published or adopted Green Street guidance or requirements. Nonetheless, the City’s adopted Low Impact Development (LID) ordinance and associated Handbook of Best Management Practices governs stormwater management requirements for new development. Project consistency with this guidance is discussed in Attachment B: Explanation of Checklist Determinations of the Initial Study provided in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. Additionally, some examples of the Project’s features and practices that coincide with Green Street elements are as follows:

- Section 4.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR states that the Project will pre-wire, or install conduit and panel capacity for, electric vehicle charging stations in 20 percent of on-site parking spaces in order to encourage carpooling and the use of electric vehicles and improve air quality.
- The incorporation of PDF-TRAF-1, Construction Traffic Management, and PDF-TRAF-2, Pedestrian Safety, into the Project provides safety precautions for pedestrians and bicyclists. This will enhance pedestrian use of sidewalks and encourage alternative means of transportation.
**COMMENT NO. 5-8**

**CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS**

The project is required to implement stormwater control measures during its construction phase. All projects are subject to a set of minimum control measures to lessen the impact of stormwater pollution. In addition for projects that involve construction during the rainy season that is between October 1 and April 15, a Wet Weather Erosion Control Plan is required to be prepared. Also projects that disturb more than one-acre of land are subject to the California General Construction Stormwater Permit. As part of this requirement a Notice of Intent (NOI) needs to be filed with the State of California and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) needs to be prepared. The SWPPP must be maintained on-site during the duration of construction.

If there are questions regarding the stormwater requirements, please call Kosta Kaporis at (213) 485-0586, or WPD's plan-checking counter at (213) 482-7066. WPD's plan-checking counter can also be visited at 201 N. Figueroa, 3rd Fl, Station 18.

**RESPONSE NO. 5-8**

See Response No. 5-3. This comment restates information about and mandatory regulatory requirements pertaining to stormwater control plans as detailed in Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Project’s Initial Study’s Attachment B: Checklist Explanation, and set forth in the February 2015 SCAR and will-serve letters received from the Division for the Project. As this comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

**COMMENT NO. 5-9**

**SOLID RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS**

The City has a standard requirement that applies to all proposed residential developments of four or more units or where the addition of floor areas is 25 percent or more, and all other development projects where the addition of floor area is 30 percent or more. Such developments must set aside a recycling area or room for onsite recycling activities. For more details of this requirement, please contact Daniel Hackney of the Special Project Division at (213) 485-3684.

**RESPONSE NO. 5-9**

As noted in on page 2-23 of Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, recycling facilities would be provided as part of the Project in compliance with LAMC requirements.

**COMMENT NO. 5-10**

**RESPONSE NO. 5-10**

A copy of this attachment to Letter No. 3 is provided in Appendix A, Original Comment Letters, of this Final EIR.
LETTER NO. 6

Leron Gubler  
President & CEO  
Hollywood Chamber of Commerce  
7018 Hollywood Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 6-1

On behalf of the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, I am writing to provide our input on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed 5750 Hollywood Blvd. Project. The Chamber has reviewed the DEIR and has found no significant impacts which concern us.

This location is an important gateway to Hollywood. We find that the architects have been sensitive to this location and have designed a project that will be welcoming and which has a Hollywood theme incorporated in the design. The project is fully parked to code as required in the Station Neighborhood Area Plan (SNAP). We are also pleased to see that the design calls for up to five live-work units, with the residence located above the street-level business, which will help to activate the street. We are also glad to see that 14 of the units will be set aside for very-low income residents.

RESPONSE NO. 6-1

The comment states that the Draft EIR findings do not include significant impacts of concern to the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce. The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.

COMMENT NO. 6-2

One area that the Chamber feels strongly about is that the project’s contribution of one percent for the arts be spent either within this project or within Hollywood. As a showplace for the City and with a large number of local artists, we would like to be sure that all art funds are utilized within Hollywood proper.

We encourage your approval of this project.

RESPONSE NO. 6-2

A final decision regarding disposition of the required one percent for the arts has not been made for this Project, but the Project Applicant is currently exploring ways to fulfill this requirement through implementation of proposed Project Design Feature PDF-HIST-1, presented in Section 4.D, Historic Resources, of the Draft EIR, which would salvage and install selected architectural features of the automobile showroom in the original building at 5766 Hollywood Boulevard in the main entrance lobby of the new Project building. As part of this, an interpretive program is proposed and may include historical photographs, existing conditions photographs, written narrative, and/or a commemorative plaque, to be installed in a display space within the common area, likely the main lobby, to accompany the salvaged architectural features and commemorate the history of the former automobile showroom.
LETTER NO. 7

Laurie Goldman
Executive Director
Friends of Hollywood Central Park
1680 N. Vine Street, Suite 1000
Los Angeles, CA 90028
(323) 464-8888
hollywoodcentralpark.org

COMMENT NO. 7-1
Friends of the Hollywood Central Park is proud to support the above-referenced project. On behalf of FHCP, I have reviewed the DEIR and find no objections. There are no long term significant impacts from the project. I am particularly pleased that the project will provide 14 low income housing units.

RESPONSE NO. 7-1
This comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR. Instead, the comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.

COMMENT NO. 7-2
As a gateway project, 5750 Hollywood Boulevard is appropriate and designed with the community in mind. Additionally, the project has a symbiotic relationship with the Hollywood Central Park. In the not too distant future, tenants will have a 38-acre park in their "back yard".

RESPONSE NO. 7-2
This comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR, but the comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.

COMMENT NO. 7-3
Having witnessed the extraordinary renewal in Hollywood, I have every confidence that this project will be of great benefit to our community.

Thank you for allowing FHCP to provide comment and please add us to your mailing list.

RESPONSE NO. 7-3
This comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR. However, the comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 8

Andrew Froemming  
Director of Administration  
Hollywood Adventist Church  
1711 North Van Ness Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90028  
andrew@hollywoodsda.org

COMMENT NO. 8-1

Please know that the 5750 Hollywood Boulevard team has reached out to the church and done due diligence in notifying us about the project.

RESPONSE NO. 8-1

This comment acknowledges that the Applicant has engaged in outreach with the nearby Hollywood Seventh Day Adventist Church. This comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR.
LETTER NO. 9

JEFF ZARRINNAM  
CHAIR  
HOLLYWOOD/WESTERN BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (HWBID) STEERING COMMITTEE

COMMENT NO. 9-1
I write to advise you of the Hollywood/Western Business Improvement District’s (HWBID) support for the above referenced project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard.

RESPONSE NO. 9-1
This comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR. The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.

COMMENT NO. 9-2
The 5750 Hollywood project team has actively and consistently supported the forthcoming Hollywood/Western Business Improvement District. We are glad to have the 5750 Hollywood project team as partners in the effort to revitalize our neighborhood and strengthen the local economy.

RESPONSE NO. 9-2
This comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR. The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.

COMMENT NO. 9-3
Further, HWBID members have expressed concerns around the cleanliness and safety of Hollywood Boulevard at the 101 Freeway- immediately adjacent to the project site. There is no question that replacing a vacant pool hall at this location with the proposed mixed-use building will be a terrific improvement to our community and the local pedestrian experience.

RESPONSE NO. 9-3
This comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR. The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.

COMMENT NO. 9-4
The HWBID Steering Committee was pleased to learn of the 5750 Hollywood project team’s engagement with, and lack of objections from, local property owners and business tenants on the boulevard. In keeping with the project endorsement for 5750 Hollywood offered by the Hollywood United Neighborhood Council, the HWBID similarly believes this project fits in well with the development plan for the area and merits approval from the City.

RESPONSE NO. 9-4
The comment acknowledges that the Applicant has engaged in outreach with the HWBID Steering Committee, local property owners, and business tenants. This comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 10

Bryan Cooper  
President  
Hollywood Heritage, Inc.  
P.O. Box 2586  
Hollywood, CA 90078  
(323) 874-4005

COMMENT NO. 10-1

The Board of Directors of Hollywood Heritage, its Preservation Issues Committee and its members, thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 5750 Hollywood Boulevard Project.

We have been actively engaged in a continuous project dialogue since its initial introduction; this inclusive relationship has already generated positive project changes implemented by the Developer.

RESPONSE NO. 10-1

This comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR. This comment acknowledges the Applicant’s early and ongoing engagement in outreach to Hollywood Heritage.

COMMENT NO. 10-2

As commented on in the NOP; [sic] the Developer heard our desire to see remaining original significant historic features identified and incorporated in a meaningful way in the project, but our discussions were preliminary. Hollywood Heritage proposes an alternative approach to the implementation; we advocate a slightly different design solution which we think will be a “win-win”.

RESPONSE NO. 10-2

This comment acknowledges that the Applicant was responsive to requests made by Hollywood Heritage throughout the course of discussions about the Project, and incorporated original building features into the Project building, as described in Project Design Feature PDF-HIST-1 in Section 4.D, Historic Resources, in the Draft EIR. Hollywood Heritage is proposing an alternative approach, which is noted, and responses are provided below. While the comment refers to “remaining original significant historic features,” as discussed on page 4.D-11 in Section 4.D, Historic Resources, of the Draft EIR, the building “lacks sufficient character-defining features and no longer retains its historic integrity to exhibit associations with early automobile-oriented commercial development in Hollywood.” Additionally, as discussed on page 4.D-14 in Section 4.D, Historic Resources, of the Draft EIR, the remaining “interior spaces and features are generally not publicly accessible and by themselves are not sufficient to convey the period of the building’s original construction or its significance.”
COMMENT NO. 10-3

We have five areas of comment:

1. Historic designation listed in the California Register cannot be “de-designated” through an EIR: Your EIR correctly reports that the building at 5766 Hollywood Boulevard – locally known as the ‘Franklin Motorcar Showroom” and designed by Hollywood’s top architectural firm of Morgan Walls and Clement – is listed in the California Register.

In our letter of February 26, 2015 responding to the NOP, Hollywood Heritage explained to you the legally-required process to change the existing determination of significance for this building. Your page 4-D4 outlines this process of consulting with the State Historic Resources Commission. This must be followed if the argument will be made that the earthquake damage and subsequent bad quality remodeling at this building did so much damage as to cause it to lose its significance and eligibility for designation.

As you know, the 2010 Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Historic Survey did not remove the building from the state list, both because the process was not ever followed, and because that 2010 survey was never formally reviewed and adopted. Thus the EIR that is still in force is the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan EIR for the 2003-5 update, which listed this building as 2S2, “individual property determined eligible for National Register by a consensus through Section 106 process. Listed in the California Register”.

In 1997, after the earthquake, the building was still eligible for the National Register. We see no evidence in the EIR that you or the applicant followed up to initiate the public process with the State Office, or contacted CRA to find out which designation was actually the current one, or took on further research. Our letter mentions that much of the exterior remains, and we expected to see the legally-required effort with the SHPO if this building was to be de-designated.

This building is still listed, and thus its demolition is a significant adverse impact under CEQA.

RESPONSE NO. 10-3

The Draft EIR does not purport to “de-designate” 5766 Hollywood Boulevard from the California Register as suggested by the commenter. To the contrary, page 4.D-11 in Section 4.D, Historic Resources, of the Draft EIR, states that:

“Despite the loss of integrity from the 1994 earthquake, 5766 Hollywood Boulevard remains listed on the California Register by virtue of the 1994 FEMA survey. Unless it is removed from the California Register through the formal delisting process, 5766 Hollywood Boulevard remains listed on the California Register, despite analysis which confirms it no longer qualifies as an historic resource.”

The delisting process is not legally required during preparation of an EIR in order to determine whether the Project may result in a significant impact on an historical resource. A project results in a significant impact under CEQA if it causes a “substantial adverse change” in the significance of an historic resource.\(^{14}\)

\(^{14}\) CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5(b).
“Substantial adverse change” can occur if demolition materially impairs “the significance of an historical resource.”\textsuperscript{15} “Significance” is “materially impaired” when a project demolishes or alters “those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance.”\textsuperscript{16} Thus, based on Section 15064.5(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, a significant impact only occurs if “a project” demolishes those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance. When the baseline condition of a building is such that those physical characteristics that conveyed its historical significance and justified its inclusion on the California Register are absent, an EIR may conclude based on substantial evidence that \textit{the project} does not result in a significant impact because \textit{the project} is not causing a substantial adverse change. The commenter provides no authoritative citation or evidence to support their conclusion that since the building is still listed in the California Register, its demolition is automatically a significant adverse impact under CEQA.

The commenter’s conclusion ignores the existing condition of 5766 Hollywood Boulevard, which was thoroughly assessed in Section 4.D, Historic Resources, of the Draft EIR. The conclusion of that Assessment Report was that the building “lacks sufficient character-defining features and no longer retains its historic integrity to exhibit associations with early automobile-oriented commercial development in Hollywood.” The subject property had lost its integrity due to significant alterations over time, including after the 1994 earthquake. The Assessment Report includes as evidence a building permit dated August 15, 1994 for repair work after the 1994 Northridge earthquake, which describes the work as replacing the property’s “URM [unreinforced masonry] wall with CMU, new storefront and roll-up door.” Thus, the façade of the building was removed in 1994, resulting in a loss of integrity. The 2010 Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Historic Survey records the altered condition of the structure, stating that, “5766 Hollywood Boulevard was no longer eligible for listing in the National Register or California Register and assigned it a status code of 6Z, which is defined as ‘found ineligible for National Register, California Register or local designation through survey evaluation.’”

However, the commenter is incorrect in stating that “the EIR that is still in force is the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan EIR for the 2003-5 update, which listed this building as 2S2.” An EIR examines potential impacts on the environment from a project. An EIR is not “in force” but rather serves as an informational document for decision-makers so they can understand the environmental consequences of their decisions. It is acknowledged on page 4.D-10 in Section 4.D, Historic Resources, of the Draft EIR that at the time of the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Update EIR, a 2002 historical resources survey assigned 5766 Hollywood Boulevard a status code 2S2, which was concluded by the Project’s architectural historians to have been carried over in deference to the 1994 consensus determination and listing in the California Register, despite the resource’s loss of integrity in 1994. This assumption is based on the fact that the photo in the survey form shows that the character-defining facade features were no longer present. Again, the more recent 2010 Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Historic Survey assigned a status code of 6Z. The Draft

\textsuperscript{15} Id.

\textsuperscript{16} Id.
EIR fully discloses that the historic survey prepared in 2002 assigned a status code 2S2. It is acknowledged that the former CRA’s list of historic buildings within the Hollywood Redevelopment Area prepared pursuant to Section 511 of the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan contains 5766 Hollywood Boulevard and shows a status code of 2S2, even though, as discussed on page 4.D-11 in Section 4.D, Historic Resources, of the Draft EIR, the building “lacks sufficient character-defining features and no longer retains its historic integrity to exhibit associations with early automobile-oriented commercial development in Hollywood.”

With respect to the previously assigned 2S2 status code, California State Office of Historic Resources Technical Assistance Bulletin #8, which is a user’s guide to historical resources status codes, provides the following note in using status codes:

‘Users of Historic Resource Status Codes should keep in mind that the status codes are broad indicators which, in most cases, serve as a starting place for further consideration and evaluations. Because the assigned status code reflects an opinion or action taken at a specific point in time, the assigned status code may not accurately reflect the resource’s eligibility for the National Register, California Register, or local listing or designation at some later time. Individuals and agencies attempting to identify and evaluate historical resources need to consider the basis for evaluation upon which the particular code was assigned, i.e. date of evaluation, the reason and criteria applied for evaluation, and any changes that may have been made to the resource that would impact its integrity.” ¹⁷ (Emphasis in original.)

Thus, a status code is a snapshot in time and the later 2010 Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Historic Survey assigned a status code of 6Z which was confirmed by the analysis in Section 4.D, Historic Resources, and Appendix D, Historic Resources Assessment Report, of the Draft EIR.

Nevertheless, the Draft EIR considered 5766 Hollywood Boulevard to be a designated historical resource for purposes of CEQA analysis and analyzed potential impacts from the project on pages 4.D-13 thru 4.D-18 of the Draft EIR. The results of this analysis are presented in detail in the Assessment Report, provided in Appendix D to the Draft EIR, which was prepared by qualified professionals in accordance with established evaluation methods and applicable criteria, and are summarized in Section 4.D of the Draft EIR.

The analysis concluded that the impact from removal of the building located at 5766 Hollywood Boulevard would be less than significant under CEQA because, as a result of the 1994 Northridge earthquake and repairs made in response to damage sustained in that earthquake, the entire front six feet of the primary façade was replaced and the building therefore no longer retains integrity or historical significance as a 1920s Spanish Colonial Revival style automobile showroom. As discussed on page 4.D-14 in Section 4.D, Historic Resources, of the Draft EIR, the remaining “interior spaces and features are generally not publicly accessible and by themselves are not sufficient to convey the period of the building’s original construction or its significance.” Because the primary character-defining façade and the majority of the interior character-defining features were previously altered or removed, the building is no longer representative of its style or building type and it no longer conveys its significant historical associations or expresses the aesthetic and historic sense of early 20th century automobile-related commercial architecture. The Assessment Report evaluated the existing property under the applicable evaluation criteria, and found that the property does

not retain sufficient architectural integrity to convey the historical sense of time and place or architectural function with which the building was historically associated. Furthermore, according to the Assessment Report, “interior spaces and features are generally not publicly accessible and by themselves are not sufficient to convey the period of the building's original construction or its significance.” Since the integrity of the building at 5766 Hollywood Boulevard was previously already compromised, the Project would not result in the removal of any existing significant architectural features that would convey its historical or architectural significance and that would otherwise justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register. Therefore, because the Project would not remove any significant character-defining features that justify its eligibility for listing in the National Register, California Register, or as a local City Historic-Cultural Monument, the Project would not result in a significant unavoidable impact on an historical resource. While the interior alone does not qualify for the integrity of the original building, the Applicant has volunteered to include PDF-HIST-1, which would retain and reuse remnant interior features from the former showroom space. Nevertheless, because the subject property has lost overall integrity, the Project would have a less than significant impact on a historic property.

**COMMENT NO. 10-4**

You must either apply to the State Historic Preservation Office, and wait the 60 days, or include a Statement of Overriding Consideration in order to allow the current project to proceed. Due to this, your EIR requires a further alternative. We recommend you prepare supplemental work for this EIR looking at options for preservation—perhaps in keeping with #3 below.

**RESPONSE NO. 10-4**

With respect to the commenter’s assertion that a Statement of Overriding Considerations would be required for the Project to proceed, that would only be the case if the Draft EIR had concluded that the Project would result in a significant impact on historic resources. As discussed in Response No. 10-3, however, the Draft EIR analyzed potential impacts to historical resources pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines as defined in Section 15064.5 and the L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide, and found that the Project would result in a less than significant impact to historical resources. Therefore, there is no need for a Statement of Overriding Considerations. Because there would be a less than significant impact on historical resources, there is no need to contact the State Historic Preservation Office. Finally, the commenter provides no authoritative citation or evidence to support this proposed action.

The commenter provides no authoritative citation or evidence to support the conclusion that an application to the State Historic Preservation Office or a statement of overriding considerations is required for the Project to proceed. As discussed in Response to Comment No. 10-3, above, the Draft EIR does not purport to delist 5766 Hollywood Boulevard from the California Register nor is delisting legally required for preparation of an EIR to determine whether the Project may result in a significant impact on an historical resource.

Since no significant impact was determined to result from the Project, no preservation alternative was required, although a preservation alternative was considered and the reasons for its rejection are discussed on pages 5-7 and 5-8 in Section 5.0, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, in response to discussions with Hollywood Heritage, PDF-HIST-1 was developed to retain and reuse remnant interior features from the showroom space and communicate the history of the building through interpretation to reduce any less than significant adverse impacts to the maximum extent possible.
COMMENT NO. 10-5

Please note also that the CRA has the ability to delay demolition. It is unclear if you contacted them. Hollywood Heritage recognizes that this building is an unusual case, but we also recognize that procedural slip-ups can add up to major losses of our heritage.

RESPONSE NO. 10-5

The project team consulted with the CRA concerning the Project, as required by the Hollywood Development Plan. Specifically, the project team first contacted the CRA in July 2015, and in November 2015, during the public review period for the Draft EIR, the Draft EIR Project Description and analysis of historic resources were provided to Craig Bullock at the CRA for review.

Section 511 of the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan contains a mechanism to ensure that “grading, foundation, demolition, building or any other kind of permit” which may impact a building within the Plan area identified by the CRA as historic, is not issued without a process to fully assess potential impacts and to allow parties to explore whether adverse impacts can be avoided or mitigated. This determination is required to occur prior to the issuance of grading, foundation, building or other permits by the City for the Project. Section 511 allows the CRA to delay issuance of such permits for up to 180 days to allow this process to occur.

As a part of the archival records search for the Assessment Report, the results of the 2010 Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area Survey were consulted to identify previously evaluated resources within the area of potential impact for the Project. As previously stated in Response No. 10-3, the 2010 Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Historic Survey concluded that 5766 Hollywood Boulevard was no longer eligible for listing in on the National Register or California Register and assigned the property a status code of 6Z, which is defined as “found ineligible for National Register, California Register or local designation through survey evaluation.” Therefore, even though 5766 Hollywood Boulevard remains on the CRA list of historic buildings within the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan area, its most recent survey acknowledges the building lacks sufficient character defining features to be eligible to remain on that list. Nonetheless, as stated by the commenter, Hollywood Heritage has been “actively engaged in a continuous project dialogue since its initial introduction; this inclusive relationship has already generated positive project changes implemented by the Developer.” This dialogue, which has been ongoing for more than a year, is the kind of effort envisioned by Section 511. Additionally, the potential impacts to 5766 Hollywood Boulevard were thoroughly assessed in Section 4.D, Historic Resources, of the Draft EIR and the Assessment Report. Even though 5766 Hollywood Boulevard no longer qualifies for listing in either the California Register or the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan list of historic buildings in the Plan area, the Draft EIR considered it to be an historical resource for purposes of CEQA analysis. Section 511 of the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan ensures that projects which may impact historic resources in the Plan area do not “fall through the cracks” and receive permits that result in alteration or demolition without a dialogue with interested parties and assessment of potential impacts. The Draft EIR process, including preparation of the Assessment Report, and dialogue with the commenter demonstrates compliance with Section 511 of the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan.

COMMENT NO. 10-6

2. Loss of historic fabric after earthquake should not have happened: We do not see any discussion or explanation as to how a listed building in the CRA area was defaced by removing all of the historic original Churrigueresque ornament at the street-front façade. We do not see that the EIR researched what building
permits were taken and when, who signed the clearances, and whether the applicant followed up on reports that the ornament was removed and put in.

RESPONSE NO. 10-6

The first part of this comment questions why the historic façade of the subject property was removed and does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR. The Applicant was not responsible for this alteration. The removal of the façade occurred before the Applicant proposed the Project. In addition, CEQA considers the baseline of a Project Site to be the existing conditions at the time of the application. Notwithstanding, the following explanation of the removal of the façade is provided for the commenter. Part of the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) response to the Northridge earthquake damage was to offer FEMA funding assistance for necessary repairs and to conduct Section 106 review of affected historic properties, including survey and evaluation of potential historical resources and identification and determination of eligibility for those resources found eligible for listing in the National Register. However, as stated in the Assessment Report provided in Appendix D of the Draft EIR (see footnote nos. 38 and 39 on pages 27-28 of the report, and page 83), the property owner elected at the time not to accept FEMA funding assistance and therefore the owner was not legally required to complete the repair work in conformance with the Standards.

The second part of the comment questions the adequacy of the research conducted to investigate the removal of the façade. Contrary to the commenter’s claim, discussion and documentation of the 1994 earthquake damage to the subject building was provided in the Assessment Report on pages 27 and 28, along with copies of the pertinent building permits in Appendix E of the Assessment Report. The Assessment Report also notes on page 28 that there was speculation that original elements of the facade may have been salvaged but the Assessment Report documents verbal communication with the prior owner who has no knowledge of any such salvage. In addition, and as stated in Response 10-3 above, at the time of the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Update EIR, a 2002 historical resources survey assigned 5766 Hollywood Boulevard a status code of 2S2, which is assumed to have been “carried over in deference to the 1994 consensus determination and listing in the California Register, despite the resource's loss of integrity in 1994.” This assumption is based on the fact that the photo in the survey form shows that the character-defining facade features were no longer present. A building permit dated August 15, 1994 (attached to the Assessment Report), obtained to undertake repair work after the 1994 Northridge earthquake, describes the work as “URM wall with CMU, new storefront and roll-up door.” This indicates that the character-defining front facade of the building was completely removed in 1994 well before the 2002 historical resources survey.

COMMENT NO. 10-7

3. Retention of historic features and reuse in the project should be meaningful, and should involve a minor project re-design at the northwest corner: Hollywood Heritage had productive site visits with the project representatives, and found an ensemble of remaining interior architectural features, quite convincingly recalling the era of the building’s significance, and quite evocative of the Morgan, Walls, and Clements luxury showroom.

In our letter of February 26, 2015 we listed features we were aware of, and recommended reusing the interior in the project. The list appears to match what we saw, and we look forward to further investigation. Hollywood Heritage has given careful consideration to the proposal to use the showroom architecture in
pieces in a modern lobby, and prefers to have a meaningful re-use of the historic features. We prefer the features are incorporated into the showroom as it was on site, and used in a meaningful way.

**RESPONSE NO. 10-7**

This comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR. However, for the record, the Applicant has had seven meetings with Hollywood Heritage, including a site visit and three meetings focused on the salvage program with a subcommittee that the organization created to work with the Applicant concerning this Project. The Applicant has carefully considered a variety of options for incorporating the ensemble of remaining interior architectural features into the Project in a meaningful way, and input was received from the Hollywood Heritage subcommittee at each meeting that resulted in a number of enhancements to this plan. Project Design Feature PDF-HIST-1, presented in Section 4.D, Historic Resources, of the Draft EIR, was developed as a result of careful consideration to provide a balanced approach that supports Project objectives and preservation goals to retain and preserve the remnant historic features in a publically accessible, prominent location within the proposed building. The selected features represent those identified by Hollywood Heritage in discussions with the Applicant.

With respect to the existing building features to be salvaged and their installation as part of the Project, as discussed on page 2-20 of Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR,

“The Project proposes to salvage selected architectural features from the existing building and install these features in the lobby of the Project's mixed-use building. Depending on the technical feasibility of their removal and reinstallation, the salvaged architectural features may include the existing building’s wooden coffered ceiling, turned wooden balustrades, decorative wood cornices from interior doorways, decorative plaster rope moldings, bi-fold multi-paneled wooden doors, and the exterior brick wall. The lobby floor of the Project's mixed-use building would utilize decorative paving to replicate and delineate the existing building's footprint and original automobile showroom. The lobby would also provide a display space to accompany the salvaged materials and acknowledge the existing building’s former use. The display space would house an interpretive program featuring elements such as historical photographs, written narrative, and a commemorative plaque.”

The proposed salvage and installation program is discussed in more detail on pages 4.D-13-14 in Section 4.D, Historical Resources, of the Draft EIR, as part of Project Design Feature PDF-HIST-1:

“PDF-HIST-1: The Applicant proposes to salvage and install selected architectural features of the automobile showroom in the original building at 5766 Hollywood Boulevard in the main entrance lobby of the new Project building. Depending on the technical feasibility of their removal and reinstallation, salvaged architectural features may include such original showroom features as the wooden coffered ceiling; turned wooden balustrades lining the second floor mezzanine; decorative wood cornices from interior doorways; decorative plaster rope moldings; bi-fold multi-paneled wooden doors; and an exterior masonry (brick) wall. Within the lobby, scored concrete paving would replicate the floor treatment of the original automobile
showroom, while additional decorative paving would delineate the footprint of the original showroom and building on the lobby floor.

Additionally, an interpretive program is proposed and may include, but may not be limited to, such elements as historical photographs, existing conditions photographs, written narrative, and/or a commemorative plaque. Interpretive program elements would be installed in a display space within the common area, most likely the building’s main lobby, to accompany the salvaged architectural features and commemorate the history of the former automobile showroom. “

COMMENT NO. 10-8

In the EIR, PDF-HIST 1 states that the applicant proposes to salvage and install selected architectural features – ceiling, wall balustrades, rope molding, floor patterns – which jive with the list prepared by Hollywood Heritage.

We recommend that this change to “in a lobby in the location of the original showroom, with the interior features restored in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards, and the exterior reconstructed with original materials (if located) or reconstructed in accordance with historic documentation.” sounds [sic] like a fine idea.

RESPONSE NO. 10-8

This comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR. However, as discussed above in Response No. 10-7, Project Design Feature PDF-HIST-1 was developed as a result of careful consideration to provide a balanced approach that supports Project objectives and preservation goals to retain and preserve the remnant historic features in a publically accessible, prominent location. As the result of a suggestion from the subcommittee, PDF-HIST-1 would require a demarcation of the space occupied by the original showroom to be created within the new Project building to provide a sense of space and history, as follows:

“Within the lobby, scored concrete paving would replicate the floor treatment of the original automobile showroom, while additional decorative paving would delineate the footprint of the original showroom and building on the lobby floor.”

As stated therein, the scored concrete and decorative paving would be installed in the location of the original showroom floor. This would be implemented in addition to the integration of other original building features into the Project building lobby as well as the installation of an interpretive program in a display space within the common area to commemorate the former automobile showroom.

COMMENT NO. 10-9

Project design at street level is unacceptable: There is a shocking disconnect between the words in the Aesthetics section of the EIR and the renderings offered in the EIR. The renderings show a reflective glass tall fence along the sidewalk, in a location which is supposed to be inviting for shops and support pedestrian activities. The tall fence has no articulation, no expression of human scale, glass entrance doors indistinguishable from the glass curtain wall, etc. with a shiny reflective glass with no purpose on the dark
north façade at street level. The EIR states that the applicant wishes to eliminate the required street widening of Hollywood Boulevard in order to have a better pedestrian experience. What they show on their drawings in that area could not be worse. Every tenet of pedestrian-friendly, safe urban design is violated. Shiny reflective glass creates an unending barrier for the full Hollywood Boulevard frontage: no humans can see into shops, and anyone on the sidewalk has no sense of being seen or safe. Humans at the second floor balconies cannot provide “eyes on the street” - the barrier appears too high. The minimal basics of providing a place for retail signage have not been addressed. This kind of barrier is always the best candidate for graffiti and smash-and-grab attacks, and creates an atmosphere of fear and insecurity.

RESPONSE NO. 10-9

Although this comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR, an explanation of the rendering is provided to clarify the intent of the Project design.

With respect to the comment about the rendering, no “glass fence” is proposed as part of the Hollywood Boulevard frontage. Instead, the misidentified “glass fence” is the Hollywood Boulevard building frontage, which includes the ground floor entrances of five live-work shopkeeper units, with transparent glazing (i.e., windows) that are meant to invite visual access into the interiors of the units from pedestrians on the sidewalk and motorists on the street, as well as allow visual access to the streetfront from within the units, during the day and at night. The second levels of the shopkeeper units also feature tall expanses of transparent glazing, for additional two-way daytime and nighttime visual access. The glazing that the building design proposes was presented in Section 2.0, Project Description, and illustrated in Figures 2-9 and 2-11 (which have been updated and provided in Chapter 3.0 of this Final EIR, Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR, and were analyzed in Section 4.A, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR on page 4.A-54. Any potential glare impacts would be reduced with the use of anti-glare coating on the glazing.

Regarding pedestrian-friendly design, the Project is regulated by existing policies and plans that ensure adequate street activation. As discussed in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, certain features of the Hollywood Boulevard elevation of the Project building are governed by the need to comply with Specific Plan requirements for a minimum area of at-grade open space, which for the Project includes a building setback for the easternmost shopkeeper unit that could accommodate potential café seating (the Taft gateway); a pedestrian throughway between the street and alley south of the Project; expanses of transparent glazing along the Hollywood Boulevard ground-floor frontage to provide street-level interest, visual connection between tenants and passersby, and visual differentiation between the four shopkeeper units; and building height stepbacks at the second floor and 30 feet above grade, again to create visual interest for passersby.

In addition, the Project features upper-level balconies on the east portion of the façade overlooking Hollywood Boulevard. At the other (northwestern) end of the building, the East Hollywood gateway demarcating the building lobby entrance would also allow visual and physical access to the Project Site, with ground-level ornamental security fencing that would be secured only after hours. These elements, together with the pedestrian throughway passage along the Project’s eastern perimeter, are intended to enhance visual and physical access to the Project Site and enliven this stretch of Hollywood Boulevard.

Regarding the commenter’s opinion about the balconies, as stated on page 2-20 in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Vermont/Western Transit Oriented District Specific Plan governing
building design standards on the Project Site requires a 10-foot building height stepback from the sidewalk at the second level along the building’s Hollywood Boulevard frontage as well as a 15-foot stepback at a height of 30 feet above grade. The 10-foot second-level stepback, which is intended to contribute to articulation of the building elevation and a more inviting street-level pedestrian environment, determines the location of the balcony relative to the sidewalk. Building code requirements related to safety regulate balcony railing height at 42 inches above the finished floor. The balconies exceed the Specific Plan-required minimum size, to allow for the maximum amount of usable space and visual access to Hollywood Boulevard. Above the second level, the glass-fronted Taft gateway common open space balcony and the rooftop terraces are intended to further enliven the building frontage and pedestrian environment along Hollywood Boulevard.

While not presently defined in detail, on-site signage will be included in the Project, as noted on page 2-23 of Section 2.0, Project Description, which says, in part, that the "Project Site would include building identification, wayfinding, and security signage. On-site commercial signage would be similar to other existing streetfront commercial signage in the Project vicinity ...". As also stated on page 2-23, proposed lighting along the Hollywood Boulevard frontage, including lighting of pedestrian throughway, is intended to enhance pedestrian security and appeal.

Finally, the Hollywood Design Review committee has reviewed the Project and expressed support for the current design.

**COMMENT NO. 10-10**

5. Project fairly close to permitted size: This EIR discusses Land Use in terms of goals, but strangely omits quantification of allowed unit count and density in a clear tabulation. Hollywood Heritage finds this project roughly in keeping with its entitlements-- as long as the entitlements are for the unit count requested, not the 271 units mentioned somewhere in the EIR.

**RESPONSE NO. 10-10**

Contrary to the commenter’s assertion that the Draft EIR omits a quantification of the unit count and density, Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR contains a tabular summary of the proposed number of residential dwellings on Page 2-10, with narrative discussions of density provided on pages 2-9 and 2-19. The entitlements sought for the Project, as identified on page 2-24 of Section 2.0 likewise reflect the proposal for 161 dwelling units.

As discussed on page 2-19 of Section 2.0, the Project Site’s [Q] condition limits residential density to one residential dwelling (unit) per 400 square feet of lot area, and pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22.C.16, one-half of the adjacent alley may be included for purposes of calculating the allowable number of residential dwellings. Using this ratio, the lot area would permit the development of 119 “base” units on the Project Site. Pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22.A.25(c), the Project qualifies for a by-right density bonus of 35 percent over the otherwise allowable base density in exchange for designating 11 percent of the 119 base permitted units for Very Low Income households. The 35 percent density bonus results in a total of 161 dwelling units.

With respect to the commenter’s statement that the Draft EIR mentions 271 units, this appears to be an misinterpretation of the statement that a total of 271 vehicular parking spaces are proposed to accommodate future Project residents, guests, and shopkeeper employees and patrons, per Table 2-1 on
page 2-10 of the Project Description, and per the accompanying discussions of parking supply on pages 2-1, 2-9, and 2-22. The number 271 does not reflect the number of proposed dwelling units.

COMMENT NO. 10-11
We look forward to our continued dialogue; and truly commend the '5750 Hollywood Boulevard Project Team’s committed responsiveness and inclusion of Hollywood Heritage in the evolution of their Project.

RESPONSE NO. 10-11
The comment again acknowledges the Applicant’s engagement in outreach to Hollywood Heritage, but does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR. This comment is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.

COMMENT NO. 10-12
About Hollywood Heritage, Inc.

For three decades Hollywood Heritage has, through advocacy and hands-on preservation, informed and educated the public about how the built environment contributed to making Hollywood the entertainment capital of the world. These efforts have resulted in the rehabilitation of significant landmarks and the creation of historic districts within the community. We support the goal of preserving what is most significant in Hollywood, while encouraging responsible new infill development. Our organization has nominated many of the current Historic Cultural Monuments, listed the Hollywood Boulevard Commercial and Entertainment District in the National Register of Historic Places at the National level of significance and provided technical assistance to owners and developers in preserving, restoring or repurposing significant properties.

RESPONSE NO. 10-12
The comment is an introduction to Hollywood Heritage, Inc. and its mission statement. However, as this comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.
LETTER NO. 11

Jim Van Dusen
Chair
Planning, Land Use & Management Committee

Susan Swan
President
Planning, Land Use & Management Committee

Hollywood United Neighborhood Council
Certified Council #52
P.O. Box 3272 Los Angeles, CA 90078
www.HollywoodUnitedNC.org
HUNCoffice@gmail.com

COMMENT NO. 11-1

The Hollywood United Neighborhood Council reviewed the following project at its regularly scheduled Board meeting on November 16th, 2015. We found that it fits in well with the development plan for the area and has ample parking provided. The Board also commented positively on the preservation of elements of the former auto showroom in the project.

RESPONSE NO. 11-1

Although this comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR, the comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.

COMMENT NO. 11-2

5750 Hollywood Boulevard, LLC: a mixed-use project on an approximately 1.10-acre site at the gateway to East Hollywood. The project includes 161 residences, both market-rate and affordable units in a variety of configurations and sizes, as well as live/work lofts that feature ground-level commercial space fronting Hollywood Boulevard. Enclosed within seven stories and oriented around a central courtyard and a publicly-accessible plaza, the maximum project floor area is approximately 172,800 square feet. Structured, code-required parking is provided for all on-site uses, with 271 automobile parking spaces and 96 bicycle parking spaces within two subterranean levels and an at-grade level enclosed by the building. Vehicle access to the project is provided via a single driveway on Hollywood Boulevard at the eastern end of the project site.

RESPONSE NO. 11-2

The comment provides a summary of the Project description as provided by the Draft EIR. However, as this comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.
LETTER NO. 12

Heather Carmichael, LCSW
Executive Director
My Friend’s Place
P.O. Box 3867 Hollywood, CA 90078
(323) 903-0011
www.myfriendsplace.org

COMMENT NO. 12-1
On behalf of My Friend’s Place, I would like to acknowledge that we have been engaged on the above referenced project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. Located across the street from our facility at 5850 Hollywood Boulevard, we are optimistic that replacing the vacant pool hall at this location with the proposed mixed-use building with units reserved for very low income residents will be an improvement to our community.

RESPONSE NO. 12-1
The comment acknowledges the Project team’s cooperation with My Friend’s Place. Although this comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR, this comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.

COMMENT NO. 12-2
My Friend’s Place is a professionally staffed drop-in Resource Center serving over 1,700 homeless youth ages 12 to 25 and their children each year. Our primary goal is to lower traditional barriers to service and provide homeless youth with the opportunity to improve their psychological, intellectual and physical capacity to reach their potential. We are glad to have the 5750 Hollywood project team as local partners in this effort.

RESPONSE NO. 12-2
The comment provides an introduction to My Friend’s Place and their mission statement. However, as this comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

COMMENT NO. 12-3
We are pleased the applicant team has directly engaged My Friend’s Place and our neighbors and hope this is the beginning of a partnership to holistically address issues impacting all members of our community. We look forward to finding new ways to work together for the benefit of all residents. This project will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities.

RESPONSE NO. 12-3
The commenter provides a summary of the comments provided in this letter and does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR. Responses to these comments are provided in Responses to Comments 12-1 and 12-2, above.
LETTER NO. 13

Joyce Dillard  
P.O. Box 31377  
Los Angeles, CA 90031

COMMENT NO. 13-1  

This appears to be designed for the tourism industry with potential short-term rentals or airbnb-type units. Analysis should be made for transient occupancy and the related stress on infrastructure including economic analysis.

RESPONSE NO. 13-1  

As noted in Section 2.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Project is proposed as a mixed-use commercial and multi-family residential apartment project. Contrary to the commenter’s assertion, there is no reason to believe that the Project will offer transient occupancy of any kind; therefore, such additional analysis is unnecessary. In addition, the commenter does not provide any specific reference to infrastructure; notwithstanding, the capacity of the water infrastructure is analyzed in the Utilities and Service Systems section of this Project’s Initial Study. Finally, an economic analysis is not required per CEQA.

COMMENT NO. 13-2  

We see no justification in density. We see no analysis of needed infrastructure versus current aging infrastructure.

RESPONSE NO. 13-2  

Contrary to the commenter’s assertion, an explanation of the requested density is provided in the Draft EIR. As stated in Response No. 10-10, and as discussed on page 2-19 of Section 2.0, the Project Site’s [Q] condition limits residential density to one residential dwelling (unit) per 400 square feet of lot area, and pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22.C.16, one-half of the adjacent alley may be included for purposes of calculating the allowable number of residential dwellings. Using this ratio, the lot area would permit the development of 119 “base” units on the Project Site. The Project qualifies for a by-right residential density bonus of 35 percent over the otherwise allowable maximum density of the Q-R5 zone in exchange for designating 11 percent (14) of the 119 base permitted units for Very Low Income households. LAMC Section 12.22.A.25(f) provides a Menu of Incentives available to residential projects that include affordable housing, and one of the requested incentives is an allowable FAR increase equivalent to the percentage of the density bonus for which the Project is eligible, or 35 percent. This incentive, together with the requested building height increase incentive, is requested to accommodate the affordable residential dwellings while maintaining an acceptable average residential dwelling size, consistent with the Specific Plan.

With regard to the analysis of needed infrastructure, the evaluation of wastewater and water supply were evaluated in the Project’s Initial Study, which is included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. In the discussion under Section XVII, Utilities and Service Systems, existing infrastructure was considered adequate to serve the needs of the Project. The Project would not generate sewer flows that would exceed established wastewater treatment requirements, and adequate wastewater and water conveyance capacity have been preliminarily confirmed and will be finalized prior to connection by the City of Los Angeles Bureau of
Sanitation and the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, respectively. As a result, potential impacts regarding infrastructure were determined to be less than significant, and no discussion of these topics was required in the EIR.

**COMMENT NO. 13-3**

The alternatives are not sufficient.

**RESPONSE NO. 13-3**

The comment does not provide a specific comment on the adequacy of the alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR. Notwithstanding, the commenter referred to Section 5.0, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, which describes the requirements for the evaluation of Project alternatives. In addition to the required No Project Alternative, two additional alternatives were evaluated in detail, in order to avoid or reduce potentially significant Project impacts, all of which are limited to Project construction, not long-term operations, as is common with infill projects in established urban neighborhoods. A number of other alternatives that were considered and rejected due to their infeasibility and are discussed in the beginning of Section 5.0. The discussion of alternatives is therefore fully compliant with CEQA.

**COMMENT NO. 13-4**

Watershed issues included the LA MS4 Separate Storm Sewer permit is not discussed as to the satisfaction of the EWMPS Enhanced Watershed Management Plans.

**RESPONSE NO. 13-4**

Contrary to the comment's claim that there is no discussion of storm water management, please refer to Appendix A, Initial Study, of the Draft EIR, and the discussion under Section IX, Hydrology and Water Quality. As that section detailed, the Applicant would be required to meet the provisions of the Project-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan in accordance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit, which would be subject to review by the City for compliance with the City of Los Angeles’ Best Management Practices Handbook, Part A, Construction Activities. The Applicant would also comply with the City of Los Angeles Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan, which would also comply with the City’s Low Impact Development Ordinance. Additional Best Management Practices, including a Wet Weather Erosion Control Plan would be implemented. Compliance with these measures would ensure that potential impacts regarding Hydrology and Water Quality would be less than significant, and no discussion of these topics was required in the EIR.
LETTER NO. 14

Messiah Jacobs  
http://www.messiahjacobs.com  
(323) 804-4510  
mjjua@yahoo.com

COMMENT NO. 14-1  
I write this letter as a resident on Taft Avenue. I have concerns about the building to be built on Hollywood Blvd. It appears that the garage exit for the building will be onto Hollywood Blvd right at the intersection of Hollywood and Taft. If you know anything about this area, I believe this will create a traffic nuisance on one of the major corridors through Hollywood. It is already difficult to turn left off of Hollywood onto Taft, as there is no traffic light. And if you have a garage exit going right on there, I feel you will cause a traffic jam. It is also where the northbound and southbound 101 and Hollywood Blvd all intersect, along with a fire station! I believe the exit for the garage should be in the back alley - same as the building next to it. If this is not possible, the garage exit should be located elsewhere.

List of solutions:

- A traffic signal on Taft and Hollywood.
- A must-turn-right sign out of the new garage.
- Have dual exits: one off Hollywood and one off the alley.

RESPONSE NO. 14-1  
The Draft EIR addressed traffic in Section 4.G, Transportation and Traffic, with supporting data provided in the Traffic Study contained in Appendix G of the Draft EIR. As described in Chapter 9, Site Access and Internal Circulation, vehicular access to the Project would be provided via a single driveway on Hollywood Boulevard, aligning with Taft Avenue to the north. The driveway would provide limited access, accommodating right-turn only ingress and egress traffic movements to the parking garage per the commenter’s suggestion. This limitation will eliminate left-turns to and from Hollywood Boulevard from the Project site and minimize potential conflicts. In acknowledgment of comments received during the public scoping process concerning the possible increase in congestion due to the alignment of the Project driveway, analysis of the unsignalized intersection of Taft Avenue & Hollywood Boulevard was prepared as detailed in Chapter 7, Signal Warrant Analysis, of the Traffic Study, including an evaluation of the potential for installation of a traffic signal at the intersection. As detailed on pg. 4.G-29 in Section 4.G, Transportation and Traffic, of the Draft EIR, as well as in Chapter 7 of the Traffic Study, the installation of traffic signal was not warranted under either Existing with Project or Future with Project conditions. The traffic volume on the minor road (i.e., Taft Avenue or the Project driveway) would not meet the minimum volume thresholds that indicate a signal would be necessary. In addition, the intersection of Taft Avenue & Hollywood Boulevard is located within 300 feet of the signalized intersections of Hollywood Freeway Northbound Ramps & Hollywood Boulevard and Wilton Avenue & Hollywood Boulevard. The traffic signals at these intersections provide sufficient gaps in traffic for vehicles attempting to turn from Taft Avenue or Hollywood Boulevard to complete the turning movements.
The opinions expressed in the comment related to the locations of the exit in the back alley or elsewhere are noted and will be forwarded to the decision-makers.

**COMMENT NO. 14-2**

Please take this letter into consideration as planning for this building moves forward.

**RESPONSE NO. 14-2**

This comment is noted and will be forwarded to the decision-makers.

**COMMENT NO. 14-3**

Also, consider sending out an inspector to determine if they draw the same conclusion.

**RESPONSE NO. 14-3**

This comment is noted and will be forwarded to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 16

Angelo N—[Surname illegible]
1817 Taft Ave. Apt. 3
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 16-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 16-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 17

Grigor Garsevanian
1845 N. Van Ness Ave. #7
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 17-1
I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 17-1
The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 18

Anna Babayan
1845 N. Van Ness Ave. #7
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 18-1
I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project's shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 18-1
The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 19

Armine Garsevanian
1845 N. Van Ness Ave. #7
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 19-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 19-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 20

D.A. Jones
1825 N. Wilton
Los Angeles, CA 90025

COMMENT NO. 20-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 20-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 21

Michelle M. Perdue  
1733 Wilton Place  
Los Angeles, CA 90027

COMMENT NO. 21-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 21-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 22

Robert Arteaga
1733 Wilton Place
Los Angeles, CA 90027

COMMENT NO. 22-1
I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project's shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 22-1
The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 23

Houhannes Agvazyan
1733 Wilton Place #10
Los Angeles, CA 90027

COMMENT NO. 23-1
I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project's shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 23-1
The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 24

Kaapet Jerejian
1806 N. Wilton Apt. 8
Los Angeles, CA 90027

COMMENT NO. 24-1
I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 24-1
The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 25

Misar Blueyan
1745 Wilton Place Apt. 5
Los Angeles, CA 90027

COMMENT NO. 25-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 25-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 26

Arsen Atshemyan
1802 N. Wilton Place Apt. 7
Los Angeles, CA 90027

COMMENT NO. 26-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 26-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 27

Manik Pirumyan  
1802 N. Wilton Place Apt. 7  
Los Angeles, CA 90027  

COMMENT NO. 27-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project's shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 27-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 28

Juanita Alvarez
1745 N. Wilton Place #3
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 28-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 28-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 29

Marine Hakobyan
1806 N. Wilton Place # 2
Hollywood, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 29-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project's shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 29-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 30

Flora Aydinyan
1802 N. Wilton Place #7
Hollywood, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 30-1
I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project's shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 30-1
The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 31

Mary Boules
1812 N. Wilton Place #2
Hollywood, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 31-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 31-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 32

Rima Horhannesyan
1812 N. Wilton Place #?
Hollywood, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 32-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 32-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 33

Zaren Karapetyan
1812 N. Wilton Place #?
Hollywood, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 33-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project's shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 33-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 34

Kayren Burke
1755 N. Wilton Place
Hollywood, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 34-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project's shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 34-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 35

Danielle Deltardt
1719 N. Wilton Place #22
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 35-1
I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 35-1
The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 36

Juliana Ossa
1724 N. Wilton Place
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 36-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project's shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 36-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 37

Emmanual Romera
1722 N. Wilton Place
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 37-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 37-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 38

Leonard Ullrich
1733 N. Wilton Place
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 38-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 38-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 39

Michele Rozell
1733 N. Wilton Place
Los Angeles, CA 90027

COMMENT NO. 39-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 39-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 40

Mher Tormasyan  
1844 N. Taft Ave. #11  
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 40-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project's shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 40-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 41

Lusine Tormasyan
1844 N. Taft Ave. #11
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 41-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 41-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 42

Anait Adzhemyan  
1844 N. Taft Ave. #9  
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 42-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 42-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 43

Marine Adzhemyan
1844 N. Taft Ave. #9
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 43-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project's shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 43-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 44

Mariam Babityan  
1836 N. Gramercy Place #5  
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 44-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 44-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 45

Sargis Berberyan
1806 N. Wilton Place #1
Hollywood, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 45-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 45-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 46

Oganes Berberyian
1806 N. Wilton Place #1
Hollywood, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 46-1
I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project's shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 46-1
The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 47

Gagik Hovmanolsyan
1719 N. Wilton Place Apt [Not provided]
Hollywood, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 47-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project's shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 47-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 48

Semagyul Berberyyan  
1806 N. Wilton Place #1  
Hollywood, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 48-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 48-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 49

Asatur Kocharyan  
1802 N. Wilton Place #1  
Hollywood, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 49-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 49-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 50

Chris Dollinger
1803 N. Gramercy #14
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 50-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 50-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 51

Debbie Choxan
1801 N. Gramercy Place #1
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 51-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 51-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 52

Aaron Batts
1801 N. Gramercy Place #4
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 52-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 52-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 53

Kelsi McKeown
1801 N. Gramercy Place #9
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 53-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project's shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 53-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 54

Anthony Campos
1803 N. Gramercy Place Apt # 1
Hollywood, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 54-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 54-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 55

Wilfredo Sanchez
1724 N. Gramercy Place
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 55-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 55-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 56

Quinta A. Avila  
1720 N. Gramercy Apt. 1  
Hollywood, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 56-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 56-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 57

Mary T. Avila
1720 N. Gramercy Apt. 1
Hollywood, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 57-1
I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 57-1
The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 58

Sergey Zaikin
1740 Taft Ave. #? [Not provided]
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 58-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 58-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 59

Boris Akunts  
1740 Taft Ave. #7  
Los Angeles, CA 90028

COMMENT NO. 59-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project's shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 59-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 60

Marco Bodaraco  
2426 W. Berkeley Ave.  
Los Angeles, CA 90026

COMMENT NO. 60-1

I am a longtime East Hollywood resident and am writing in support of the project at 5750 Hollywood Boulevard. This beautifully designed building will be a terrific addition to our community. It will bring a currently dormant and disconnected section of the Boulevard back to life and make it a highlight of our neighborhood.

I am glad that 5750 Hollywood is strongly connected to our community. I am very supportive of the 5750 Hollywood project and the much-needed 14 units of on-site very low income housing it will bring. The project’s shopkeeper lofts are unique and new street-level retail space will provide a much better experience for everyone walking on Hollywood Boulevard than what is there today.

The 5750 Hollywood project represents the best kind of investment in the future of our neighborhood. It is sustainable, compatible with plans for the Hollywood Central Park and will be an iconic gateway to East Hollywood. It will make our community cleaner and safer, while strengthening the local economy and creating new housing opportunities for working people.

I offer my endorsement of 5750 Hollywood and request that you approve this project application.

RESPONSE NO. 60-1

The comment in support of the Project is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.
LETTER NO. 61

Scott Morgan, Director
State of California
Governor’s Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit
1400 Tenth Street
P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

COMMENT NO. 61-1
The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on December 7, 2015, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project's ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

"A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

RESPONSE NO. 61-1
The comment acknowledges receipt of the Draft EIR. However, as this comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR, no further response is warranted.

COMMENT NO. 61-2

RESPONSE NO. 61-2
A copy of this attachment to Letter No. 61 is provided in Appendix A, Original Comment Letters, of this Final EIR.
COMMENT NO. 61-3
Duplicate of Letter 1 – State of California Department of Transportation

RESPONSE NO. 61-3
Please see the Responses to Comments 1-1 through 1-9 (Diana Watson Letter 1).
LETTER NO. 62

Joseph Ontiveros  
Cultural Resource Director  
Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians  
P.O. Box 487  
San Jacinto, CA 92581

COMMENT NO. 62-1

The Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians appreciates your observance of Tribal Cultural Resources and their preservation in your project. The information provided to us on said project(s) has been assessed through our Cultural Resource Department, where it was concluded that although it is outside the existing reservation, the project area does fall within the bounds of our Tribal Traditional Use Areas. At this time the Soboba Band does not have any specific concerns regarding known cultural resources in the specified areas that the project encompasses, but does request that the appropriate consultation continue to take place between the tribes, project proponents, and government agencies.

RESPONSE NO. 62-1

The comment acknowledges the receipt of the Draft EIR through their Cultural Resource department. This comment does not raise a substantive issue concerning the content of the Draft EIR; therefore, this comment is noted and will be provided to the decision-makers.

COMMENT NO. 62-2

Also, working in and around traditional use areas intensifies the possibility of encountering cultural resources during any future construction/excavation phases that may take place. For this reason the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians requests that approved Native American Monitor(s) be present during any future ground disturbing proceedings, including surveys and archaeological testing, associated with this project. The Soboba Band wishes to defer to Gabrieleño Tribal Consultants, who are closer to the project area. Please feel free to contact me with any additional questions or concerns.

RESPONSE NO. 62-2

Comprehensive outreach to Native American tribes was undertaken at the time of Draft EIR circulation. Potential Project impacts on Native American resources were addressed in the Initial Study, provided in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. Regulatory Compliance Measure IS-7 in Section V, Cultural Resources, of Attachment B: Explanation of Checklist Determinations of the Initial Study requires that if human remains are discovered at the Project Site during construction, work at the specific construction site shall be suspended, the City of Los Angeles Public Works Department and County coroner shall be immediately notified, and if the remains are determined by the County coroner to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be notified within 24 hours, and Native American Heritage Commission guidelines shall be implemented in the treatment and disposition of the remains. The Applicant is required to implement this measure.
LETTER NO. 63

Dianna Watson  
Branch Chief  
Community Planning & LD / IGR Review  
Department of Transportation  
100 S. Main Street, MS 16  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
(213) 897-9140  
www.dot.ca.gov

COMMENT NO. 63-1

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above referenced project. The project would redevelop the properties at 5732 to 5766 Hollywood Boulevard and construct 161 apartment units and 6,000 square feet of ground floor commercial uses. The existing commercial buildings on site have been vacant for over two years.

The project is estimated to generate a net increase of 1,180 daily trips, 88 trips in the a.m. peak hour, and 106 trips in the p.m. peak hour. At the time of the preparation of the traffic study, there are 64 related projects in the project vicinity. Currently, there are more than 70 related projects [sic] in the Hollywood community.

Caltrans is aware that addressing cumulative traffic impacts on the State highway system is challenging. In the spirit of mutual cooperation, Caltrans would like to partner with the City to evaluate cumulative traffic impacts, identify potential improvements, and establish a funding mechanism to mitigate cumulative transportation impacts from future development on the regional highway network.

On Caltrans [sic] NOP letter dated February 26, 2015, we request [sic] a study location at US-101 off-ramp at N Wilton Pl. and Harold Way. Traffic study did not include this location.

The project Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was prepared on 7/9/14. However, the traffic study 2012 freeway data was used per Table 10 CMP Freeway Segment Analysis Existing With Project Operating Conditions (page 63 of Traffic Study) and per Table 4 Freeway Segment Screening Process Existing Operating Conditions (Year 2014) with ambient growth of one percent. The 2014 Traffic volume or data should be used since the MOU is [sic] prepared in 2014. In this area, the US-101 freeway is operating at LOSE/F. When calculating LOS using traffic volume, the results need to match with the existing driver experience. When the traffic speed is low due to freeway traffic congestion, traffic volume is low; therefore, LOS should be based on speed, not volume.

For Table 5, Freeway Off-Ramp Screening Process Existing Operating Conditions (Year 2014), the traffic study uses 1,500 vehicles as off-ramp capacity. For off-ramp screening, the 1,500 vehicle/hour/lane that is referenced in section 3.1 of the October 2013 agreement with the City of Los Angeles is based on the free-flow speed without any traffic controls, per the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). However, the capacity for interrupted flow such as signal or stop controlled ramp is reduced. As analysis is needed to determine
appropriate ramp capacity since the level of service is based on the ramp capacity. Once the true ramp capacity is determined, screening criteria as per agreement will be applied.

On page 44 of the traffic study, there is only inbound traffic. There is no outbound traffic disclosed. Location #4 (US 101 SB Ramp Hollywood Blvd) and Location #5 (US 101 NB Ramps/Van Ness Avenue & Hollywood Blvd.) Project-Only traffic volume is not consistent between those two locations. In location #5, please justify left-turn lane volume 3(2) trips to on-ramp/Van Ness as the in-bound traffic is not going toward the project site. Cumulative traffic impact may occur at Location #4 and #5. The lead agency should consider proposing feasible traffic improvements at both location. Additional lane [sic] at both off-ramps may be needed.

Storm water run-off is a sensitive issue for Los Angeles and Ventura counties. Please be mindful that projects should be designed to discharge clean run-off water. Additionally, discharge of storm water run-off is not permitted onto State highway facilities without any storm water management plan.

Transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials, which requires the use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways, will require a transportation permit from Caltrans. It is recommended that large size truck trips be limited to off-peak commute periods.

Caltrans would like to work with the City in an effort to evaluate traffic impacts, identify potential improvements, and establish a funding mechanism that helps mitigate cumulative transportation impacts in the Hollywood area.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Alan Lin the project coordinator at (213) 897-8391 and refer to IGR/CEQA No. 151052AL-DEIR.

**RESPONSE NO. 63-1**

Please see the Responses to Comments 1-1 through 1-9 (Letter No. 1).
LETTER NO. 64

Dianna Watson  
Branch Chief  
Community Planning & LD / IGR Review  
Department of Transportation  
100 S. Main Street, MS 16  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
(213) 897-9140  
www.dot.ca.gov

COMMENT NO. 64-1

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above referenced project. The project would redevelop the properties at 5732 to 5766 Hollywood Boulevard and construct 161 apartment units and 6,000 square feet of ground floor commercial uses. The existing commercial buildings on site have been vacant for over two years.

The project is estimated to generate a net increase of 1,180 daily trips, 88 trips in the a.m. peak hour, and 106 trips in the p.m. peak hour. At the time of the preparation of the traffic study, there are 64 related projects in the project vicinity. Currently, there are more than 70 related project in the Hollywood community.

Caltrans is aware that addressing cumulative traffic impacts on the State highway system is challenging. In the spirit of mutual cooperation, Caltrans would like to partner with the City to evaluate cumulative traffic impacts, identify potential improvements, and establish a funding mechanism to mitigate cumulative transportation impacts from future development on the regional highway network.

On Caltrans [sic] NOP letter dated February 26, 2015, we request [sic] a study location at US-101 off-ramp at N Wilton Pl. and Harold Way. Traffic study did not include this location.

The project Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was prepared on 7/9/14. However, the traffic study 2012 freeway data was used per Table 10 CMP Freeway Segment Analysis Existing With Project Operating Conditions (page 63 of Traffic Study) and per Table 4 Freeway Segment Screening Process Existing Operating Conditions (Year 2014) with ambient growth of one percent. The 2014 Traffic volume or data should be used since the MOU is [sic] prepared in 2014. In this area, the US-101 freeway is operating at LOSE/F. When calculating LOS using traffic volume, the results need to match with the existing driver experience. When the traffic speed is low due to freeway traffic congestion, traffic volume is low; therefore, LOS should be based on speed, not volume.

For Table 5, Freeway Off-Ramp Screening Process Existing Operating Conditions (Year 2014), the traffic study uses 1,500 vehicles as off-ramp capacity. For off-ramp screening, the 1,500 vehicle/hour/lane that is referenced in section 3.1 of the October 2013 agreement with the City of Los Angeles is based on the free-flow speed without any traffic controls, per the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). However, the capacity for interrupted flow such as signal or stop controlled ramp is reduced. As analysis is needed to determine
appropriate ramp capacity since the level of service is based on the ramp capacity. Once the true ramp capacity is determined, screening criteria as per agreement will be applied.

On page 44 of the traffic study, there is only inbound traffic. There is no outbound traffic disclosed. Location #4 (US 101 SB Ramp Hollywood Blvd) and Location #5 (US 101 NB Ramps/Van Ness Avenue & Hollywood Blvd.) Project-Only traffic volume is not consistent between those two locations. In location #5, please justify left-turn lane volume 3(2) trips to on-ramp/Van Ness as the in-bound traffic is not going toward the project site. Cumulative traffic impact may occur at Location #4 and #5. The lead agency should consider proposing feasible traffic improvements at both location. Additional lane [sic] at both off-ramps may be needed.

Storm water run-off is a sensitive issue for Los Angeles and Ventura counties. Please be mindful that projects should be designed to discharge clean run-off water. Additionally, discharge of storm water run-off is not permitted onto State highway facilities without any storm water management plan.

Transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials, which requires the use of oversize-transport vehicles on State highways, will require a transportation permit from Caltrans. It is recommended that large size truck trips be limited to off-peak commute periods.

Caltrans would like to work with the City in an effort to evaluate traffic impacts, identify potential improvements, and establish a funding mechanism that helps mitigate cumulative transportation impacts in the Hollywood area.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Alan Lin the project coordinator at (213) 897-8391 and refer to IGR/CEQA No. 151052AL-DEIR.

**RESPONSE NO. 64-1**
Please see the Responses to Comments 1-1 through 1-9 (Diana Watson Letter 1).