

6400 Sunset Boulevard Project

Sustainable Communities Project CEQA Exemption

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY—PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE (PRC) § 21155		
PRC § 21155(a). Consistency with the general use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in a sustainable communities strategy.	Consistent?	
	Yes	No
<p>The Project would develop a 26-story (25 occupiable floors and one mechanical floor) mixed-use building on a 0.89-acre infill Project Site located in a highly urbanized part of the Hollywood Community Plan Area of the City of Los Angeles. The Project Site is comprised of a Northern Lot and a Southern Lot. The Northern Lot is currently occupied by the two-story Amoeba Music store. The Southern Lot is located 150 feet south of the Northern Lot and is comprised of a surface parking lot that contains 21 surface parking spaces for the Amoeba Music store. All Project construction would occur on the Northern Lot. No excavation or construction would occur on the Southern Lot, which would remain as a surface parking lot to provide parking for the Project. The proposed building would consist of up to 200 residential units with 5 percent reserved for Very Low Income Households, and 7,000 square feet of commercial uses. Adjacent land uses are a mix of low-, mid-, and high-rise buildings containing commercial, office, retail, entertainment, and institutional uses. The Project Site is accessible by regional and local transit, and the Project would provide bicycle and vehicle parking on-site. The Project Site's land use designation in the City of Los Angeles (City) General Plan is Regional Center Commercial (see Attachment A for the General Plan Land Use Map of the Project Site and area). The proposed uses are consistent with the Regional Center Commercial land use designation, which permits commercial and residential land uses.</p> <p>The Project is consistent with the general land use designation, density, and building intensity in the Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 RTP/SCS). Using data collected from local jurisdictions, including general plans, SCAG categorized existing land use into land use types, then combined the land use types into 35 place types, and then classified sub-regions into one of three land use development categories: urban, compact, or standard. SCAG used each of these categories to describe the conditions that exist and/or are likely to exist within each specific area of the region. (SCAG, 2016 RTP/SCS, p. 20-21.)</p> <p>Based on Exhibit 5 and Exhibit 6 of SCAG's SCS Background Documentation, the Project Site and surrounding area are within the "Urban" Land Development Category (SCAG, 2016 RTP/SCS Appendix: SCS Background Documentation, p. 10-11). The 2016 RTP/SCS provides the following definition for the "Urban" Land Development Category:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>These areas are often found within and directly adjacent to moderate and high density urban centers. Nearly all urban growth in these areas would be considered infill or redevelopment. The majority of housing is multi-family and attached single-family (townhome), which tend to consume less water and energy than the larger types found in greater proportion in less urban locations. These areas are</i></p>	<p>X</p>	

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY—PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE (PRC) § 21155

supported by high levels of regional and local transit service. They have well-connected street networks, and the mix and intensity of uses result in a highly walkable environment. These areas offer enhanced access and connectivity for people who choose not to drive or do not have access to a vehicle. (SCAG, 2016 RTP/SCS, p. 20.)

Within the “Urban” Land Development Category, there are various urban footprint place types, including mixed use, residential, commercial, office, research and development, industrial, civic and open space (SCAG, 2016 RTP/SCS Appendix: SCS Background Documentation, p. 90, “Place Types Categorized into Land Development Categories (LDCs)”; SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS Appendix: SCS Background Documentation, p. 90, “Urban Footprint—Place Types Summary,” pp. 1–2). The Project is consistent with the Urban Mixed Use and Urban Residential place types within the “Urban” Land Development Category. Each category is briefly described and a Project summary illustrating general consistency with these categories is provided below.

- Urban Mixed Use districts are exemplified by a variety of intense uses and building types. Typical buildings are between 10 and 40+ stories tall, with offices and/or residential uses and ground-floor retail space. Parking is usually structured below or aboveground. Workers, residents, and visitors are well-served by transit, and can walk or bicycle for many of their transportation needs. The typical land use mix for this place type is approximately 18 percent residential, 16 percent employment, 45 percent mixed use, and 21 percent open space/civic. The residential mix is 100 percent multi-family. The average total net Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is 9.0 and the gross density ranges from 40 to 500+ households per acre (SCAG, 2016 RTP/SCS Appendix: SCS Background Documentation, p. 90, “Urban Footprint—Place Types Summary.” p. 1).
- Urban Residential place types are typically found within or adjacent to major downtowns. They include high- and mid-rise residential towers, with some ground-floor retail space. Parking is usually structured below or aboveground. Residents are well-served by transit, and can walk or bicycle for many of their daily needs. The land use mix for this place type is typically approximately 64 percent residential, 4 percent employment, 12 percent mixed use, and 21 percent open space/civic. The residential mix is 100 percent multi-family. The average total net FAR is 9.0 and the gross density ranges from 75- to 500+ households per acre (SCAG, 2016 RTP/SCS Appendix: SCS Background Documentation, p. 90, “Urban Footprint—Place Types Summary.” p. 1).

As described above, the Project proposes to construct a 26-story mixed-use building of 200 residential units and 7,000 square feet of commercial uses with two subterranean parking levels on a site that is currently occupied by a two-story commercial building. Adjacent land uses are a mix of low-, mid-, and high-rise buildings containing commercial, office, retail, entertainment, and institutional uses. The Project Site is accessible by regional and local transit (i.e., Metro Red Line, Metro Local Route 2 and 210, Metro Limited Route 302) and the Project would provide 180 bicycle parking spaces and 285 vehicle parking spaces on-site. The Project is approximately 97 percent residential and the residential mix is 100 percent multi-family. The

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY—PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE (PRC) § 21155

maximum FAR is 6:1 with an average density per acre of 225 household units per acre. In addition, as described in further detail below, the Project would be at least 15 percent more energy efficient than Title 24 standards. The Project building and landscaping are also designed to achieve 25 percent less water usage than the average household in the region. Thus, the Project is consistent with the SCAG “Urban” Land Use Designation, as well as the associated density and building intensity assumptions in the SCAG’s 2016 RTP/SCS. Furthermore, the Project is consistent with the applicable goals and policies in the 2016 RTP/SCS, as outlined in Attachment B. As such, the Project is consistent with this criterion.

PRC §21155(b). To be considered a Transit Priority Project (TPP) as defined by §21155(b), the project must meet all of the following criteria. A TPP shall:

Consistent?	
Yes	No

(1) Contain at least 50 percent residential use, based on total building square footage and, if the project contains between 26 percent and 50 percent nonresidential uses, a floor area ratio of not less than 0.75;

X	
----------	--

The Project would construct a mixed-use residential and commercial building with a total floor area of 231,836 square feet that will consist of approximately 7,000 square feet of commercial uses, and 200 residential units totaling 224,836 square feet. Therefore, the Project contains approximately 97 percent residential use (224,836 square feet ÷ 231,836 square feet = 0.97 x 100 = 97%) and less than 26 percent nonresidential uses (7,000 square feet ÷ 231,836 square feet = 0.03 x 100 = 3%). As such, the Project is consistent with part (1) of this criterion.

(2) Provide a minimum net density of at least 20 dwelling units per acre; and

X	
----------	--

The Project will develop a 0.89-acre site with a mixed-use residential and commercial building that includes up to 200 residential units. The net housing density for the Project is approximately 225 dwelling units per acre (200 units/0.89 acre), which is more than the required minimum of 20 units per acre. Thus, the Project is consistent with part (2) of this criterion.

(3) Be within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor included in a regional transportation plan. A major transit stop is as defined in Section 21064.3, except that, for purposes of this section, it also includes major transit stops that are included in the applicable regional transportation plan. For purposes of this section, a high-quality transit corridor means a corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours. A project shall be considered to be within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor if all parcels within the project have no more than 25 percent of their area further than one-half mile from the stop or corridor and if not more than 10 percent of the residential units or 100 units, whichever is less, in the project are farther than one-half mile from the stop or corridor.

X	
----------	--

The applicable regional transportation plan is the SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS. PRC Section 21064.3 defines a major transit stop as “a site containing an existing rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.”

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY—PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE (PRC) § 21155

All parcels within the Project Site are located within one-half mile of an existing major transit stop and an existing high quality transit corridor, as shown in the SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS. An existing rail station, the Metro Red Line Hollywood/Vine Station, is considered a major transit stop as defined in Section 21064.3 above and is located approximately 0.3 mile northeast of the Project Site. The intersection of Sunset Boulevard and Vine Street, which is approximately 0.13 mile east of the Project Site, is also considered a major transit stop where Metro Local Line 2, Metro Local Line 210, and Metro Limited Line 302 intersect (Attachment C: Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc. [Gibson], Transportation Impact Study for the 6400 Sunset Boulevard Mixed-Use Development [Traffic Study], p. 18-20 and Figure 3 on p. 25). These bus lines have frequency of service intervals of 15 minutes or less during peak commute periods (Attachment C: Gibson, Traffic Study, p. 18-20).

The Project is also located within one-half mile of a high-quality transit corridor with bus service intervals of 15 minutes or less during peak commute hours. There are 12 bus lines that operate in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site (Attachment C: Gibson, Traffic Study, p. 18-20). Sunset Boulevard is considered a high quality transit corridor since it has fixed route bus service provided by Metro Local Line 2 and Metro Limited Line 302 (Attachment C: Gibson, Traffic Study, p. 18-20 and Figure 3 on p. 25). Furthermore, the Project Site is in an area identified a High Quality Transit Area by SCAG (SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS Exhibit 5.1, High Quality Transit Areas in the SCAG Region for 2040 Plan). Thus, the Project is consistent with part (3) of this criterion.

PRC §21155.1(a). The transit priority project complies with all of the following environmental criteria:

Consistent?	
Yes	No

(1) The transit priority project and other projects approved prior to the approval of the transit priority project but not yet built can be adequately served by existing utilities, and the transit priority project applicant has paid, or has committed to pay, all applicable in-lieu or development fees.

X	
----------	--

The immediate vicinity of the Project Site is fully built out and there is no other transit priority project that has been approved but not built. The Project Site is currently developed with a retail building (Amoeba Music store) on the Northern Lot and associated surface parking lot on the Southern Lot, which are both in operation. The Project Site is currently served by existing utilities, including water mains, sewer lines, and storm drain inlets maintained by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) and the City’s Department of Public Works (Bureau of Sanitation). The Project would connect to the existing utility structures, as explained in detail below.

Based on the 6400 Sunset Wastewater and Water Utility Infrastructure Technical Report (Utility Report), prepared by KPFF Consulting Engineers (KPFF), dated August 2018, there is an 8-inch water main in Sunset Boulevard, an 8-inch water main in Ivar Avenue, and a 12-inch water main in Cahuenga Boulevard (Attachment D: KPFF, Utility Report, p. 4). The Project Site has two domestic water connections off of Ivar Avenue and one connection off of Cahuenga Boulevard (Attachment D: KPFF, Utility Report, p. 4). While the Project would increase demand for utility services, LADWP has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity to provide water service to the Project (Attachment D: KPFF, Utility Report, p. 11). In addition, as the Project is consistent with regional growth projections, the Project would not require new water supply entitlements and/or

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY—PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE (PRC) § 21155

require the expansion of existing or construction of new water treatment facilities beyond those already considered in the LADWP 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. Furthermore, the Project would be required to comply with numerous water conservation regulations contained in the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) to reduce water consumption (i.e., Ordinance Nos. 166,080; 180,822; 181,480; 181,899; 182,849; 183, 608; 183,833; 184,248; and 184,250), and with the California Green Building Standards Code, which contain standards designed for efficient water use. The Project, with inclusion of the required water conservation features, will use approximately 15,519 gallons per day, which is equivalent to approximately 30.4 gallons per person per day (Attachment E: Glumac, Water Consumption Calculations—6400 Sunset Blvd., p. 3). The average residential household water use in California in 2016 was 85 gallons per person per day. Therefore, the water usage for the Project would be approximately 64 percent less than the average California household. See also response to PRC § 21155.1(a)(8), below.

The Project would connect to the existing wastewater system by connection to the existing 12-inch sewer main at Cahuenga Boulevard and the existing 12-inch sewer main at Ivar Avenue (Attachment D: KPFF, Utility Report, p. 14). The Project would connect to the existing wastewater system through these existing mains by utilizing existing or new on-site sewer connections to the existing sewer mains adjacent to the Project Site. The results of the Sewer Capacity Availability Request (SCAR) obtained from the City’s Bureau of Engineering confirms that there is sufficient capacity to service the Project (Attachment D: KPFF, Utility Report, p. 14). In addition, based on KPFF’s Utility Report, the Hyperion Water Reclamation Plant has sufficient capacity to treat wastewater flows from the Project (Attachment D: KPFF, Utility Report, p. 14). Therefore, the Project would not result in or require the construction of a new wastewater treatment facility.

The Project would not increase the existing peak flow rate or runoff volumes into the stormwater drainage system since the Project Site is currently 100 percent impervious and does not contain any landscaping on-site. Per City requirements, the Project would be required to comply with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Hydrology Manual and the City’s Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinance to treat stormwater for pollutants and control runoff at buildout. Therefore, the Project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage system. As such, the existing stormwater drainage system would have sufficient capacity to service the Project and the Project would not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

The Project would pay all applicable in-lieu or development fees pursuant to code requirements and conditions of Project approval. Thus, the Project is consistent with part (1) of this criterion.

(2) (A) The site of the transit priority project does not contain wetlands or riparian areas and does not have significant value as a wildlife habitat, and the transit priority project does not harm any species protected by the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. Sec. 1531 et seq.), the Native Plant Protection Act (Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 1900) of Division 2 of the Fish and Game Code), or the California Endangered Species Act (Chapter 1.5 (commencing with Section 2050) of Division 3 of the Fish and Game Code), and the project does not cause the destruction or removal of any species protected by a local ordinance in effect

X

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY—PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE (PRC) § 21155

at the time the application for the project was deemed complete.

(B) For the purposes of this paragraph, “wetlands” has the same meaning as in the United States Fish and Wildlife Service Manual, Part 660 FW 2 (June 21, 1993).

(C) For the purposes of this paragraph:

(i) “Riparian areas” means those areas transitional between terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and that are distinguished by gradients in biophysical conditions, ecological processes, and biota. A riparian area is an area through which surface and subsurface hydrology connect waterbodies with their adjacent uplands. A riparian area includes those portions of terrestrial ecosystems that significantly influence exchanges of energy and matter with aquatic ecosystems. A riparian area is adjacent to perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral streams, lakes, and estuarine-marine shorelines.

(ii) “Wildlife habitat” means the ecological communities upon which wild animals, birds, plants, fish, amphibians, and invertebrates depend for their conservation and protection.

(iii) Habitat of “significant value” includes wildlife habitat of national, statewide, regional, or local importance; habitat for species protected by the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. Sec. 1531, et seq.), the California Endangered Species Act (Chapter 1.5 (commencing with Section 2050) of Division 3 of the Fish and Game Code), or the Native Plant Protection Act (Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 1900) of Division 2 of the Fish and Game Code); habitat identified as candidate, fully protected, sensitive, or species of special status by local, state, or federal agencies; or habitat essential to the movement of resident or migratory wildlife.

The Project Site is fully developed with a commercial building and a surface parking lot, and is located in a heavily urbanized area of Hollywood Community Plan Area in the City of Los Angeles. Adjacent and surrounding land uses include a mix of commercial, office, retail, entertainment, and institutional uses. Review of the National Wetlands Inventory identified no protected wetlands in the vicinity of the Project Site and the Project Site is not located within a riparian area (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory, Wetlands Mapper, www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html, accessed February 2018). Further, as the Project Site is fully developed and there are no open spaces with water courses such as streams or lakes, the Project Site does not support any riparian or wetland habitat, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on wetlands, riparian habitat, or other sensitive natural communities identified in federal, state, or local plans, policies, and regulations.

The Project Site is not located in or adjacent to a Biological Resource Area as defined by the City (City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, Los Angeles Citywide General Plan Framework, Draft Environmental Impact Report, January 19, 1995, p. 2-18-4). Moreover, the Project Site and immediately surrounding area are not within or near a designated Significant

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY—PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE (PRC) § 21155

Ecological Area (Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, Planning & Zoning Information, GIS-NET3 online database, website: <http://planning.lacounty.gov/gisnet3>, accessed February 2018). The Project Site is built-out with the existing Amoeba Music Store and a surface parking lot and does not contain any trees or any habitat capable of sustaining any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Additionally, there are no known locally designated natural communities at the Project Site or in the immediate vicinity, nor is the Project Site located immediately adjacent to undeveloped natural open space or a natural water source that may otherwise serve as habitat for state- or federally listed species. Thus, the Project would not harm any species protected by the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. Sec. 1531 et seq.), the Native Plant Protection Act (Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 1900) of Division 2 of the Fish and Game Code), or the California Endangered Species Act (Chapter 1.5 (commencing with Section 2050) of Division 3 of the Fish and Game Code) and therefore meets part (2) of this criterion.

(3) The site of the transit priority project is not included on any list of facilities and sites compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.

X

The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) maintains a database (EnviroStor) that provides access to detailed information on hazardous waste permitted sites and corrective action, facilities, as well as existing site cleanup information. The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) maintains a similar database (Geotracker). EnviroStor and Geotracker also provide information on investigation, cleanup, permitting, and/or corrective actions that are permitting, planned, being conducted, or have been completed under DTSC's and the RWQCB's respective oversight.

A preliminary endangerment assessment (PEA) was prepared by California Environmental (CE), dated August 2018, for the Project (see Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report). As part of the PEA, inquiry letters were sent to the DTSC and RWQCB, and the DTSC and RWQCB online databases were reviewed. The results of the database review are contained in the PEA (see Appendix IV of the PEA). Based on this review, the Project Site is not listed on these databases (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 11). In addition to the DTSC and RWQCB databases, agency database lists were reviewed for known or suspected contaminated sites and for sites that store, generate or use hazardous materials.

The Project Site is listed on the HAZNET databases for the generation and offsite disposal of asbestos waste in the late 1990s, associated with the demolition of existing structures. (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 18.) This listing on the HAZNET database does not represent a significant environmental concern because the asbestos was removed from the Project Site and disposed of in accordance with regulations. Furthermore, the PEA did not identify any other recognized environmental conditions, historical recognized environmental conditions, or controlled recognized environmental conditions on the Project Site. Therefore, the Project is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material sites or create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Thus, the Project meets part (3) of this criterion.

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY—PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE (PRC) § 21155

(4) The site of the transit priority project is subject to a preliminary endangerment assessment prepared by a registered environmental assessor to determine the existence of any release of a hazardous substance on the site and to determine the potential for exposure of future occupants to significant health hazards from any nearby property or activity.

X

(A) If a release of a hazardous substance is found to exist on the site, the release shall be removed or any significant effects of the release shall be mitigated to a level of insignificance in compliance with state and federal requirements.

(B) If a potential for exposure to significant hazards from surrounding properties or activities is found to exist, the effects of the potential exposure shall be mitigated to a level of insignificance in compliance with state and federal requirements

As part of the PEA, the previous uses of the Project Site and nearby properties were evaluated to identify any historically recognized environmental conditions. As detailed in the PEA, the Northern Lot remained undeveloped until the early 1900s when it was developed with stables, a riding academy, and residential structures from 1907 to 1919 (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 20). By 1950, the Northern Lot was occupied by retail stores, offices, a residence, and an auto sales/repair facility (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 20). Additional commercial and retail buildings were developed on the Project Site by 1955 (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 20). Commercial and retail uses, including auto-related uses, continued on the Project Site until the 1970s (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 20). The Southern Lot was vacant until approximately 1919 when it was developed for residential uses (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 20). Records indicate that the Southern Lot continued to be utilized for residential purposes between 1933 and 1942 (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 21). By 1950, the Southern Lot was again vacant land (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 9). By the 1960s, the Southern Lot was developed for its current use as a surface parking lot (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 20). The PEA did not identify the historic use of the Northern Lot for auto repair uses as a significant environmental concern.

The PEA reported no evidence of existing aboveground or underground storage tanks, clarifiers, sumps, or grease interceptors on the Project Site during the site reconnaissance (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 14). In addition, no evidence of transformers or equipment containing toxic polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or evidence of spills or stains was observed on-site (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 14). Furthermore, no strong, pungent, or noxious odors were evident during the site reconnaissance and no other indications of release of hazardous substances or other conditions of environmental concern were observed (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 14-17).

The Project Site is not located within a Methane Zone or Methane Buffer Zone identified by the City (City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Zone Information and Map Access System [ZIMAS] Parcel Profile Reports for APN 5546-014-058 Lots 12, 13, 14, and 24, and APN

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY—PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE (PRC) § 21155

5546-014-029 Lot 170). According to the PEA, the Project Site is not located within a recognized methane hazard zone and there are no oil wells or oil fields within a 2,000-foot radius of the Project Site (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 17-18). Furthermore, the PEA indicated that although a radon hazard assessment was not conducted for the Project Site, the radon levels at 13 sites located within the 90028 ZIP Code were below the federal action level (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 15). Thus, the likelihood of radon levels being above the federal action level at the Project Site is considered low. The PEA also concluded that a vapor encroachment condition does not exist on the Project Site (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 19).

The Project will require the demolition of the existing 43,077-square-foot commercial building in order to construct the proposed 26-story mixed use building. The PEA concluded that based on the age of the existing building, which was built in 2001 according to its Certificate of Occupancy, it is unlikely that asbestos containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paint (LBP) would be present in the demolition debris. In the unlikely event that ACMs and/or LBP are discovered during construction, all ACMs and LBP would be removed in accordance with all applicable regulatory requirements. Specifically, in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 1403 (Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities), prior to demolition activities associated with the Project, the Applicant would conduct a survey of the existing areas where construction would occur to verify the presence or absence of any of these materials and conduct remediation or abatement before any disturbance occurs. Furthermore, the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal-OSHA) has established limits of exposure to lead contained in dusts and fumes through California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1532.1, which provides for exposure limits, exposure monitoring, and respiratory protection, and mandates good working practices by workers exposed to lead, since demolition workers are at greatest risk of adverse health exposure. Lead-contaminated debris and other wastes must also be managed and disposed of in accordance with applicable provisions of the California Health and Safety Code. Mandatory compliance with these regulatory requirements would reduce any potential risks associated with ACMs and LBP to acceptable levels.

According to the PEA, the Project Site was identified in the regulatory database as a HAZNET database for the generation and off-site disposal of asbestos waste in the late 1990s, associated with the demolition of existing structures. However, this listing on the HAZNET database does not represent a significant environmental concern since asbestos has been removed from the Project Site and disposed of in accordance with regulations. Furthermore, the PEA did not identify any other recognized environmental conditions, historical recognized environmental conditions, or controlled recognized environmental conditions on the Project Site. Therefore, the Project meets part (4) of this criterion.

(5) The transit priority project does not have a significant effect on historical resources pursuant to Section 21084.1.

There are no historical resources on the Project Site. The existing building on the Project Site was constructed in 2001 and has not been determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historic Resources, the Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments Register, and/or any local register (Attachment G: Historical Resources

X

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY—PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE (PRC) § 21155

Group, Historic Resources Technical Report, Amoeba Music—6400 Sunset Boulevard, Hollywood, p. 33). In addition, although Historical Resources Group identified several historical resources in the vicinity of the Project Site, none of these historical resources would be directly or indirectly impacted by the Project (Attachment G: Historical Resources Group, Historic Resources Technical Report, Amoeba Music—6400 Sunset Boulevard, Hollywood, p. 38-40). Thus, the Project meets part (5) of this criterion.

(6) The transit priority project site is not subject to any of the following:

X

(A) A wildland fire hazard, as determined by the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, unless the applicable general plan or zoning ordinance contains provisions to mitigate the risk of a wildland fire hazard.

As described above and recognized in the 2016 RTP/SCS, the Project Site is located in a highly urbanized area and is fully developed with a surface parking lot and the Amoeba Music Store. There are no wildlands located in the vicinity of the Project Site. Furthermore, the Project Site is not located within a City-designated Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, ZIMAS Parcel Profile Reports for APN 5546-014-058 Lots 12, 13, 14, and 24, and APN 5546-014-029 Lot 17). Therefore, the Project Site is not subject to a wildland fire hazard and meets part (6)(A) of the criterion.

(B) An unusually high risk of fire or explosion from materials stored or used on nearby properties.

The buildings surrounding the Project Site are currently occupied by office, retail, restaurant, entertainment, and institutional uses. Specifically, surrounding uses include a Jack In The Box restaurant with a drive-thru to the north; the Los Angeles Film School to the northeast, and a two-story commercial building to the northwest across Sunset Boulevard; one- and two-story office buildings, including a night club and hotel under construction to the south; a full-block mixed-use Academy Square project currently under construction to the southeast; the Hollywood Civic Center, which includes the Los Angeles Fire Department Station 27, the Los Angeles Fire Department Historical Society Museum, and the Los Angeles Police Department—Hollywood Station to the southwest; the ArcLight Cinema complex, which includes the Cinerama Dome, a 24-Hour Fitness facility, several restaurants and retail shops, and a seven-story parking structure to the east; and the 14 story CNN high-rise building to the west. Any hazardous materials stored on such sites typically consist of small quantities of cleaning products and similar household and commercial materials. Such properties typically do not contain large quantities of hazardous materials that would pose an unusually high risk of fire or explosion. In addition, the PEA identified sites of environmental concern within a quarter-mile radius of the Project Site. However, the risk of release of hazardous materials from these identified sites is considered unlikely (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 21). Therefore, the Project Site is not subject to an unusually high risk of fire or explosion from materials stored or used on nearby properties, and meets part (6)(B) of this criterion.

(C) Risk of a public health exposure at a level that would exceed the standards established by any state or federal agency.

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY—PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE (PRC) § 21155

As discussed above, the Project Site is not located within a Methane Zone or Methane Buffer Zone identified by the City, and according to the PEA, the Project Site is not located within a recognized methane hazard zone and there are no oil wells or oil fields within a 2,000-foot radius of the Project Site (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 17-18). In addition, the PEA indicated that the likelihood of radon levels being above the federal action level at the Project Site is considered low (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 15). The PEA also concluded that a vapor encroachment condition does not exist on the Project Site (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 19). Moreover, the PEA did not identify any other recognized environmental conditions, historical recognized environmental conditions, or controlled recognized environmental conditions on the Project Site (Attachment F: CE, Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Report, p. 21). Therefore, the Project would not result in public health exposure at a level that would exceed the standards established by any state of federal agency, and thus meets part (6)(C) of this criterion.

(D) Seismic risk as a result of being within a delineated earthquake fault zone, as determined pursuant to Section 2622, or a seismic hazard zone, as determined pursuant to Section 2696, unless the applicable general plan or zoning ordinance contains provisions to mitigate the risk of an earthquake fault or seismic hazard zone.

PRC Section 2622 requires the State Geologist to delineate earthquake fault zones and to continue to revise and delineate additional earthquake fault zones when warranted by new information. PRC Section 2696 requires the State Geologist to compile maps identifying seismic hazard zones. CGS released the Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation Map for the Hollywood Quadrangle on November 6, 2014 (Earthquake Fault Zones Map). This map is the State of California’s currently official earthquake fault zone map for the Hollywood area. The recently revised map shows the location of Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones and Seismic Hazard Zones based, in part, on current geographic information system (GIS) technology. According to the Earthquake Fault Zone Map, the Project Site is not within the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone for the Hollywood Fault, which is located approximately 1,558 feet (0.30 mile) north of the Project Site. The Project Site is also not located within the Hollywood-Raymond Preliminary Fault Study Zone (City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, ZIMAS Parcel Profile Reports for APN 5546-014-058 Lots 12, 13, 14, and 24, and APN 5546-014-029 Lot 17). Furthermore, a Geotechnical Engineering Investigation (Geotechnical Investigation) was prepared for the Project Site by Geotechnologies, Inc., dated August 2018 (Attachment H: Geotechnologies, Geotechnical Investigation, p. 4-11), which concluded that there are no known active faults or potentially active faults that cross the Project Site. Therefore, the potential for surface fault rupture hazard at the Project Site is considered low (Attachment H: Geotechnologies, Geotechnical Investigation, p. 4-12). As such, the Project would not result in seismic risk as a result of being within a delineated earthquake fault zone or a seismic hazard zone, and the Project meets part (6)(D) of this criterion.

(E) Landslide hazard, flood plain, flood way, or restriction zone, unless the applicable general plan or zoning ordinance contains provisions to mitigate the risk of a landslide or flood.

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY—PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE (PRC) § 21155

The Project Site and surrounding area are fully developed and generally characterized by flat topography. The Project Site is not located in a landslide area as mapped by the City of Los Angeles, or within a landslide zone as mapped by CGS, and the probability of seismically induced landslides occurring at the Project Site would be considered low (City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element, November 1996, Exhibit C, Landslide Inventory & Hillside Areas, p. 51; California Geological Survey. Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation, Hollywood Quadrangle, released November 6, 2014). The Project Site is not located within a designated 100-year flood plain area as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) or by the City (Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Insurance Rate Map, Map Number 06037C1605F, September 26, 2008; City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element, November 1996, Exhibit F, 100-Year & 500-Year Flood Plain, p. 57). Furthermore, based on the Geotechnical Investigation, the probability of seismically induced landslides is low and the risk of flooding from a seismically induced seiche is remote (Attachment H: Geotechnologies, Geotechnical Investigation, p. 14-15). Therefore, the Project would not result in landslide hazard, flood plain, flood way, or restriction zone, and the Project meets part (6)(E) of this criterion.

- (7) The transit priority project site is not located on developed open space.**
- (A) For the purposes of this paragraph, “developed open space” means land that meets all of the following criteria:**
- (i) Is publicly owned, or financed in whole or in part by public funds.**
 - (ii) Is generally open to, and available for use by, the public.**
 - (iii) Is predominantly lacking in structural development other than structures associated with open spaces, including, but not limited to, playgrounds, swimming pools, ballfields, enclosed child play areas, and picnic facilities.**
- (B) For the purposes of this paragraph, “developed open space” includes land that has been designated for acquisition by a public agency for developed open space, but does not include lands acquired with public funds dedicated to the acquisition of land for housing purposes.**

X

The Project Site is privately owned, has not been designated for acquisition by a public agency for use as open space, and is located in a highly urbanized area that includes a mixture of low-, mid-, and high-rise buildings containing a variety of office, retail, restaurant, entertainment, and institutional uses. The Project Site is currently occupied by the Amoeba Music store and associated surface parking lot, contains no active or passive recreational facilities, and has not been used by the public for recreational purposes. There is no landscaping on the Project Site or in the surrounding sidewalks. Instead, existing electrical poles and street lights are situated within the Project Site and along the sidewalks surrounding the Project Site. The Project Site is zoned C4-2D-SN (Commercial, Height District 2 with Development Limitation, Hollywood Signage Supplemental Use District) and C4-2D (Commercial, Height District 2 with Development Limitation), which provides for residential and commercial uses. The immediate surrounding area is also fully built out with commercial buildings and does not include any open spaces. Therefore,

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY—PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE (PRC) § 21155

the Project is not located on developed open space and meets part (7) of this criterion.

(8) The buildings in the transit priority project are 15 percent more energy efficient than required by Chapter 6 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and the buildings and landscaping are designed to achieve 25 percent less water usage than the average household use in the region.

X

Based on the Title 24 Energy Performance Report—6400 Sunset Blvd. prepared by Glumac, dated August 2018, the Project will be 15.3 percent more energy efficient than the 2016 Title 24 standards, referenced in Chapter 4.2 of CEQA (Implementation of the Sustainable Communities Strategy). This Chapter of CEQA was a by-product of SB 375, which was originally drafted and presented to the California Senate in February 2007, amended several times, and approved in September 2008. At the time of passage of SB 375, California had not adopted mandatory green building standards, and was in the process of developing voluntary green building standards. The intent regarding this performance standard arose from the California’s original Climate Change Scoping Plan (December, 2008) which called reducing reduction of GHG emissions by approximately 15 percent from 2008 levels in order to meet 2020 targets (Climate Change Scoping Plan, CARB, December 2008, page ES-1). This 15-percent reduction goal from 2008 levels is reflected in the criteria written in CEQA pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21155.1(8).

After the passage of SB 375, state agencies began the compliance process by reviewing existing green building standards, best practices, guidelines, and other published material. The 2008 California Green Building Standards Code was composed of voluntary measures that formed the basis of what would become the mandatory 2010 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen), codified as Part 11 of Title 24, California Code of Regulations. This landmark code achieved significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, energy consumption, and water conservation for the State (Climate Change Scoping Plan, CARB, December 2008, page ES-1). Building efficiency standards were updated in 2013 (effective January 1, 2014) for residential and non-residential buildings that are new, additions, or alterations. Building efficiency standards were again updated in 2016 (effective January 1, 2017) and are more efficient than 2013 standards.

For the purposes of this analysis, the 2016 version of Title 24 is the applicable version referenced in part (8) of this criterion. Based on the Title 24 Energy Performance Report—6400 Sunset Blvd. prepared by Glumac, dated August 2018, the Project will be 15.3 percent more energy efficient than the 2016 Title 24 standards (Attachment I: Glumac, Title 24 Energy Performance Report—6400 Sunset Blvd., p. 4). For the detailed analysis of building efficiency above Title 24 standards, please see Attachment I.

The Project will also be required to comply with numerous water conservation regulations contained in the LAMC (Ordinance Nos. 166,080; 180,822; 181,480; 181,899; 182,849; 183, 608; 183,833; 184,248; and 184,250) to reduce water consumption, and with CALGreen, which contains standards designed for efficient water use. These water-saving features were adopted after construction of most existing developments in the region, so the Project will be required, at a minimum, to include more water efficient fixtures and appliances than other local residences.

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY—PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE (PRC) § 21155

The average residential household water use in California in 2016 was 85 gallons per person per day (Attachment E: Glumac, Water Consumption Calculations—6400 Sunset Blvd., p. 3). The Project will include up to 200 residential units. Based on the Utility Report prepared by KPFF, the Project will have a water demand of approximately 23,947 gallons per day without the required conservation features (Attachment D: KPFF, Utility Report, p. 4). Assuming the same residential population of 510 residents used in the Glumac report (see Table 1 in Attachment E), this equates to approximately 47 gallons per person per day, which is approximately 45 percent less than the average residential water use in California in 2016. The Project, including the required water conservation features, will use approximately 15,519 gallons per day, which is equivalent to approximately 30.4 gallons per person per day (Attachment E: Glumac, Water Consumption Calculations—6400 Sunset Blvd., p. 3). Thus, with implementation of the required water conservation features, water usage for the Project will be approximately 64 percent less than the average California household.

Therefore, the Project is designed to be 15 percent more energy-efficient than required by Chapter 6 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, and is designed to achieve 25 percent less water usage than the average household in the region. Thus, the Project meets part (8) of this criterion.

PRC § 21155.1(b). The transit priority project meets all of the following land use criteria:

Consistent?	
Yes	No

(1) The site of the transit priority project is not more than eight acres in total area.

The Project Site is approximately 0.89 acres (38,722 square feet). Therefore, the Project Site is less than 8 acres, and the Project meets part (1) of this criterion.

X	
----------	--

(2) The transit priority project does not contain more than 200 residential units.

The Project proposes up to 200 residential units. Therefore, the Project will not include more than 200 residential units and the Project meets part (2) of this criterion.

X	
----------	--

(3) The transit priority project does not result in any net loss in the number of affordable housing units within the project area.

The existing uses on the Project Site do not include residential uses. As part of the Project, 5 percent of the Project units will be reserved for Very Low Income households. Thus, the Project will increase the number of affordable housing units at and within the vicinity of the Project Site and the Project meets part (3) of this criterion.

X	
----------	--

(4) The transit priority project does not include any single level building that exceeds 75,000 square feet.

The Project would construct a high-rise building with 26-stories (25 occupiable floors and one mechanical floor). Therefore, the Project does not include any single level building that exceeds 75,000 square feet and the Project meets part (4) of this criterion.

X	
----------	--

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY—PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE (PRC) § 21155

(5) Any applicable mitigation measures or performance standards or criteria set forth in the prior environmental impact reports, and adopted in findings, have been or will be incorporated into the transit priority project.

X

The City has identified four prior environmental impact reports (EIRs) (collectively the “Prior EIRs”) with mitigation measures that apply to the Project Site: (i) Hollywood Redevelopment Project Final EIR (January 1986); (ii) Hollywood Community Plan Revision Final EIR (July 1988); (iii) Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment Final EIR (February 2003); and (iv) SCAG 2016-2040 RTP/SCS Final Program EIR (April 2016). Each of these Prior EIRs are included in Attachment J.

The City, in its independent judgment, has determined that some of the mitigation measures, performance standards or criteria in the Prior EIRs (collectively “Mitigation Measures”) are applicable to the Project and some are not applicable. These Mitigation Measures will be incorporated into the Project as either a Project Condition or as a result of compliance with existing regulatory requirements. The Mitigation Measures that will be applied to the Project as Project Conditions are identified in Table K-1 of Attachment K. The Mitigation Measures that will be applied to the Project as a result of compliance with regulatory requirements are identified in Table K-2 of Attachment K. The Mitigation Measures that are not applicable to the Project are listed in Table K-3 of Attachment K, along with an explanation of why they are not applicable to the Project.

The following technical reports were prepared to assess Project-specific impacts and the applicability of corresponding Mitigation Measures: (i) Attachment C—Transportation Impact Study (Gibson); (ii) Attachment D—Wastewater and Water Utility Infrastructure Technical Report (KPFF); (iii) Attachment E—Water Consumption Calculations (Glumac); (iv) Attachment F—Environmental Site Assessment—Phase I PEA Formatted Report (CE); (v) Attachment G—Historic Resources Technical Report (HRG); (vi) Attachment H—Geotechnical Engineering Investigation (Geotechnologies); (vii) Attachment I—Title 24 Energy Performance Report (Glumac); (viii) Attachment L—Paleontological Resource Evaluation and Impact Assessment (SRI); and, (ix) Attachment M—Vibration Impacts Analysis (AES). These reports concluded, and upon its review, the City has determined, that the Project will have less than significant impacts in the following environmental areas: (i) Transportation and Traffic; (ii) Utilities; (iii) Water; and, (iv) Vibrations. As a result, the City has determined in its independent judgment that Mitigation Measures identified in the Prior EIRs that address these four areas of environmental concern are not applicable to the Project.

Based on the technical appendices prepared for the Project and all other documents in the record, the City determines that the Project has potential impacts that require the incorporation of applicable Mitigation Measures contained in the Prior EIRs for the following impact categories: Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Geology, GHGs, Energy, Land Use, Noise, Public Services, and Recreation, Utilities and Service Systems: As noted above, the City is incorporating into the Project the applicable Mitigation Measures for these identified impact categories, as set forth in Attachment K, Table K-1 and K.2. Thus, the Project meets part (5) of this criterion.

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY—PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE (PRC) § 21155

<p>(6) The transit priority project is determined not to conflict with nearby operating industrial uses.</p> <p>The nearest site utilized and zoned for industrial uses is located approximately 2,000 feet east of the Project Site, on the southeast corner of Sunset Boulevard and Gower Street, occupied by Sunset Gower Studios (a production studio). The site is zoned “M1-1,” which is a limited industrial zone and allows for light manufacturing uses by the City (City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning, ZIMAS, http://zimas.lacity.org/). Due to distance from the Project as well as the buffering provided by existing development located between the Project and the nearest industrial zoned site, the Project will not conflict with nearby operating industrial uses and, therefore, meets part (6) of this criterion.</p>	<p>X</p>	
<p>(7) The transit priority project is located within one-half mile of a rail transit station or a ferry terminal included in a regional transportation plan or within one-quarter mile of a high quality transit corridor included in a regional transportation plan.</p> <p>The Metro Red Line Hollywood/Vine Station is located approximately 0.3 mile northeast of the Project Site. In addition, Sunset Boulevard is considered a high quality transit corridor since it has fixed route bus service provided by Metro Local Line 2 and Metro Limited Line 302 (Attachment C: Gibson, Traffic Study, p. 18-20 and Figure 3 on p. 25). Therefore, the Project Site is located within one-half mile of a rail transit station and directly within a high quality transit corridor included in a regional transportation plan. As such, the Project meets part (7) of this criterion.</p>	<p>X</p>	
<p>PRC 21155.1(c). The transit priority project meets at least one of the following three criteria:</p>	<p>Consistent?</p>	
<p>(1) The transit priority project meets both of the following:</p> <p>(A) At least 20 percent of the housing will be sold to families of moderate income, or not less than 10 percent of the housing will be rented to families of low income, or not less than 5 percent of the housing is rented to families of very low income.</p> <p>(B) The transit priority project developer provides sufficient legal commitments to the appropriate local agency to ensure the continued availability and use of the housing units for very low, low-, and moderate-income households at monthly housing costs with an affordable housing cost or affordable rent, as defined in Section 50052.5 or 50053 of the Health and Safety Code, respectively, for the period required by the applicable financing. Rental units shall be affordable for at least 55 years. Ownership units shall be subject to resale restrictions or equity sharing requirements for at least 30 years.</p> <p>Five percent of the 200 proposed residential units (10 units) shall be reserved for Very Low Income households for at least 55 years. Therefore, not less than 5 percent of the housing shall be rented to Very Low Income Households. The Project operator will enter into a housing regulatory agreement memorializing these requirements and making them binding on any successors or assigns for the regulatory period. Thus, the Project meets this criterion.</p>	<p>X</p>	

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY—PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE (PRC) § 21155

<p>(2) The transit priority project developer has paid or will pay in-lieu fees pursuant to a local ordinance in an amount sufficient to result in the development of an equivalent number of units that would otherwise be required pursuant to paragraph (1).</p> <p>The Project meets part (1) of this criterion, above. Therefore, the Project meets the requirements of PRC 21155.1(c).</p>	<p>N/A</p>	
<p>(3) The transit priority project provides public open space equal to or greater than five acres per 1,000 residents of the project.</p> <p>The Project meets part (1) of this criterion, above. Therefore, the Project meets the requirements of PRC 21155.1(c).</p>	<p>N/A</p>	