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I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of an Initial Study

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was enacted in 1970 for the purpose of providing decision-makers and the public with information regarding environmental effects of proposed projects; identifying means of avoiding environmental damage; and disclosing to the public the reasons behind a project's approval even if it leads to environmental damage. The Bureau of Engineering Environmental Management Group (EMG) has determined the proposed project is subject to CEQA and no exemptions apply. Therefore, the preparation of an initial study is required.

An initial study is a preliminary analysis conducted by the lead agency, in consultation with other agencies (responsible or trustee agencies, as applicable), to determine whether there is substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the initial study concludes that the project, with mitigation, may have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report should be prepared; otherwise the lead agency may adopt a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration.

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared in accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code §21000 et seq.), the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, §15000 et seq.), and the City of Los Angeles CEQA Guidelines (1981, amended July 31, 2002).

B. Document Format

This Final IS/MND is organized into ten sections as follows:

Section I, Introduction: provides an overview of the project and the CEQA environmental documentation process.

Section II, Project Description: provides a description of the project location, project background, and project components.
Section III, Existing Environment: provides a description of the existing environmental setting with focus on features of the environment which could potentially affect the proposed project or be affected by the proposed project.

Section IV, Potential Environmental Effects: provides a detailed discussion of the environmental factors that would be potentially affected by this project as indicated by the screening checklist in Appendix A.

Section V, Mitigation Measures: provides the mitigation measures that would be implemented to ensure that potential adverse impacts of the proposed project would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Section VI, Preparation and Coordination/Consultation: provides a list of key personnel involved in the preparation of this report and key personnel consulted.

Section VII, Determination – Recommended Environmental Documentation: provides the recommended environmental documentation for the proposed project.

Section VIII, References: provides a list of reference materials used during the preparation of this report.

Section IX, Clarifications and Modifications: provides a list of revisions intended to update the IS/MND in response to the comments received during the public review period.

Section X, Response to Comments: provides individual responses to the comments received during the public review period; and,

C. CEQA Process

Once the adoption of a negative declaration (or mitigated negative declaration) has been proposed, a public comment period opens for no less than twenty (20) days or thirty (30) days if there is state agency involvement. The purpose of this comment period is to provide public agencies and the general public an opportunity to review the initial study and comment on the adequacy of the analysis and the findings of the lead agency regarding potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. If a reviewer believes the project may have a significant effect on the environment, the reviewer should (1) identify the specific effect, (2) explain why it is believed the effect would occur, and (3) explain why it is believed the effect would be significant. Facts or expert opinion supported by facts should be provided as the basis of such comments.

After the close of the public review period, the Board of Public Works considers the negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration, together with any comments received during the public review process, and makes a recommendation to the City Council on whether to approve the project. One or more Council committees may then review the proposal and documents and make its own recommendation to the full City Council. The City Council is the decision-making body and also considers the negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration, together with any comments received during the public review process, in the final decision to approve or disapprove the project.

During the project approval process, persons and/or agencies may address either the Board of Public Works or the City Council regarding the project. Public notification of agenda items for the Board of Public Works, Council committees and City Council is posted 72 hours prior to the public meeting. The Council agenda can be obtained by visiting the Council and...
Public Services Division of the Office of the City Clerk at City Hall, 200 North Spring Street, Suite 395; by calling 213/978-1047, 213/978-1048 or TDD/TTY 213/978-1055; or via the internet at http://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/.

If the project is approved, the City will file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk within 5 days. The Notice of Determination will be posted by the County Clerk within 24 hours of receipt. This begins a 30-day statute of limitations on legal challenges to the approval under CEQA. The ability to challenge the approval in court may be limited to those persons who objected to the approval of the project, and to issues which were presented to the lead agency by any person, either orally or in writing, during the public comment period.

As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and, upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Location

The proposed project is located within the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historic Park, the original center of Los Angeles. The project site contains the Masonic Hall, located at 416 North Main Street, Merced Theatre, located at 420 North Main Street, and the Pico House, located at 424 North Main Street (project site). All three structures are listed on the State Historical Register.

Accessed via Sanchez Street, a private street extending easterly from Arcadia Street, the project site is bordered by several other historic buildings in the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historic Park. The project site is bounded by the Los Angeles Plaza Park to the northeast, the Chinese American Museum to the southeast, U.S. Route 101 (US 101) to the south, and a public parking lot to the west and northwest. In this area of downtown Los Angeles, US 101 is grade separated from the project site. Figure 1 shows the regional location of the project site. Figure 2 shows the project site vicinity. Figure 3 shows the proposed project site plan.

The Masonic Hall is located adjacent to the Merced Theatre to the southwest. The two-story brick building was built in 1858 as a freemason lodge. The second floor was used for lodge purposes and the ground floor was leased out for commercial purposes. The Masonic Hall is one of the smaller structures in the Pico-Garnier block and shares access to walkways and stairways with the Merced Theatre.

The Merced Theatre was constructed in 1870 and served as the main source of theatrical activity in Los Angeles from 1871 to 1876. The three-story theatre with a basement has the third largest floor area of all structures in the Pico-Garnier block of the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument.

The approximately 19,100 square foot Pico House is located adjacent to the Merced Theatre to the northeast and is the largest building in the Pico-Garnier block of the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument. The three-story historic stone and brick structure was constructed in 1870 and was originally built to house the City’s first three-story hotel and various commercial entities. Since construction, the Pico House has received several rehabilitations to address its various uses over time. Most recently, the entire Pico Block received minimal voluntary structural upgrades and mechanical, electrical and plumbing (MEP) upgrades to prepare for the 2000 Democratic National Convention.
Figure 3
Proposed Project Site Plan
B. Purpose

The purpose of the proposed project is to rehabilitate the existing Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre (interior and exterior retrofits) for Los Angeles City View Channel 35 studio use and a coordinated structural retrofit to the Masonic Hall, Merced Theatre, and Pico House.

The City of Los Angeles’ Information Technology Agency (ITA) has been working with the City’s Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering (BOE) to relocate the Channel’s currently leased studio in Little Tokyo to a City-owned property in the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historic Park. The proposed project would be funded by the City’s Public Education and Governmental Access Fund and is currently a part of the ITA’s five-year budget plan. The budget report includes recommendations to upgrade current analog studio equipment to a digital system to better serve the residents of Los Angeles by providing necessary information regarding City government policies and services, as well as various issues facing the community.

C. Description

The proposed Channel 35 Studio Relocation Project (proposed project) includes the design and construction of a new digital television studio, within the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre in the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historic Park in the City of Los Angeles. In order to utilize the two-story Masonic Hall and three-story Merced Theatre for studio use, the proposed project would require extensive structural, mechanical, electrical and plumbing system retrofits. A ramp and elevator structure would also be installed to allow Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) access and equipment loading to all floors of the building. The proposed project would also structurally retrofit the three-story Pico House, located directly adjacent to the Merced Theatre on the northeast. Both the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre have received a number of retrofits and rehabilitations over the years. As a result, much of the interior historic fabric has been removed and lost during past projects.

Currently, Channel 35 is occupying leased space in the neighborhood of Little Tokyo. The City’s asset management policy is to reduce private lease agreements by either purchasing property or retrofitting existing City property to reduce expenditures. Therefore, approximately 18,000 square feet of existing building space in the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre would be rehabilitated to accommodate the studio’s needs. The basement of both structures would be utilized as the hub for the television studio’s data center, and building infrastructure. A public lobby, live audience television studio, equipment checkout and storage facilities would dominate the space on the first floor. The second floor would consist of two studios and control rooms. The third floor would contain open office space, conference rooms, a lunch room, and access to the roof deck. To allow Channel 35 to operate in the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre, a series of extensive structural, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing system retrofits would be made to the existing structures. Additionally, the adjacent Pico House would be structurally retrofitted. The structural systems of the Masonic Hall, Merced Theatre, and Pico House are tied together and require a coordinated structural retrofit design to ensure the structures act as one during an earthquake.

Interior Retrofits

Interior rehabilitation would involve the removal of non-original tenant improvements. Partitions, doors, ceilings, mechanical ducts, plumbing, unused electrical equipment, and finishes would be removed throughout the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre for new tenant
improvements. New tenant improvements would include new roofing and new plumbing, electrical, and mechanical distribution. In addition, on the third floor, non-original floor and framing would be removed for the installation of new stairs.

Historical fabric appears to exist on the interior of the Masonic Hall. However, after further investigation it was discovered that the interior plaster, molding, stairways, and restrooms were installed as part of a rehabilitation that occurred in the 1960s, and is not deemed as historic fabric.

The interior of the Merced Theatre has been stripped of its non-structural historic fabric. Therefore, the remaining fabrics of note are structural and include fluted columns on the first floor and stringers to the historical stairway. To meet current structural requirements for gravity floor loads and lateral diaphragm strength, the existing historical floor framing would be removed from the first and second floors and replaced with composite steel deck floor systems. Additionally, the historical stairway would be removed and reinstalled in accordance with current seismic design criteria. If possible, the Merced Theatre’s fluted columns and historical stairway would be restored.

To allow for new door and hallway openings, portions of historic brick wall would be cut between the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre.

**Exterior Retrofits**

The remaining exterior historical facades are located along Main Street and Sanchez Street. Although they have been altered throughout the years, the majority of the components, along the north and south facades, still exist as originally constructed. No improvements would be made to these exteriors.

The west façade, along Arcadia Street, contains a roof deck, a detailed entablature on the Masonic Hall, and an exterior brick and concrete stairway on the Merced Theatre, all of which are not historical fabric. The original construction of the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre left the structures landlocked on the east and west facades. In 1954, during construction of US 101, the structures adjacent to the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre were demolished, exposing the west facades of both buildings. In the 1960s, the State of California invested in the structures to update the west façades. It was at this time that the roof deck, detailed entablature, and stairway were added.

Exterior retrofits would be limited to the west, non-historical façade. New openings would be made in the Masonic Hall to allow for new doors and staff access. To allow for the installation of an elevator at the rear of the Masonic Hall, the south end of the balcony would be removed and rebuilt in a straighter configuration. In addition, several non-original windows would be converted to door openings to provide access to the elevator walkway and the new roof deck above the Masonic Hall. Improvements would also be made to the existing parking lot to accommodate three Channel 35 vans, and to develop a pedestrian plaza.

**Structural Retrofits**

The structural systems of the Masonic Hall, Merced Theatre, and Pico House are tied together and require a coordinated structural retrofit to ensure the structures act as one during an earthquake. Structural retrofits would include the addition of shear walls and frames to reinforce the lateral system, a combination of mat and spread foundations, and composite slabs and beams to reinforce the gravity system. After construction of the
structural components is complete, the Pico House would be up to date with the City's current Building Code. It should be noted that the proposed structural retrofit will be based on reduced seismic forces as allowed by the Historical Building Code.

Lateral system retrofits to the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre would involve the use of a reinforced concrete shear wall system. The system would be overlain against the existing unreinforced brick walls and would use dowels to secure the new reinforced concrete to the existing brick. Lateral system retrofits to the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre would also involve a steel brace within the interior of the third floor. Within the Pico House, the lateral system retrofits would consist of a steel brace frame system. In addition, various frames, outriggers, chords and collectors, and walls, as well as truss and diaphragm strengthening would also be added to the Pico House, to transfer lateral loads to the resisting elements within the Merced Theater.

The foundation systems of the Merced Theatre and Masonic Hall would include a combination of mat and spread foundations. Mat foundations would be located at each shear wall and spread foundations would be located at each column. The foundation for the Pico House would include spread foundations and tension piles as needed at each brace frame and outrigger.

Gravity system retrofits to the Merced Theatre would involve a concrete slab system at the first and second floors. The slab system would be supported by girders and beams. In order to create an open studio space, columns would also be installed on the first and second floors. Girders and beams would be included to support the loading requirements of the new roof deck to be added to the existing roof of the Masonic Hall. In addition, new joists would be added in between the existing wood joists on the third floor of the Merced Theatre and the first and second floors of the Masonic Hall. Slabs will be installed only where new foundations are installed.

**Project Construction**

Rehabilitation of the Merced Theatre, Masonic Hall, and Pico House is anticipated to begin in October 2016 and take approximately 14 months to complete, concluding in December 2017. It is estimated that approximately 20 to 30 construction personnel would be on-site per day. Additionally, approximately 5 to 10 truck trips would occur per day to haul construction material and soil to and from the site. Approximately 370 cubic yards (CY) of materials would be hauled off-site during project construction. Additionally, excavation of soil would occur approximately 14 feet deep with approximately 11,000 cubic feet of soil being excavated during ground disturbing activities.

Project construction would occur Monday through Friday between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m., although daily construction would not likely occur after 6:00 p.m. Construction would occur between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays and National Holidays. There would be no construction activities on Sundays and no construction would occur during prohibited hours.

All interior, exterior, and structural retrofits would require the use of heavy construction equipment. The estimated construction equipment that would be required during rehabilitation activities is as follows:

- 2 Excavators
- 1 Bull Dozer or Skip Loader
• Backhoe Loader  
• Soil Compactor  
• Shoring Elements (for stabilization of elevator pit) and building walls  
• Dump Truck  
• Concrete Mixing Truck  
• Crane  
• Scaffolding

An appropriate combination of monitoring and resource impact avoidance would be employed during all the construction activities, including implementation of the following Best Management Practices (BMPs):

• The proposed project would implement Rule 403 fugitive dust control measures required by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), which requires reasonable precautions to be taken to prevent visible particulate matter from being airborne, under normal wind conditions, beyond the property from which the emission originates. Reasonable precautions include, but are not limited to the following:
  
  o Application of water on dirt roads, material stockpiles, and other surfaces that can give rise to airborne dusts; and  
  o Maintenance of roadways in a clean condition.

• The construction contractor would develop and implement an erosion control plan and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for construction activities. Erosion control and grading plans may include, but would not be limited to, the following:
  
  o Minimizing the extent of disturbed areas and duration of exposure;  
  o Stabilizing and protecting disturbed areas;  
  o Keeping runoff velocities low; and  
  o Retaining sediment within the construction area.
  
  o Construction erosion control Best Management Practices may include the following:
    
    a. Temporary desilting basins;  
    b. Silt fences;  
    c. Gravel bag barriers;  
    d. Temporary soil stabilization with mattresses and mulching;  
    e. Temporary drainage inlet protection; and
f. Diversion dikes and interceptor swales.

- The proposed project would comply with the Regional Water Quality Control Board’s National Pollution Discharge Elimination System.

- BOE would work with the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation to prepare a construction worksite traffic control plan to minimize off-site transportation and traffic effects.

- The proposed project construction would incorporate source reduction techniques and recycling measures and maintain a recycling program to divert waste in accordance with the Citywide Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance.

**Project Operation and Maintenance**

Channel 35 Television studios currently operate in a rental property in Little Tokyo with 13 employees. Once rehabilitation of the historic structures is complete, the studios would relocate their operations to the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre. It is estimated that approximately twenty-two Channel 35 employees would work at the new location due to the additional space the structures provide and room for new positions. The studios would operate during the hours of 6 a.m. to 6 p.m.

**Project Actions and Approvals**

The proposed project would require approval by the City of Los Angeles Board of Public Works and City Council. Additional anticipated approvals or permits for the proposed project include, but are not limited to, the following:

- City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety, building and grading permits (electrical, mechanical, and plumbing permits)

- City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, street work permit

- El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument Authority (approval received November 13, 2014)

- City of Los Angeles Department of Cultural Affairs (approval received March 16, 2015)

The analysis in this document assumes that, unless otherwise stated, the proposed project will be designed, constructed and operated following all applicable laws, regulations, ordinances and formally adopted City standards including but not limited to:

- *Los Angeles Municipal Code* (Reference 26)

- Bureau of Engineering *Standard Plans* (Reference 33)

- *Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction* (Reference 4)

- *Work Area Traffic Control Handbook* (Reference 5)

- *Additions and Amendments to the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction* (Reference 32)
III. EXISTING ENVIRONMENT

The project site is located in the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historic Park in the City of Los Angeles. The proposed project would be located within two adjacent historic structures, the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre. The proposed project would also structurally retrofit the adjacent Pico House. All three structures are part of the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument. The area surrounding the project site is highly urbanized. Current land use in the area is dominated by open space, public lands, and commercial, industrial, and multi-family residential uses. The proposed project is surrounded by several other historic buildings in the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument. The proposed project site is bounded by the Los Angeles Plaza Park to the northeast, the Chinese American Museum to the southeast, US 101 to the south, and a public parking lot to the west and northwest. In this area of downtown Los Angeles, US 101 is grade separated from the project site. The project site is located approximately 0.7 mile east of State Route 110 (SR 110) and approximately 1.45 miles west of Interstate 5 (I-5).

The project site is within the Central City Community Plan Area and is zoned PF-1VL (Public Facilities - Very Limited Height District). The height district states that no structure in this zone shall exceed three stories, nor shall it exceed 45 feet in height. The project site has historically been associated with the early days of the City of Los Angeles. The Masonic Hall was the first freemasonry hall built in Los Angeles in 1858, and was the official meeting place until 1868. The Merced Theatre was the center of theatrical activity in Los Angeles from 1871 to 1876. The Pico House was built in 1870 and was the first-three hotel in the City. Today, all three structures are a part of the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument. Additionally, the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument as a whole is designated as a part of the State Historic Register and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NPS-72000231). As a result, this IS/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) includes a detailed discussion of cultural resources.

The California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey’s Seismic Hazard Zonation Program Map indicates that the project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The nearest active fault to the project site is the Hollywood Fault which is located 4.4 miles northwest of the project site. Additionally, the Raymond Hill Fault is located approximately 5 miles north of the project site. No active faults are known to cross the project site. The Seismic Hazard Map also shows that the project site is located within a potentially liquefiable zone. Lastly, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone.
IV. POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact as indicated by the checklist in Appendix A. A detailed discussion of these potential environmental effects follows.

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Geology / Soils
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Land Use / Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation / Traffic
- Utilities / Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

A. Aesthetics

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact or less than significant impact. (see Appendix A)

Scenic Vistas

Scenic views or vistas are panoramic public views of various natural features, including the ocean, striking or unusual natural terrain, or unique urban or historic features. Public access to these views may be available from nearby parklands, private and public-owned sites, and public right-of-way.

The Central City Community Plan does not delineate or designate any specific views as scenic vistas within the project area. Although the Central City Community Plan does not designate any views as scenic vistas within the project area and therefore no impact to designated scenic vistas would occur, the proposed project is located within a historic area in the City of Los Angeles. All building retrofits would require the use of several pieces of construction equipment as well as several temporary scaffolding structures up to 40 feet in height. However, rehabilitation of the existing structures would be relatively minor and short-term in nature. The impact would be less than significant during project construction.

Once rehabilitation activities are complete, the structures would exist similar to existing conditions. The proposed project involves the construction of an elevator structure, which would be taller than the existing structures. However, architectural design would be subject to review by the Board of Cultural Affairs Commissioners to ensure that the project is designed to be aesthetically compatible with its surroundings. As such, less than significant impacts to scenic vistas would occur.
**Scenic Highways**

The proposed project is not located along or near a designated California Scenic Highway or locally designated scenic highway. The nearest designated scenic highway is US 110, also known as the Arroyo Seco Historic Parkway, which is located approximately two miles northeast of the project site. In addition, the Angeles Crest Highway (Highway 2) is located approximately 11 miles north of the project site in the San Gabriel Mountains. No scenic resources such as groves of trees or rock outcroppings are located on the project site. Historic buildings are located on the project site as the Masonic Hall, Merced Theatre, and Pico House are designated historic resources themselves. However, these historic buildings are not within a state scenic highway and the proposed project would rehabilitate the historic buildings in accordance with Secretary of Interior Standards to preserve the structures. Additionally, the project site is not visible from any designated scenic highways, and the proposed project would not damage any scenic resources. As such, no impact would occur.

**Visual Character**

The project site is located in a highly urbanized area in downtown Los Angeles. The site was previously developed during the early years of the City of Los Angeles. The Masonic Hall was constructed in 1858 and was the City’s first freemasonry lodge. The Merced Theatre was built in 1870 and served as the center of theatrical activity in Los Angeles from 1871 to 1876. The Pico House, adjacent to the Merced Theatre was originally built to house the City’s first three story hotel and various commercial entities. Since construction, the structures have received several rehabilitations that have removed a majority of the original historic fabric. Most recently, the entire Pico Block received minimal voluntary structural upgrades and mechanical, electrical, and plumbing (MEP) upgrades to prepare for the 2000 Democratic National Convention.

The proposed project would rehabilitate the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre for Channel 35 studio operations. In addition, the proposed project would also involve the structural retrofit of the adjacent Pico House, which would require a coordinated structural retrofit involving the hall, the theatre, and the Pico House. Therefore, the proposed project has the potential for short-term aesthetic effects during rehabilitation, due to excavation, grading, and the storage of construction equipment and materials on-site. In addition, scaffolding would be utilized to install formwork, rebar, and other steel structures, and repair exterior plaster and grout. The scaffolding would be approximately 40 feet high and be used in five separate locations for concrete placement and three separate locations for steel erection. These effects would be temporary and occur in a location primarily surrounded by urbanized uses.

The proposed project would not make any significant changes to the visual character that currently exists. Architectural design would be subject to review by the Board of Cultural Affairs Commissioners to ensure that the project is designed to be aesthetically compatible with its surroundings. Any new structures would also meet the site’s scale and massing requirements. As such, less than significant impacts to visual character would occur.

**Light and Glare**

The project site is located in a highly urbanized area and is currently illuminated by existing on-site lighting and lighting associated with the El Pueblo Historical Monument.
Additionally, adjacent street lights and light sources associated with US 101 also illuminate the project site.

Project construction would occur during daylight hours and, therefore, would not require nighttime lighting. The proposed project would involve interior and exterior retrofits to the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre, as well as a coordinated structural retrofit to the Masonic Hall, Merced Theatre, and Pico House. The proposed project would include new outdoor lighting, but would be limited to the minimum levels necessary for safety. In addition, the new light fixtures would be designed to prevent spill-over. Nighttime lighting fixtures currently exist on-site and within the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historic Park. Land uses adjacent to the project site are public facilities, open space, and commercial, and no sensitive land uses would be directly affected by the new sources of outdoor lighting. Open space land uses in the area are in urbanized areas and include the El Pueblo Historical Monument Plaza and other areas near City government facilities. As such, there are no nearby natural open space areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a substantial source of light or glare that would result in adverse effects to day/nighttime views of the area. Impacts would be less than significant.

B. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact. (see Appendix A)

Prime Farmland

No prime or unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance exists within the project site or vicinity. The project site is not located on or near any property zoned or otherwise intended for agricultural uses. Therefore, no impact to state-designated agricultural land would occur.

Williamson Act

No land on or near the project site is zoned for or contains agricultural uses. As the City of Los Angeles does not participate in the Williamson Act, there are no Williamson Act properties in the City of Los Angeles. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Forest Land

The project site is zoned PF-1VL (Public Facilities – Very Limited Height District) and is a part of the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historic Park. There are no forest land or timberland areas in the vicinity of the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the existing zoning or cause rezoning of forest land or timberland resources, and no impact would occur.

C. Air Quality

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause less than significant impact. (see Appendix A)

Air Quality Management Plan

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) monitors air quality within the project area and the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which includes Orange County and
portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties. The SCAB is bounded by the Pacific Ocean to the west; the San Gabriel, San Bernardino and San Jacinto mountains to the north and east; and the San Diego County line to the south.

Air quality plans describe air pollution control strategies to be implemented by a city, county, or regional air district. The primary purpose of an air quality plan is to bring an area that does not attain federal and state air quality standards into compliance with those standards pursuant to the requirements of the Clean Air Act and California Clean Air Act. SCAB is currently designated as nonattainment for 8-hour ozone and particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter less than 2.5 microns (PM$_{2.5}$) for both state and federal standards and nonattainment for particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter less than 10 microns (PM$_{10}$) for the state standards.

The most recent Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) was adopted by the SCAQMD in December 2012. The AQMP was prepared by SCAQMD in partnership with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Air Resources Board (ARB), and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), and is the legally enforceable blueprint for how the region will meet and maintain state and federal air quality standards.

Projects that would be consistent with the 2012 AQMP would be considered less than significant for this impact. Consistency with the AQMP is determined through evaluation of project-related air quality impacts and demonstration that project-related emissions would not increase the frequency or severity of existing violations, or contribute to a new violation of the air quality standards.

The use of construction equipment in the AQMP is estimated for the region on an annual basis, and construction-related emissions are estimated as an aggregate in the AQMP. The project would not increase the assumptions for off-road equipment use in the AQMP.

Consistency with the AQMP is also determined through evaluation of whether the project would exceed the estimated emissions used as the basis of the AQMP, which are based, in part, on population projections developed by the SCAG. The SCAG forecasts are based on local general plans and other related documents, such as housing elements, that are used to develop population projections and traffic projections.

The proposed project is consistent with the existing zoning (PF-1VL) for the site. In addition, the proposed project would be a relocation of existing land uses and would not substantially increase population or employment in the planning area. The proposed project would not generate vehicle trips that exceed the current assumptions used to develop the General Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, and AQMP. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the intensity of operational emissions have been accounted for in the 2012 AQMP. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. The impact would be less than significant.

**Air Quality Standards**

**Construction**

Construction emissions are described as “short-term” or temporary in duration; however, they have the potential to represent a significant impact with respect to air quality. Construction of the proposed project would result in the temporary generation of reactive organic gases (ROG), carbon monoxide (CO), oxides of nitrogen (NO$_x$), PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$ emissions from site preparation, excavation, demolition, and construction of project
components. Fugitive particulate matter (PM) dust emissions are primarily associated with site preparation, excavation, and grading activities and vary as a function of such parameters as soil silt content, soil moisture, wind speed, acreage of disturbance area, and miles traveled by construction vehicles on- and off-site.

Construction of the proposed project would occur over approximately 14 months beginning in 2016. Construction-related emissions associated with typical construction activities were modeled using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2013.2.2. CalEEMod allows the user to enter project-specific construction information, such as types, number, and horsepower of construction equipment, and number and length of off-site motor vehicle trips.

As shown in Table 1, construction emissions for the proposed project would result in maximum daily emissions of approximately 3 pounds of ROG, 31 pounds of NOx, 25 pounds of CO, 3 pounds of (combined exhaust and fugitive dust) PM10, and 2 pounds of (combined exhaust and fugitive dust) PM2.5. This conservative estimate of maximum daily emissions would not exceed any of the SCAQMD’s construction thresholds of significance. Additional modeling assumptions and details are provided in Appendix B of this IS/MND.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Estimated Emissions (lbs/day)</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>PM10</th>
<th>PM2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>30.61</td>
<td>25.41</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>28.44</td>
<td>24.31</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daily Emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>30.61</td>
<td>25.41</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance Threshold</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed Significance?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Estimates include control factors for fugitive PM10 and PM2.5 emissions per SCAQMD Rule 403 requirements.
Source: Estimated by AECOM in 2015.

Localized emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors were assessed in accordance with SCAQMD’s local significance thresholds (LST) guidance. SCAQMD recommends that lead agencies perform project-specific air quality modeling for projects larger than five acres. For projects less than five acres, the SCAQMD has developed look-up tables showing the maximum mass emissions that would not cause an exceedance of any LST. Since the proposed project site is approximately 1 acre, peak daily emissions were compared to the applicable LSTs from the SCAQMD lookup tables.

Receptor locations are off-site locations where persons may be exposed to the emissions from project activities. Receptor locations include residential, commercial and industrial land use areas; and any other areas where persons can be situated for an hour or longer at a time. Therefore, although the project is located in a commercial area, the analysis conservatively assumes a receptor distance of 25 meters to the nearest park area. Table 2 shows the maximum daily construction emissions compared to the SCAQMD LSTs.
Although SCAQMD LSTs only consider the amount of on-site emissions generated by construction activities, this analysis conservatively compared the total construction-related emissions to the LSTs. Emissions associated with vehicle trips to and from the project site during construction would be dispersed throughout the region and would have a nominal localized impact at the project site. As shown in Table 2, the maximum daily construction-related emissions would not exceed any of the SCAQMD LSTs.

As shown in Tables 1 and 2, the maximum daily construction-generated emissions of ROG, CO, NO\textsubscript{x}, PM\textsubscript{10}, and PM\textsubscript{2.5} would not exceed applicable mass emission or localized significance thresholds established by SCAQMD. Therefore, construction emissions would not violate an ambient air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing violation, and the impact would be less than significant.

**Operation**

After construction, day-to-day activities associated with operation of the project would generate emissions from a variety of sources. Operational emissions would be generated by area and mobile sources associated with the project. Area sources include sources such as consumer products, natural gas combustion for water and space heating, and periodic architectural coatings. Mobile-source emissions would include employee commute trips. Operational emissions associated with the day-to-day activities of the proposed land uses were quantified using CalEEMod. The estimated daily project criteria air pollutant emissions from operations are shown in Table 3.
As shown in Table 3, operational emissions would not exceed any of the SCAQMD’s mass daily operational significance thresholds. Therefore, operational impacts related to violation of air quality standards would be less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

**Cumulative Net Increase**

The SCAQMD cumulative analysis focuses on whether a specific project would result in cumulatively considerable increase in emissions. By its very nature, air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. The nonattainment status of regional pollutants is a result of past and present development within the SCAB, and this regional impact is cumulative rather than being attributable to any one source. A project’s emissions may be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable when taken in combination with past, present, and future development projects. The SCAQMD thresholds of significance are relevant to whether a project’s individual emissions would result in a cumulatively considerable incremental contribution to the existing cumulative air quality conditions. If a project’s emissions would be less than those threshold levels, the project would not be expected to result in a considerable incremental contribution to the significant cumulative impact.

As discussed above, the proposed project would result in the generation of criteria air pollutant emissions, but at levels that do not exceed any of the SCAQMD regional and localized thresholds for construction or operational activities. These thresholds are designed to identify those projects that would result in significant levels of air pollution and to assist the region in attaining the applicable state and federal ambient air quality standards. Projects that would not exceed the thresholds of significance would not impede attainment and maintenance of ambient air quality standards. Accordingly, the proposed project’s construction and operational emissions would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the region’s air quality. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**Sensitive Receptors**

Some members of the population are especially sensitive to air pollutant emissions and should be given special consideration when evaluating air quality impacts from projects. These people include children, older adults, persons with preexisting respiratory or cardiovascular illness, and athletes and others who engage in frequent exercise. For the purposes of a CEQA analysis, the SCAQMD considers a sensitive receptor to be a location such as residence, hospital, convalescent facility where it is possible that an individual could remain for 24 hours. Commercial and industrial facilities are not included in the definition of sensitive receptor because employees do not typically remain onsite for a full 24 hours. The project area is primarily commercial, and there are no sensitive receptor locations near the project site. The Los Angeles Plaza Park is located adjacent to the project site, but it not considered a location for sensitive receptors for the purposes of the air quality analysis. However, this analysis provides a discussion of the potential impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed project.

**Construction**

The greatest potential for toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions would be related to diesel particulate matter (diesel PM) emissions associated with heavy-duty construction equipment operations. According to SCAQMD methodology, health effects from carcinogenic TACs
are usually described in terms of individual cancer risk, which is based on a 30-year lifetime exposure to TACs.

Building construction activities for the proposed project are anticipated to last approximately 14 months and would cease following completion of the proposed project. Therefore, if the duration of potentially harmful construction activities near a sensitive receptor was 14 months, then the exposure would be approximately 4 percent of the total exposure period used for typical health risk calculations (i.e., 30 years). In addition, construction emissions would occur intermittently throughout the day and would not occur as a constant plume of emissions from the project site. Heavy-duty construction equipment would only operate intermittently each day during the 14-month construction period and would cease following buildout of the proposed project. Construction of the proposed project would also not exceed the SCAQMD localized significance thresholds, and unhealthful pollutant concentrations would not be generated. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial construction pollutant concentrations. The impact would be less than significant.

Operation

The land uses associated with the proposed project would be commercial, which are not typically sources of TAC emissions. Therefore, the proposed project’s long-term operational activities would not generate substantial TAC emissions and would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial operational TAC concentrations. The impact would be less than significant.

Objectionable Odors

The occurrence and severity of odor impacts depend on numerous factors, including the nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; wind speed and direction; and the presence of sensitive receptors. While offensive odors rarely cause any physical harm, they still can be very unpleasant, leading to considerable distress and often generating citizen complaints to local governments and regulatory agencies.

Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include exhaust from diesel construction equipment. Odors from these sources would be localized and generally confined to the immediate area surrounding the proposed project site. The proposed project would utilize typical construction techniques, and the odors would be typical of most construction sites and temporary in nature.

Operation of the proposed project would not add any new odor sources. The land uses associated with the proposed project would be commercial, which are not typically large generators of odor emissions. The project would not have any significant odor sources, and any odors generated would be similar to existing odors associated with land uses in the area. As a result, the proposed project’s construction and operational activities would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The impact would be less than significant.

D. Biological Resources

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact or less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (see Appendix A)
Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Species

Sensitive plant species are those that are candidates, proposed, or listed as threatened or endangered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and those plants that are considered sensitive species by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS). Sensitive wildlife are those animal species, which are candidates, proposed, or listed as threatened or endangered by the USFWS or the CDFW, and those animals that are considered species of concern or are listed as protected or fully protected by the state. Sensitive habitats are those that are regulated by USFWS, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and/or those considered sensitive by the CDFW.

Special-status wildlife species include those listed by the USFWS under the federal Endangered Species Act and by CDFW under CESA. USFWS and CDFW officially list species as either Threatened, Endangered, or as Candidates for listing. Additional species receive federal protection under the Bald Eagle Protection Act (e.g., bald eagle, golden eagle), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), and state protection under CEQA Section 15380(d). All birds, except European starlings, English house sparrows, rock doves (pigeons), and non-migratory game birds such as quail, pheasant, and grouse, are protected under the MBTA. However, non-migratory game birds are protected under California Fish and Game Code Section 3503. Many other species are considered by CDFW to be California Species of Special Concern, and others are on a CDFW Watch List. The California Natural Diversity Database also tracks species within California for which there is conservation concern, including many which are not formally listed, and assigns them a California Natural Diversity Database rank. Although Species of Special Concern, CDFW Watch List species, and species that are tracked by the California Natural Diversity Database are not formally listed or afforded official legal status, they may receive special consideration during the CEQA review process. CDFW further classifies some species as "Fully Protected," indicating that the species may not be taken or possessed except for scientific purposes, under special permit from CDFW. Additionally, California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503, 3505, and 3800 prohibit the take, destruction or possession of any bird, nest, or egg of any bird except English house sparrows and European starlings unless authorization is obtained from the CDFW.

A search of relevant regional databases for special-status biological resources in the vicinity of the project area was conducted. This included a nine-quad search based on the United States Geological Survey’s Los Angeles, CA quadrangle of CDFW’s California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) and CNPS electronic Inventory. A review of these databases indicates that a combined total of 60 plant species from the CNDDB and CNPS, and 28 wildlife species from the CNDDB have been documented from the Los Angeles and surrounding eight quadrangles. The search results can be found within Appendix C of this IS/MND.

The project site occurs in heavily-urbanized downtown Los Angeles and consists of historic structures and ornamental street trees, including Peruvian pepper (Schinus molle) and sycamore (Plantanus sp), which would not be removed as part of the proposed project. Due to the urban developed nature of the project site and surrounding area, and lack of potentially suitable habitat to support special-status species, the project would not result in a substantial adverse impact to listed, candidate, or otherwise sensitive special-status plant or wildlife species. However, due to the presence of ornamental trees which may provide suitable nesting habitat for birds protected under the MBTA, impacts from noise and dust could occur if construction on the outside of the building occurs during the nesting bird season, generally considered to extend from February 15 through September 15. Mitigation
Measure BIO-1 would ensure that nesting birds protected under the MBTA are not significantly impacted.

Therefore, with implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures provided in Mitigation Measure BIO-1, potential indirect impacts on nesting birds during construction activities associated with the proposed project would be less than significant. No impact is anticipated from operation of the proposed project.

Riparian Habitat/Sensitive Natural Communities

Sensitive natural communities are those that are designated as rare in the region by the CNDDB, provide potentially suitable habitat to support special-status plant or wildlife species, or receive regulatory protection (i.e., Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and/or Section 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code). Rare communities are given the highest inventory priority. Based on a review of the CNDDB, a total of seven sensitive vegetative communities have been recorded within the Los Angeles and surrounding eight quadrangles. None of these records coincide with the project site. The site occurs in heavily-urbanized downtown Los Angeles and no natural vegetation communities occur on-site. Therefore, no impact to a sensitive natural community or riparian habitat would occur.

Wetlands

The Clean Water Act of 1997, as amended, provides for the restoration and maintenance of the physical, chemical, and biological integrity of the nation’s waters. The act sets up a system of water quality standards, discharge limitations, and permit requirements. Activities that have the potential to discharge dredge or fill materials into jurisdictional waters of the U.S., which include those waters listed in 33 Code of Federal Regulations 328.3 (Definitions), are regulated under Section 404 of the Act, as administered by US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). Section 401 of the CWA requires a water quality certification from the state for all permits issued by the Corps under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) is the state agency in charge of issuing a CWA Section 401 water quality certification or waiver.

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act is the basic water quality control law for California and works in concert with the CWA. Under Section 13000 et seq. of Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, the RWQCB is the agency that regulates discharges of waste and fill material within any region that could affect a water of the state (Water Code 13260[a]), (including wetlands and isolated waters) as defined by the California Water Code Section 13050(e). A permit under the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act is required prior to a project's implementation, for impacts to water bodies and riparian habitat. Additionally, under Section 1602 of the California Fish and Wildlife Code, a Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW is required prior to any activity that would result in the modification of the bed, bank, or channel of a state stream, river, or lake, including water diversion and damming and removal of vegetation from the floodplain to the landward extent of the riparian zone. This permit governs both activities that modify the physical characteristics of the stream and activities that may affect fish and wildlife resource that use the stream and surrounding habitat (i.e., riparian vegetation or wetlands).

The project site occurs in heavily-urbanized downtown Los Angeles and no federal or state-protected wetlands or other waters coincide with the project site or would be affected by implementation of the project. As a result, no impact would occur.
Migratory Species

In an urban context, a wildlife migration corridor can be defined as a linear landscape feature of sufficient width and buffer to allow animal movement between two comparatively undisturbed habitat fragments, or between a habitat fragment and some vital resource that encourages population growth and diversity. Habitat fragments are isolated patches of habitat separated by otherwise foreign or inhospitable areas, such as urban/suburban tracts or highways. Two types of wildlife migration corridors seen in urban settings are regional corridors, defined as those linking two or more large areas of natural open space, and local corridors, defined as those allowing resident wildlife to access critical resources (food, cover, and water) in a smaller area that might otherwise be isolated by urban development.

The project site occurs in heavily-urbanized downtown Los Angeles and there are no surface waters, drainages, or other corridors that allow for wildlife movement on or within the vicinity of the project site. The site is not within an established wildlife corridor, and the proposed project would not interfere with the movement of any native wildlife species. Additionally, the project does not include the construction of extensive facilities or fences that could impede wildlife movement. As a result, the proposed project would not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and would not impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. However, as described below, ornamental trees on-site may provide suitable nesting habitat for birds protected under the MBTA. Nesting birds may avoid the project vicinity due to increased levels of noise or dust during construction on the outside of the building, if it occurs during the nesting bird season (February 15 through September 15). Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would reduce potential impacts on the movement and behavior of nesting birds to a less than significant level.

Tree Preservation

Native tree species, which measure four inches or more in cumulative diameter, four and one-half feet above the ground, including native oak (*Quercus* spp.), southern California black walnut (*Juglans californica var. californica*), western sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*), and California bay (*Umbellularia californica*) are protected by Los Angeles Municipal Code. Any tree grown or held for sale by a nursery, or trees planted or grown as part of a tree planting program, are not included in the definition of a protected tree. Although no tree removal is proposed as part of the proposed project, should any of the species listed above that meet the size requirements need to be removed, relocated, or replaced during implementation of a project must comply with the City’s protected tree ordinance.

Ornamental sycamore trees are present on the south side of the structures, along North Main Street. These trees will not be impacted by the project and as a result, no impacts to trees protected under a tree preservation policy or ordinance would occur.

Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan

The proposed project site occurs in heavily-urbanized downtown Los Angeles and does not coincide with the boundaries of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. As a result, the proposed project would not conflict with an approved conservation plan and no impact would occur.
E. Cultural Resources

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause less than significant impacts or less than significant impacts with mitigation incorporated. (see Appendix A)

Historical Resources

The project site and the area within a 250-foot radius of the project site were examined for cultural resource investigations and previously recorded cultural resource sites. Archival research was conducted and an architectural history survey of the Masonic Hall, Merced Theatre, and Pico House was completed. The entirety of the project site has been previously surveyed and/or investigated. The archival research and architectural history survey resulted in the identification of three historical resources that are 45 years of age or older in the project area. All three buildings (the Masonic Hall, the Merced Theatre, and the Pico House) are currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as contributing resources to the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historic Park and are also listed in the local register as part of the Los Angeles Plaza Park Historic-Cultural Monument. Additional details related to previously recorded cultural resources can be found in Appendix D of this IS/MND.

Based on the Cultural Resource Assessment prepared for the proposed project, the three historical resources would retain their character-defining form and footprint, which are important to conveying a specific time, period, and property type associated with buildings. While there would be changes to the buildings, the buildings would receive a new use that requires minimal to no changes of the defining characteristics and site of the resources. The overall historic character of the properties would be preserved, in particular, the building elevations (i.e., west elevation) that are critical to demonstrating the properties’ historic significance. In addition, no materials would be inappropriately removed that characterize the properties, their arrangements, spaces, (remaining) workmanship, and composition. As a result, distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques from the periods of significance would be preserved and remain intact. Deteriorated and non-code compliant features would be repaired or replaced in-kind (i.e., the Merced Theatre interior staircase) and major new construction, such as the proposed elevator, would not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. In addition, the proposed retrofits would be differentiated from the old and would be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the properties and their setting.

Additionally, the proposed alterations planned for the Masonic Hall, the Merced Theatre, and the Pico House are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, particularly the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings. Therefore, the impact related to historic resources would be less than significant.

Archaeological Resources

Based on previous cultural surveys and reports for the project site and surrounding areas, one known archaeological site was encountered in the basement of the Merced Theatre and preserved-in-place. This site appears to date to the construction of the theatre and could shed light on the builders of this NRHP-eligible building and on the development of nineteenth century Los Angeles. Additional details related to previously recorded archaeological resources can be found in Appendix D of this IS/MND.
In addition, archival research indicated the existence of a 19th century cemetery adjacent to the La Iglesia de Nuestra Señora de la Reina de los Angeles (also known as Our Lady of the Angeles and the Plaza Church). Buried within this cemetery are the remains of both Native Americans and colonists. The cemetery is unmarked, and its precise boundaries are unknown.

The background research and survey indicate a high probability for buried archaeological resources within the project area. The project site is in the general vicinity of known Gabrielino villages and prehistoric archaeological sites and is located on the banks of an important water source, the Los Angeles River. Due to the movement of the Los Angeles River, prehistoric archaeological resources may be deeply buried in the project area. In addition, the project site is within 0.5-mile of the Los Angeles Plaza, the historic heart of el Pueblo de Nuestra Señora la Reina de los Angeles. The project area has been intensively used since the early nineteenth century, and the structures in the project footprint date to the latter half of the nineteenth century. Therefore, due to the long occupation of the project vicinity from prehistoric to modern times, archaeological monitoring of ground-disturbing activities is recommended.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-1 would ensure potential impacts related to archeological resources during construction activities would be less than significant. In addition, no impact would occur from the operation of the proposed project.

**Paleontological Resources**

It is not anticipated that paleontological resources would be discovered during ground-disturbing activities since geologic maps and previous studies indicate that work will be limited to deposits of younger Quaternary alluvium deposited by the nearby Los Angeles River, which is too young to typically contain significant fossil deposits. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature. Although not expected to occur, in the event that paleontological resources are discovered during construction, the construction manager would halt construction activities in the immediate area and comply with provisions in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f). Therefore, impacts related to paleontological resources would be less than significant. In addition, no impact would occur from the operation of the proposed project.

**Human Remains**

In compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52, tribal parties were contacted about the project. The NAHC identified nine Native American representatives who may have knowledge of the project site. Each of these individuals was contacted by letter or email on April 20, 2015 and those who did not respond were contacted by phone on June 19, 2015. In the course of the follow-up calls, two individuals expressed concern about the proposed project. Additional information related to the Native American consultation can be found in Appendix D of this IS/MND. As a result of Native American consultation, LABOE will retain a qualified Native American Monitor during ground-disturbing activities.

Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments (LAHCMs) are sites that have been designated by the Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Commission. Within the Cultural Resource Assessment prepared for the proposed project, seven LAHCMs were identified within 250 feet of the project area. One of the seven identified LAHCMs is listed as the First Cemetery of Los Angeles, located at 521 North Main Street.
Archival research revealed that burials have the potential to be encountered during project construction. Additionally, one of the seven LAHCMs identified within 250 feet of the project site is a cemetery. Therefore, construction of the proposed project could potentially disturb human remains. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-2 would ensure impacts related to the discovery of human remains would be less than significant. In addition, no impact is anticipated from the operation of the proposed project.

F. Geology and Soils

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact or less than significant impact. (see Appendix A)

*Fault Zones*

The project site is not located within a State of California Earthquake Fault Zone/Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone. The project site is located in a seismically active area, as is most of southern California. The Hollywood Fault is located approximately 4.3 miles northwest of the project site. However, no active faults are known to cross the project site.

As such, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential adverse effects from the rupture of a known earthquake fault. In addition, the proposed project would retrofit the Masonic Hall, Merced Theatre, and Pico House in accordance with the latest version of the City of Los Angeles Building Code and other applicable federal, state, and local codes relative to seismic criteria. Therefore, the impacts would be less than significant.

*Seismic Ground Shaking*

As with most locations in southern California, the project site is susceptible to ground shaking during an earthquake. As indicated above, the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone, and thus the potential for hazards associated with strong seismic ground shaking such as ground surface rupture affecting the site is considered low.

The proposed project would retrofit the structures in accordance with the latest version of the City of Los Angeles Building Code and other applicable federal, state, and local codes relative to seismic criteria. Therefore, the impact from strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

*Liquefaction*

Liquefaction occurs when water saturated sediments are subjected to extended periods of shaking. Pressure increases in the soil pores temporarily alter the soil state from solid to liquid. Liquefied sediments lose strength, in turn causing the failure of adjacent infrastructure, including bridges and buildings. Whether a soil would resist liquefaction depends on a number of factors, including grain size, compaction and cementation, saturation and drainage, characteristics of the vibration, and the occurrence of past liquefaction. Granular, unconsolidated, saturated sediments are the most likely to liquefy, while dry, dense or cohesive soils tend to resist liquefaction. Liquefaction is generally considered to be a hazard where the groundwater is within 40 to 30 feet of the surface. Where soil drainage is good, the pore pressure, which builds up when ground motion shakes unconsolidated soil, would be more easily dissipated; thus, soils with good drainage are less likely to liquefy.
The project site is located within a state and City-designated liquefiable area. This is due to the high water table and soils conditions under the project site. However, the proposed project involves the rehabilitation of the Masonic Hall, Merced Theatre, and Pico House. In addition, the proposed project would retrofit the structures in compliance with the latest version of the City of Los Angeles Building Code. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure a less than significant impact to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.

**Landslides**

The project is identified as a potential landslide hazard area by the California Department of Mines and Geology. However, according to the City of Los Angeles General Plan, the project site is not located within a City-designated hillside area. Additionally, the proposed project involves the rehabilitation of an existing building and would retrofit the structure in compliance with the latest version of the City of Los Angeles Building Code. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure a less than significant impact to landslides.

**Soil Erosion**

The project site is entirely paved and would remain so after project rehabilitation is complete. Construction would result in ground surface disruption, such as grading and excavation to complete the retrofits. These activities could result in potential erosion at the proposed project site. However, soil exposure would be temporary and short-term and applicable Department of Building and Safety erosion control techniques would limit potential erosion. All construction would need to comply with Best Management Practices identified in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to prevent erosion or loss of topsoil. Compliance with existing regulations and Best Management Practices would ensure a less than significant impact.

**Unstable Geologic Units**

One of the major types of liquefaction induced ground failure is lateral spreading of mildly sloping ground. Lateral spreading involves primarily side-to-side movement of earth materials due to ground shaking, and is evidenced by near-vertical cracks to predominantly horizontal movement of the soil mass involved. As discussed above, the project site is located in an area identified as being at risk for potential liquefaction. However, the proposed project involves the remodel of an existing structure and no ground-disturbing activities would occur. In addition, all remodel work would adhere to the latest version of the City of Los Angeles Building code and other applicable federal, state, and local codes relative to liquefaction criteria. Additionally, proper geotechnical engineering and seismic retrofits would reduce the hazard of geologic instability to a less than significant level.

Subsidence is the lowering of surface elevation due to changes occurring underground, such as the extraction of large amounts of groundwater, oil, or gas. When groundwater is extracted from aquifers at a rate that exceeds the rate of replenishment, overdraft occurs, which can lead to subsidence. However, the proposed project does not anticipate the extraction of any groundwater, oil, or gas from the project site. Therefore, no impacts to subsidence would occur.

Collapsible soils consist of loose dry materials that collapse and compact under the addition of water or excessive loading. Collapsible soils are prevalent throughout the southwestern United States, specifically in areas of young alluvial fans. Soil collapse occurs when the land surface is saturated at depths greater than those reached by typical rain events. The
proposed project would involve the rehabilitation of existing historic structures. In addition, the proposed project would retrofit the Masonic Hall, Merced Theatre, and Pico House in accordance with the latest version of the City of Los Angeles Building Code and other applicable federal, state, and local codes relative to seismic criteria. As such, impacts associated with on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, and collapses would be less than significant.

**Expansive Soils**

The proposed project is in an area identified as having alluvium soils. Prior to any construction and as a standard practice, a geotechnical evaluation would be prepared which would prescribe methods, techniques, and specifications for: site preparation, treatment of undocumented fill and/or alluvial soils, fill placement on sloping ground, fill characteristics, fill placement and compactions, temporary excavations and shoring, permanent slopes, treatment of expansive soils, and treatment of corrosive soils. Design and construction of the proposed project would conform to recommendations in the geotechnical evaluation; therefore, impacts from potentially expansive soil would be less than significant.

**Septic Tanks/Alternative Wastewater Disposal**

Construction and operation of the proposed project would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impact associated with the use of such systems would occur.

**G. Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause less than significant impacts. (see Appendix A)

**Generation of Emissions**

Certain gases in the earth’s atmosphere, classified as greenhouse gases (GHG), play a critical role in determining the earth’s surface temperature. A portion of the solar radiation that enters earth’s atmosphere is absorbed by the earth’s surface, and a smaller portion of this radiation is reflected back toward space. This infrared radiation (i.e., thermal heat) is absorbed by GHGs within the earth’s atmosphere; as a result, infrared radiation released from the earth that otherwise would have escaped back into space is instead “trapped,” resulting in a warming of the atmosphere. This phenomenon, known as the “greenhouse effect,” is responsible for maintaining a habitable climate on Earth. Without the naturally occurring greenhouse effect, Earth would not be able to support life as we know it.

GHGs are present in the atmosphere naturally, are released by natural and anthropogenic sources, and are formed from secondary reactions taking place in the atmosphere. Natural sources of GHGs include the respiration of humans, animals and plants, decomposition of organic matter, and evaporation from the oceans. Anthropogenic sources include the combustion of fossil fuels, waste treatment, and agricultural processes.

Carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O) are the GHGs that that are widely accepted as the principal contributors to human-induced global climate change and would be generated by the proposed project. The majority of CO₂ emissions are byproducts of fossil fuel combustion. CH₄ is the main component of natural gas and is associated with agricultural practices and landfills. N₂O is a colorless GHG that results from industrial processes, vehicle emissions, and agricultural practices.
Global warming potential (GWP) is a concept developed to compare the ability of each GHG to trap heat in the atmosphere relative to CO₂. The GWP of a GHG is based on several factors, including the relative effectiveness of a gas to absorb infrared radiation and length of time (i.e., lifetime) that the gas remains in the atmosphere (“atmospheric lifetime”). The GWP of each gas is measured relative to CO₂, the most abundant GHG. GHGs with lower emissions rates than CO₂ may still contribute to climate change because they are more effective at absorbing outgoing infrared radiation than CO₂ (i.e., high GWP). The concept of CO₂-equivalents (CO₂e) is used to account for the different GWP potentials of GHGs to absorb infrared radiation.

Total construction-related GHG emissions were estimated using the same methodology discussed earlier under Air Quality. Total project construction emissions would be approximately 473 metric tons (MT) of CO₂e. SCAQMD recommends that construction emissions be amortized over 30 years, which is assumed to be the average lifetime of a project’s operations, and added to the operational emissions of the project. When this total is amortized over the 30-year life of the project, annual construction emissions would be approximately 16 MT CO₂e per year.

The SCAQMD has only adopted a significance threshold of 10,000 MT of CO₂ per year for industrial project. The GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Stakeholder Working Group recommended options for evaluating non-industrial projects including thresholds for residential, commercial, and mixed use projects. The draft thresholds released by the SCAQMD include a threshold of 3,000 MT CO₂e per year for all of those lands use types, including commercial projects. At the time of this analysis, these draft thresholds have not been adopted by the SCAQMD. Since the proposed project would include commercial land uses, the proposed SCAQMD threshold of 3,000 MT CO₂e per year will be used for this analysis. Table 4 summarizes the proposed operational emissions and amortized construction GHG emissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions Category</th>
<th>CO₂e (Metric Tons per Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project Operational Emissions</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortized Construction Emissions</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GHG Emissions</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Proposed Threshold (MTCO₂e/Year)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed Significance Threshold?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Estimated by AECOM in 2015

As shown in Table 4, the project-related GHG efficiency, including amortized construction and annual operational GHG emissions, is below the SCAQMD proposed threshold. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

**Applicable Plans and Policies**

AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, requires that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. ARB’s Scoping Plan is the state’s plan to achieve the GHG reductions in California required by AB 32 and also reiterates the state’s role in the long-term goal established in Executive Order S-3-05, which is to reduce GHG emissions to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050.
ARB is required to update the Scoping Plan at least once every five years to evaluate progress and develop future inventories that may guide this process. ARB approved the first update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan: Building on the Framework in 2014. The Scoping Plan Update confirms that the state is on track to meet the 2020 emissions reduction target, but will need to maintain and build upon its existing programs, scale up deployment of clean technologies, and provide more low-carbon options to accelerate GHG emission reductions, especially after 2020, in order to meet the 2050 target. The Scoping Plan update did not directly create any regulatory requirements for construction of the proposed project. However, the Scoping Plan update includes recommended actions (e.g., Phase 2 heavy-duty truck GHG standard standards, enhance and strengthen the Low Carbon Fuel Standard) that would indirectly address GHG emissions from construction activities.

In May 2007, the City of Los Angeles released its Climate Action Plan (CAP), “Green LA: An Action Plan to Lead the Nation in Fighting Global Warming.” The Plan sets forth a goal of reducing the City’s greenhouse gas emissions to 35% below 1990 levels by the year 2030. The CAP is a voluntary plan that identifies over 50 action items, grouped into focus areas, to reduce emissions. Climate LA is the implementation program that provides detailed information, including a context, lead departments, and a timeline for completion, for each action item discussed in the Green LA CAP. Where possible, the Climate LA program document includes potential CO2 emission reductions from full implementation of the measures.

The proposed project would be a relocation of existing land uses, and any building construction activities would be consistent with current Title 24 standards, which would improve energy efficiency of the building. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the AB 32 Scoping Plan, Green LA CAP, or Climate LA. As discussed earlier, the proposed project would also not generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The impact would be less than significant.

H. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact, less than significant impacts, or less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (see Appendix A)

Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials

Implementation of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Construction activities would be temporary in nature and would involve the limited transportation, storage, usage, and disposal of hazardous materials. Such hazardous materials could include on-site fueling/servicing of construction equipment, and the transport of fuels, lubricating fluids, and solvents. These types of materials are not acutely hazardous, and all storage, handling, and disposal of these materials are regulated by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, the U.S. EPA, the Occupational Safety & Health Administration, the City of Los Angeles Fire Department, and the Los Angeles County Health Department. The transport, use, and disposal of construction-related hazardous materials would occur in conformance with applicable federal, state, and local
regulations governing such activities. Therefore, the short-term construction impact would be less than significant.

Long-term operation of the proposed project would not involve the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials as the rehabilitated structures would house the Channel 35 television studio. Additionally, the proposed project would generate industrial wastes or toxic substances during operation. Therefore, project operation would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No operational impact related to the routine use or transport of hazardous materials would occur.

**Release of Hazardous Materials**

The proposed project construction would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. As discussed above, construction activities for both phases of the proposed project may involve limited transport, storage, use, or disposal of some hazardous materials, such as on-site fueling/servicing of construction equipment, and the transport of fuels, lubricating fluids, and solvents. These types of materials are not acutely hazardous, and compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations would ensure that construction impacts related to reasonably foreseeable upset and accident.

Construction of the proposed project would require the rehabilitation of interior walls, ceilings, floorings, roofing, and finishes. An investigation of on-site materials indicated that the existing structures contain asbestos containing materials (ACM), lead-based paint (LBP), and other hazardous materials (OHM), which could create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the release if not properly removed and handled during retrofit activities. The pre-renovation survey consisted of a visual inspection of the buildings, a review of available building information, sampling and laboratory analysis of affected building materials. Additional details pertaining to the surveys can be found within Appendix E of this IS/MND.

**Asbestos-Containing Materials**

ACM were discovered within the Merced Theatre and Pico House. No ACM was discovered in the Masonic Hall. Within the Merced Theatre, plaster and skim coat materials were found on the walls and ceiling. Drywall joint compound materials were also located on the walls and ceiling and window glaze was located on the exterior window frames. Within the Pico House, roofing mastic and roofing debris was located on the southern demising wall of the Pico House building. Similar to the Merced Theatre, plaster and skim coat material located on the walls and ceilings of the Pico House structure and window glaze was located on the exterior window frames. If ACM remains in good condition and is not disturbed, exposures to asbestos are expected to be negligible. However, when ACM deteriorates, is disturbed or damaged, such as during renovation, asbestos fibers may be released creating a potential health hazard for building occupants and construction personnel. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 would ensure that impacts related to the potential release of ACM into the environment would be less than significant.

**Lead-Based Paint**

In Los Angeles County, LBP is defined as paint containing a concentration of 0.7 mg/cm² or 600 ppm. Besides defining LBP, 0.7mg/cm² is also the concentration above which paint that is noted to be loose and flaking, or otherwise distressed, must be abated and stabilized.
Within the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre, nine areas were identified that met this definition and three areas were found in the Pico House. If the LBP remains in good condition and is not disturbed, exposures to lead are expected to be negligible. However, when LBP deteriorates, is disturbed or damaged, such as during demolition or renovation activities, lead dust may be released, creating potential health hazards for building occupants and maintenance personnel. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 would ensure that impacts related to the potential release of LBP into the environment would be less than significant.

Other Hazardous Materials

All three of the buildings were either in the process of being renovated or had already been renovated with respect to replacement of both electrical and HVAC systems. The exception to this was the first floor of the Merced Theatre where approximately 30 fluorescent lighting fixtures were noted to remain. There were also three fixtures with the potential to contain ballasts associated with lights noted on the exterior of the third floor of the Merced Theatre. However, these appeared to be newer units associated with recent renovations. Other than this, no lighting fixtures with the potential to contain PCB, or mercury containing thermostats or switches and/or pre-renovation air conditioning units containing Freon that needed to be replaced, were noted. Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-3 would ensure impacts related to the potential release of OHM into the environment would be less than significant.

Operation of the proposed project would involve television studio use for the City’s local government access channel, Channel 35. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and no operational impacts would occur.

Schools within One-Quarter Mile

There are no existing or proposed schools located within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site. The Ramon C. Cortines School of Visual & Performing Arts, a high school, is located approximately 0.35-mile northwest of the project site at 450 North Grand Avenue. The project site does not contain hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Construction and operation of the project will not involve substantial quantities of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. No impact would occur during construction.

Operation of the proposed project would involve television studio use for the City’s local government access channel, Channel 35. As such, the proposed project would not require the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, operation of the proposed project would not emit or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school that would be projected to release toxic emissions. No operational impact would occur.

Hazardous Materials Sites

An electronic database search of listings maintained by federal, state, and local agencies of sites with known or suspected hazardous material contamination, use of hazardous or toxic materials and regulated wastes, discharge or spillage incidents, discharge permits, landfills, and storage tanks was performed during preparation of this IS/MND.

The project site is not listed in the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker system which includes leaking underground fuel tank sites and spills, leaks, investigations,
and cleanups sites; or the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor Data Management System which includes CORTESE sites, or the Environmental Protection Agency’s database of regulated facilities. The nearest hazardous materials site is a cleanup program site located at 255 Temple Street, approximately 0.2-mile southwest of the project site. The cleanup status of the site is listed as completed and the case was closed as of June 1965. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

Public and Private Airports

The project is not located within a public airport land use plan area, or within two miles of a public airport, and would not create a safety hazard. The nearest public airport or public use airport is Hawthorne Municipal Airport located approximately 10.5 miles to the southwest. Therefore, no safety hazard associated with proximity to an airport is anticipated for the proposed project. No impact would occur.

The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, no safety hazard from proximity to a private airport or airstrip is anticipated from the proposed project. No impact would occur.

Emergency Response

The proposed project would not alter the adjacent street system. As applicable, any traffic detour plans during construction would address emergency response or emergency evacuation for implementation during construction.

During construction activities, vehicles and equipment would access the site via the entrance off Sanchez Street. No road or lane closures are anticipated to be necessary during the construction process. During construction, ingress and egress to the site and surrounding properties, particularly for emergency response vehicles, would be maintained at all times. In addition, operation would not permanently alter the adjacent street system. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would not impair or interfere with implementation of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Less than significant impacts would occur.

Wildland Fires

The project site is not located within a designated High Fire Hazard Severity Zone according to the City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element. The project site and surrounding areas are completely developed and there are no wildlands adjacent to the site. Therefore, no impact involving wildland fires would occur.

I. Hydrology and Water Quality

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact or less than significant impact. (see Appendix A)

Water Quality

The project site consists of three historic structures and is located within a City designated historical monument. The proposed project would not violate a water quality standard or waste discharge requirement. Rehabilitation activities, such as grading and excavation, would result in the disturbance of soil and temporarily increase the potential for soil erosion. Additionally, construction activities and equipment would require the on-site use and
storage of fuels, lubricants, and other hydrocarbon fluids. Storm events occurring during the construction phase would have the potential to carry disturbed sediments and spilled substances from construction activities off-site to nearby receiving waters.

For implementation of the proposed project, prior to the start of rehabilitation, BOE would be required to obtain a General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit, issued by the State Water Resources Control Board. One of the conditions of the General Permit is the development and the implementation of a SWPPP, which would identify structural and nonstructural BMPs to be implemented during the construction phase. As discussed in Section II Subsection C, BOE would also develop and implement an erosion control plan for the proposed project. BMPs developed for the SWPPP and the erosion control plan may include, but not be limited to, minimizing the extent of disturbed areas and duration of exposure, stabilizing and protecting disturbed areas, keeping runoff velocities low, and retaining sediment within the construction area, as well as the use of temporary desilting basins, silt fences, gravel bag barriers, temporary soil stabilization, temporary drainage inlet protection, and diversion dikes and interceptor swales. With implementation BMPs, the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Therefore, impacts on water quality from construction activities would be less than significant.

Upon completion of the proposed project, storm flows would be directed to the existing storm drain system, similar to existing conditions. There would be no exposed soil remaining at the completion of rehabilitation activities; therefore, there would be no potential for soil erosion or contamination. No long-term impact to water quality would occur during project operations.

**Groundwater**

No groundwater wells are located within the project site. The nearest groundwater well is maintained by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works and is identified as well number 2772E. This well is located near the I-5 and SR 110 interchange, approximately two miles northeast of the project site. As of January 2010, the groundwater level was recorded at 32.7 feet below ground surface. As discussed above in Section II Subsection C, Project Construction, excavation for proposed rehabilitation activities would occur to a depth of approximately 14 feet. However, it is not anticipated that groundwater would be encountered during excavation, as deep excavations would not be necessary. Additionally, the proposed project does not involve any direct extraction of groundwater. The proposed project involves rehabilitation of two existing structures and a coordinated structural retrofit of the adjacent existing Pico House. Therefore, the project site would remain primarily covered with permeable surfaces. Further, following rehabilitation, the ground cover would be returned to its existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would neither decrease the amount of storm water entering the groundwater table through an increase in the amount of impermeable surfaces, nor deplete groundwater through extraction. The impact to groundwater supply and recharge would be less than significant.

**Drainage Patterns**

The proposed project would be located within the existing structures. Interior and exterior retrofits would occur within the building footprints and surrounding areas within the parcel that have been previously disturbed with development. As discussed, following rehabilitation, the area would be returned to its existing condition. As such, the proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. As discussed above,
the project would result in temporary soil disturbance activities during construction during which time a SWPPP for the control of soil erosion and sediment runoff would be implemented. However, compliance with SWPPP and the applicable requirements of the municipal code, including grading requirements, would minimize impacts. Therefore, the impacts related to erosion resulting from altered drainage patterns would be less than significant.

As discussed above, the proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. All retrofits would occur within the existing building footprints and surrounding areas within the already disturbed parcel. Following rehabilitation activities, all areas would be returned to their existing condition. As such, after rehabilitation, stormwater flows would be similar to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project does not have the potential to substantially increase the rate of surface runoff. In addition, as discussed above, BMPs would be implemented to control runoff from the project sites during construction. Therefore, no flooding is expected to occur on- or off-site. The impact would be less than significant.

Runoff

As discussed above, implementation of the proposed project would result in similar amounts of permeable surfaces as under existing conditions. Thus, no substantial increase in the amount of runoff from the project sites is anticipated.

Additionally, BMPs would be identified in the SWPPP developed for the proposed project pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit requirements to control runoff from the project sites during construction. Thus, the proposed project would not create or contribute runoff which would exceed drainage system capacity, nor would it provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The impact would be less than significant.

Flood Hazards

A 100-year flood is a flood defined as having a 1.0 percent chance of occurring in any given year. The proposed project is located within areas designated as Zone X on the Federal Emergency Management Agency flood insurance rate maps. The Zone X designation indicates areas determined to be outside the 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain. Further, the proposed project does not include a residential component; therefore, it would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. No impact would occur.

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone. As discussed above, the proposed project is located within areas designated as Zone X on the Federal Emergency Management Agency flood insurance rate maps. The Zone X designation indicates areas determined to be outside the 100-year floodplain. The proposed project involves the rehabilitation of two existing structures. Therefore, the proposed project would not have the potential to impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood area. No impact to flooding would occur.

The proposed project is not located within an inundation area. However, the project site is located near the inundation area of the Los Angeles River. Following rehabilitation of the structures, all areas would be returned to their existing condition. Additionally, no habitable structures would be included as part of the proposed project. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss,
injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. The impact would be less than significant.

**Inundation**

Seiches are large waves generated in enclosed bodies of water in response to ground shaking. Although the project site is located west of the Los Angeles River, the Los Angeles River is not considered an enclosed large body of water that could experience seiches during an earthquake. Thus, there is no potential for seiches impacting the project site. No impact would occur.

Tsunamis are tidal waves generated in large bodies of water caused by fault displacement or major ground movement. Hazardous tsunamis, which are rare along the Los Angeles coastline, have the potential to cause flooding in the low-lying coastal area. The project site is located approximately 14 miles from the Pacific Ocean and is not within a tsunami hazard area. Therefore, no impact would occur.

As discussed above, the project site is located within a City-designated hillside area. However, the proposed project would involve rehabilitation of three existing structures and would adhere to the City Hillside Grading Ordinance during construction. Therefore, impacts associated with inundation from mudflow would be less than significant.

**J. Land Use and Planning**

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact. (see Appendix A)

**Physical Barriers**

The proposed project would occur within the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre located in the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historic Park in the City of Los Angeles. The proposed project would also involve a coordinated structural retrofit to the Masonic Hall, Merced Theatre, and Pico House. Neither construction nor operation of the proposed project would include features such as a highway, above-ground infrastructure, or an easement that would cause a permanent disruption to an established community or would otherwise create a physical barrier within an established community. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community, and no impact would occur.

**Existing Plans and Policies**

The project site is located entirely within the City of Los Angeles in the Central City Community Plan Area. The Central City Community Plan is one of 35 community plans that comprise the land use element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan. The community plan establishes the goals, objectives, policies, and programs applicable to the Central City Community Plan Area.

The City’s current zoning designation for the project site is PF-1VL (Public Facilities – Very Limited Height District). The site is designated as Public Facilities by the General Plan. The proposed project is a public facility owned by the City of Los Angeles, and would be consistent with the current zoning designation.

The proposed project is also consistent with the goals and policies set out in the City’s community plan. The Central City Community Plan advocates adaptive use of historic
buildings. Policy 10-2.7 and 10-2.8 both encourage the use of historic buildings to accommodate office space and new government uses within the Civic Center boundaries. The proposed project would rehabilitate two historic structures within the Civic Center for the City-owned Channel 35 television studios. In addition, Policy 10-2.2 encourages the use, as appropriate, of the State Historical Building Code, the federal Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings or the voluntary Historic Downtown Los Angeles Design Guidelines to ensure architectural and historic integrity when rehabilitating historic structures. As previously stated, the proposed project would be design in conformance with Secretary of Interior’s Standards. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the land use policies contained in the Central City Community Plan.

Additionally, the proposed project is consistent with the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument’s 2013-2015 Strategic Plan. The strategic plan is developed under the direction of the Board of Commissioners with input from Olvera Street merchants and other community members. Within Chapter 4, Capital Projects, the proposed project is listed as a Historical Asset and Museum initiative (Initiative 4.1.7). The plan also includes an initiative within Chapter 6, Partnerships. Initiative 6.1.1 calls for an increase in education partnerships with the Los Angeles Unified School District. As part of the proposed project, an educational component of renting studio equipment to local students for school projects would be included. As such, the proposed project would be consistent with the El Pueblo 2013-2015 Strategic Plan.

Existing land uses surrounding the project site include public facilities, open space, commercial, and industrial uses. Multi-family residential uses are located to the northwest of the project site. The proposed project is located in a highly urbanized area. Although currently vacant, the proposed project site is surrounded by other historic buildings in the El Pueblo Historical Monument, which are frequented by visitors and other pedestrians. The proposed project would not conflict with planned land uses that would surround the site and would contribute to the Civic Center District as a whole by providing a mix of uses. As such, the proposed project would not conflict with the applicable land use plans, and no impact would occur.

**Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Communities Conservation Plan**

The proposed project would be located within a highly urbanized area. As previously discussed, the project site is not located in a habitat conservation plan or a natural community conservation plan. As such, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an approved conservation plan, and no impact would occur.

**K. Mineral Resources**

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact. (see Appendix A)

No mineral resources are identified within the project site. However, according to the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources, four oil wells are located 0.6-mile southeast of the project site. The oil wells are all plugged and no longer active. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of valuable known mineral resources, and no impact would occur.
L. Noise

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact, less than significant impact, or less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. (see Appendix A)

**Noise Standards**

The City of Los Angeles has established policies and regulations concerning the generation and control of noise that could adversely affect its citizens and noise-sensitive land uses. Regarding construction, Section 41.40 (Noise Due to Construction, Excavation Work – When Prohibited) of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) states that no construction or repair work shall be performed between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., since such activities would generate loud noises and disturb persons occupying sleeping quarters in any adjacent dwelling, hotel, apartment, or other place of residence. Further, no person, other than an individual home owner engaged in the repair or construction of his/her single-family dwelling, shall perform any construction or repair work of any kind or perform such work within 500 feet of land so occupied before 8:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on any Saturday or on a federal holiday, or at any time on any Sunday. Under certain conditions, the City may grant a waiver to allow limited construction activities to occur outside of the limits described above.

Section 112.05 (Maximum Noise Level of Powered Equipment or Powered Hand Tools) of the LAMC also specifies the maximum noise level of powered equipment or powered hand tools. Any powered equipment or hand tool that produces a maximum noise level exceeding 75 A-weighted decibels (dBA) at a distance of 50 feet is prohibited. However, this noise limitation does not apply where compliance is technically infeasible. Technically infeasible means the above noise limitation cannot be met despite the use of mufflers, shields, sound barriers and/or any other noise reduction device or techniques during the operation of equipment.

**Existing Noise Levels**

Noise-and vibration-sensitive land uses are locations where people reside or where the presence of unwanted sound could adversely affect the use of the land. Residences, schools, hospitals, guest lodging, museums, libraries, and some passive recreation areas would each be considered noise- and vibration-sensitive and may warrant unique measures for protection from intruding noise. Sensitive receptors within 500 feet of the project site include:

- Chinese American Museum located to the southeast
- LA Plaza de Cultura y Artes located to the north
- Los Angeles Plaza Park located to the northeast
- Our Lady Queen of Angels Church located to the north
- La Plaza United Methodist Church located to the northeast

The existing noise environment is predominantly characterized by vehicular traffic and to a lesser extent by occasional aircraft flyovers and other typical urban noise. Sound measurements were taken using a SoundPro DL Sound Level Meter on March 31, 2015, to determine existing noise levels in the project vicinity. Daytime measurements were used to
establish existing ambient noise conditions and to provide a baseline for evaluating construction impacts and to assess operational impacts. As shown in Table 5, daytime existing ambient sound levels near the project site ranged between 63.9 and 71.5 dBA Equivalent Noise Level ($L_{eq}$). $L_{eq}$ is the average noise level on an energy basis for any specific time period. The $L_{eq}$ for one hour is the average energy noise level during the hour. The average noise level is based on the energy content (acoustic energy) of the sound. $L_{eq}$ can be thought of as the level of a continuous noise which has the same energy content as the fluctuating noise level. The Equivalent Noise Level is expressed in units of dBA. The noise and vibration assessment is included as Appendix F of this IS/MND.

### Table 5
**Existing Noise Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Monitoring Location</th>
<th>Noise Level (dBA, $L_{eq}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese American Museum</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Plaza Park</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Plaza United Methodist Church</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Construction**

Construction of the proposed project would involve interior and exterior retrofits to the existing historic structures. Interior rehabilitation would mostly involve the removal of non-original tenant improvements. Partitions, doors, ceilings, mechanical ducts, plumbing, unused electrical equipment, and finishes would be removed throughout the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre for new tenant improvements. Improvements would include new roofing and new plumbing, electrical, and mechanical distribution. Anticipated equipment for the grading phase includes two excavators, a bulldozer or skip loader, a backhoe loader, a soil compactor, shoring elements, and dump trucks. The concrete placement phase would require concrete mixing trucks and the steel erection phase would require a crane.

The remaining exterior historical facades are located along Main and Sanchez Streets. Although they have been altered throughout the years, the majority of the facades exist as originally constructed. No alterations would be made to these exteriors. Exterior retrofits would be limited to the non-historical facade. New openings would be made in the Masonic Hall for doors and staff access. To allow for the installation of an elevator at the rear of the Masonic Hall, the south end of the balcony would be removed and rebuilt in a straighter configuration. In addition, several non-original windows will be converted to door openings to provide access to the elevator walkway and the new roof deck above the Masonic Hall. Improvements will also be made to the existing parking lot. The proposed project would also structurally retrofit the Pico House.

Typical noise levels from various types of equipment that may be used during construction are listed in Table 6. The table shows noise levels at distances of 50 and 100 feet from the construction noise source. Construction activities typically require the use of numerous pieces of noise-generating equipment. The noise levels shown in Table 7 take into account that multiple pieces of construction equipment would be operating simultaneously. When considered as an entire process with multiple pieces of equipment, project-related activity (i.e., structural and finishing work) would generate noise levels between 85 and 89 dBA $L_{eq}$ at 50 feet.
Table 6
Maximum Noise Levels of Common Construction Machines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Equipment</th>
<th>Noise Level (dBA, $L_{eq}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loader</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Compactor</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranes</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumes a 6-dBA drop-off rate for noise generated by a “point source” and traveling over hard surfaces.


Table 7
Typical Outdoor Construction Noise Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Noise Level at 50 Feet (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finishing</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 8 presents the estimated noise levels at sensitive receptors within 500 feet of the project site. The noise level at each receptor location was calculated by making a distance adjustment to the construction source sound level and logarithmically adding the adjusted construction noise source level to the ambient noise level. Existing noise levels at sensitive receptors range from 63.9 to 71.5 dBA $L_{eq}$ and existing noise levels with construction activity would range from 71.9 to 89.1 dBA $L_{eq}$.

Table 8
Estimated Construction Noise Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitive Receptor</th>
<th>Distance (feet)</th>
<th>Maximum Noise Level (dBA)</th>
<th>Existing Ambient (dBA, $L_{eq}$)</th>
<th>New Ambient (dBA, $L_{eq}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese American Museum</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Plaza Park</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Plaza de Culturas y Artes</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Queen of Angels Church</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Plaza United Methodist Church</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TAHA, 2015.

The sensitive receptors listed in Table 8 would experience an increase in ambient noise levels during construction activity. Interior construction activity would not be audible beyond the property line; however, exterior construction activity would utilize heavy-duty equipment...
and trucks, and the proposed project would be required to comply with these LAMC requirements. The estimated construction-related noise levels associated with the proposed project would exceed the numerical noise threshold of 75 dBA at 50 feet from the noise source as outlined in the LAMC. Pursuant to LAMC Section 112.05, construction noise levels are exempt from the 75 dBA noise threshold if all technically feasible noise attenuation measures are implemented. Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-10 are feasible measures to control noise levels, including engine mufflers and noise blanket barriers. Mitigation Measure NOI-3 would reduce construction noise levels by approximately 3 dBA. Mitigation Measure NOI-4 would reduce equipment-related noise levels at Los Angeles Plaza Park and beyond by at least 5 dBA. The other mitigation measures, while difficult to quantify, would assist in attenuating construction noise levels. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the noise levels associated with construction of the proposed project to the maximum extent that is technically feasible. Therefore, with mitigation, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to construction noise.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-10 would reduce construction equipment engine noise levels, but not to below 75 dBA at 50 feet. However, as all feasible construction noise mitigation measures would be implemented, the LAMC Section 112.05 noise threshold would not apply, and construction activity would result in a less than significant noise impact.

Operation

The proposed project would employ approximately 22 people, and the studio would operate from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Operational activity would be conducted inside the studio and would not be audible outside the buildings. Regarding mobile noise, the California Department of Transportation Technical Noise Supplement has established that a doubling of traffic is needed to audibly increase traffic noise by 3 dBA. The proposed project would generate less than 22 peak hour trips and would not double traffic volumes on any roadway segment. Each roadway segment near the project site supports well over 100 vehicles during peak hours. Regarding stationary noise, mechanical equipment (e.g., heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment) would either be on the roof of the buildings or within the basements. If located on the roof, mechanical equipment would be screened from view to comply with the LAMC requirements for both daytime (65 dBA) and nighttime (60 dBA) operation at the property line. This noise level is reduced by at least 10 dBA when the equipment is enclosed within a structure. Based on these requirements, mechanical equipment would increase noise by less than 3 dBA. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to operational noise.

Vibration

A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would cause excessive vibration levels. High levels of vibration may cause damage to buildings or interfere with the activities within buildings. The City of Los Angeles has not established significance thresholds for assessing impacts from vibration. The Federal Transit Administration has established impact criteria for assessing building damage and annoyance. The relevant criteria in vibration decibels (VdB) are in Table 9 and used in this analysis to assess vibration impacts. Table 9 also shows the distance from the receptor at which construction activity that involves heavy-duty equipment. For example, construction activities could result in building damage when located within 20 feet of an historic structure or interfere with building activities when located within 65 feet of intuitional land uses.
Table 9
Vibration Significance Thresholds and Impact Distances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Damage</th>
<th>Vibration Level (VdB)</th>
<th>Distance to Impact (Feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings Extremely Susceptible to Vibration Damage (e.g., Historic Structures)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Engineered Timber and Masonry Buildings</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineered Concrete and Masonry Buildings (No Plaster)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforced Concrete, Steel, or Timber (No Plaster)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Activity Interference b                                                        |                       |                          |
| Institutional Land Uses With Primarily Daytime Use                              | 75                    | 64                       |

*a The distance is based on a bulldozer, which generate a vibration level of 87 VdB at 25 feet.

*b Construction activity is a frequent event occurring more than 70 times per day.


Construction

The project site is located within the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre buildings, both of which are historic structures. The proposed project would also structurally retrofit the Pico House, which is adjacent to the Merced Theatre. Construction activity would occur adjacent to and within these structures and vibration from construction has the potential to damage these buildings. Mitigation Measure NOI-11 would ensure that these historic structures would not be irreparably damaged by construction-related vibration.

Additionally, the project site is bordered by several other historic buildings in the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historic District. The nearest building to the project site is located approximately 30 feet to the east (e.g., Chinese American Museum) across Sanchez Street. Exterior facade work would not occur along Sanchez Street although improvements would be made to the parking area located at the southeast portion of the project site. Equipment would be located within 20 feet of the Chinese American Museum. No other buildings would be located within 20 feet of construction activity, including the LA Plaza de Cultura y Artes located to the west across Main Street. Mitigation Measure NOI-11 would ensure that the adjacent historic structures would not be irreparably damaged by construction-related vibration.

Regarding interference with activities, Table 9 shows that construction activity located within 64 feet of institutional land uses could generate annoying vibration levels. It is anticipated that construction equipment would be located within 20 feet of the Chinese American and Old Plaza Fire House Museums. No other building would be located within 64 feet of the project site, including the LA Plaza de Cultura y Artes and Los Angeles Plaza Park. Mitigation Measure NOI-12 would ensure that construction-related vibration would not interfere with activities at the Chinese American or Old Plaza Fire House Museums.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-11 and NOI-12 would reduce construction-related vibration impacts. Therefore, with implementation of these feasible mitigation measures, vibration impacts during construction would be less than significant.
**Operation**

The proposed project would not include significant stationary sources of vibration, such as heavy equipment operations. Operational vibration in the project vicinity would be generated by vehicular travel on the local roadways. Similar to existing conditions, traffic-related vibration levels would not be perceptible by sensitive receptors. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to operational vibration levels.

**Permanent Increase in Noise**

A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would cause a substantial permanent increase in noise levels above existing ambient levels. As discussed above, operation of the proposed project would not exceed the standards established by the City. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

**Temporary Increase in Noise**

A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. As discussed above, construction activities would result in temporary increases in noise levels at the project site. With implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-10, construction noise impacts would be less than significant.

**Airport Noise**

A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from a public airport or public use airport. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity (i.e., two miles) of any public airport. The nearest public airport or public use airport is Hawthorne Municipal Airport located approximately 10.5 miles to the southwest. The proposed project would not expose people to excessive noise levels associated with public airport activities. Therefore, no impacts related to public airport noise levels would occur.

A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from a private airstrip. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity (i.e., two miles) of any private airstrip. The proposed project would not expose any people to excessive noise levels associated with any private airstrip activities. Therefore, no impacts related to private airstrip noise levels would occur.

**M. Population and Housing**

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact or less than significant impact. (see Appendix A)

**Population Growth**

The proposed project does not include construction or operation of any residential or commercial land uses, and therefore, would not result in a direct population increase from construction of new homes or businesses. The proposed project would involve the remodel of an existing historic structure to relocate the operations for Los Angeles City View Channel
35. As discussed in Section II Subsection H, Operation and Maintenance, 13 employees currently work at Channel 35. Relocating studio operations to the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre would provide additional space to allow up to 22 employees to work at the new location. Therefore, the project would create a less than significant impact on population growth.

**Replacement Housing**

The proposed project involves the rehabilitation of two existing structures for Channel 35 studio use and a coordinated structural retrofit to the adjacent Pico House. Therefore, neither phase of the proposed project would require the removal of existing housing. Implementation of the proposed project would not impact the number or availability of existing housing in the area, and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact to housing would occur.

As discussed above, there are currently no residential uses on the project site. As such, no persons would be displaced as a result of implementation of either phase of the proposed project. Construction of replacement housing would not be necessary, and no impact would occur.

**N. Public Services**

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact or less than significant impact. (see Appendix A)

**Fire Protection**

The project site and surrounding area is currently served by the City of Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) Station Number 4, located at 450 East Temple Street (approximately 0.5-mile from project site) and Fire Station Number 3, located at 108 North Fremont Street (approximately 0.75-mile from the project site). Both fire stations would provide adequate fire service coverage.

The proposed project would not result in an increase in population and thus would not generate a need for new or altered fire protection facilities. In addition, the proposed project would be constructed in accordance with all applicable fire codes set forth by the state Fire Marshall and LAFD. Therefore, the proposed project would not be considered a fire hazard and would not exceed the capacity of the LAFD to serve the site or other areas with existing fire protection services. The nearest local fire responders would be notified, as appropriate, of traffic control plans during construction so as to coordinate emergency response routing during construction work. Less than significant impacts associated with fire protection would occur.

**Police Protection**

The proposed project area is served by the City of Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), Central Division. The Central Community Police Station is located at 251 East 6th Street in Los Angeles, approximately 1 mile southwest of the project site.

As previously stated above, the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in residential populations or employee populations. As such, implementation and operation of the proposed project would not increase the need for additional police protection services
or adversely affect service ratios or response times. No impact to police protection services would occur.

**Schools**

The proposed project would not provide new housing or substantial new employment opportunities. Therefore, it would not generate new students or increase the demand on local school systems. The proposed project would not adversely affect any existing or planned school facilities. No impact to schools would occur.

**Parks**

As previously discussed, the construction of the proposed project would not induce growth, either directly or indirectly, and therefore, would not increase the demand for recreation in the area. Therefore, no impacts to parks would occur.

**Other Public Facilities**

Construction and operation of the proposed project would not induce growth, either directly or indirectly, and, therefore, would not increase the demand for or use of libraries or other public facilities in the area. Therefore, no impact to other public facilities would occur.

**O. Recreation**

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact. (see Appendix A)

**Physical Deterioration**

As previously discussed, the proposed project would not induce growth, either directly or indirectly, and, therefore, would not increase the use of existing neighborhood parks or other recreational facilities such that physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. No impact would occur.

**Expansion of Recreation Facilities**

As previously discussed, the proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The proposed project would involve the rehabilitation of existing structures for Channel 35 studio use as well as a coordinated structural retrofit to the adjacent Pico House. Therefore, the proposed project would not involve the construction of new housing. Additionally, the proposed project would contribute to El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historic Park by restoring historic buildings. As such, no impact would occur.

**P. Transportation and Traffic**

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause no impact or less than significant impact. (see Appendix A)

**Applicable Plans and Policies**

A project would have a significant traffic impact if the traffic volume to roadway capacity ratio was increased, as shown in Table 10.
Table 10

Los Angeles Department of Transportation Significance Thresholds for
Increases in Peak-Hour V/C Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Final Volume/Capacity Ratio (V/C)</th>
<th>Project Related V/C Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.701 – 0.800</td>
<td>Equal to or greater than 0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.801 – 0.900</td>
<td>Equal to or greater than 0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E and F</td>
<td>&gt; 0.900</td>
<td>Equal to or greater than 0.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Final V/C is the V/C ratio at an intersection, considering impacts from the project, ambient, and related project growth and without proposed traffic impact mitigations.

This section evaluates the existing and future (cumulative) traffic conditions surrounding roadway intersections associated with the implementation of the proposed project. The traffic study is included as Appendix G of this IS/MND.

Construction Traffic

An evaluation was performed that addressed the potential for proposed project construction to affect traffic in the project area. As part of the study, traffic data from the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) historical traffic count database was used to characterize the existing conditions. Intersection counts at the three intersections were conducted on Tuesday, March 18, 2014, Tuesday, May 20, 2014, and Tuesday, December 12, 2012, respectively, for the 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. peak periods. The traffic counts were increased by one percent per year to reflect 2015 conditions. The project study area includes the following three study intersections:

1. Main Street and Arcadia Street
2. Main Street and Aliso Street
3. Alameda Street and Los Angeles Street/Union Station Driveway

Based on the traffic data, all of the study intersections are operating at Level of Service (LOS) A during the AM and PM peak periods.

The proposed project would be constructed over a period of approximately 14 months. Based on the anticipated construction equipment and workers, the daily total trips during construction were estimated to be 60 construction personnel trips and 50 truck trips. Based on the daily total of 60 construction personnel trips, 30 inbound trips would occur in the AM peak and 30 outbound trips would occur in the PM peak. Based on the daily total of 50 truck trips, 3 trips in and 3 trips out would occur during both the AM and PM peak hours.

To determine the impacts of peak construction activity on the roadway system, construction-generated traffic was added to existing traffic (year 2015), traffic generated by other projects in the surrounding area, and ambient growth in traffic volumes to determine future (year 2017) plus project conditions. The incremental changes in peak-hour volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratios were then compared to LADOT significance thresholds (shown in Table 10) to determine the traffic impacts. The future traffic conditions without and with peak construction traffic generated by the proposed project at the study intersections is shown in Table 11.
### Table 11
**Future Without and With Project Conditions – Peak Hour of Service (2017)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Intersections</th>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
<th>Future 2017 No Project</th>
<th>Future 2017 With Project</th>
<th>Change in V/C or LOS</th>
<th>Significant Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V/C or Delay (sec)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>V/C or Delay (sec)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (sec)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Delay (sec)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Main Street &amp; Arcadia Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Main Street &amp; Aliso Street</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Alameda Street &amp; Los Angeles Station Driveway</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Unsignalized intersection. LOS determination based on average seconds of delay per vehicle.

As shown in Table 11, during construction, all study intersections would continue to operate at LOS A during the AM and PM peak hours. However, as discussed in Section II Subsection G, BOE would be required to implement a construction worksite traffic control plan to minimize the effect on roadway operations in the vicinity of the construction site. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Operational Traffic**

Operation of the proposed project will not result in permanent traffic impacts to area roadway facilities. The new employment levels at the project site are expected to be low, and trips during the operations period would be less than those identified for the construction period. As such, permanent physical or operations improvements to either study intersections or roadway segments are not required. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Congestion Management Program**

The Congestion Management Program (CMP) was created statewide because of Proposition 111 and has been implemented locally by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. The CMP for Los Angeles County requires the analysis of the traffic impacts of individual development projects with potentially regional significance. A specific system of arterial roadways and freeways comprises the CMP system. In conformance with CMP Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines, a traffic impact analysis is conducted at:

- CMP arterial monitoring intersections, including freeway on-ramps or off-ramps, where the proposed project would add 50 or more vehicle trips during either morning or afternoon weekday peak hours.
- CMP mainline freeway-monitoring locations, where the proposed project would add 150 or more trips, in either direction, during either the morning or afternoon weekday peak hours.
The nearest CMP arterial monitoring location to the project site is at CMP #44 Alvarado Street and Sunset Boulevard (approximately two miles from the project site). Based on the trip generation and distribution of the proposed project, 50 or more new project trips per hour would not be added at this CMP intersection. Therefore, no impact to the CMP for Los Angeles County would occur.

The nearest CMP mainline freeway-monitoring location to the project site is on US 101 n/o Vignes Street, approximately 0.4-mile from the project site. The proposed project would add less than 150 new trips per hour to any freeway segments. Therefore, no impact to the CMP for Los Angeles County would occur.

**Air Traffic Patterns**

The proposed project would include rehabilitation of two existing structures for Channel 35 studio use as well as a coordinated structural retrofit involving the adjacent Pico House. Neither construction nor operation of the proposed project would affect air traffic patterns. Therefore, no impact to air traffic patterns would occur.

**Design Features**

As previously discussed, operational use of the rehabilitated Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre would not result in significant traffic impacts. The proposed project would be accessed by Sanchez Street (gated) located off of Arcadia Street. The small parking lot associated with the two structures is located behind the gated entrance to Sanchez Street and would remain gated after project construction, limited to Channel 35 vans and other employees. The access intersection on Arcadia Street would not create a hazard to traffic or pedestrians. Additionally, the proposed project would not create sharp curves or dangerous intersections. The proposed project would not increase hazards to a design feature or have any incompatible uses. No impacts would occur.

**Emergency Access**

During construction activities, vehicles and equipment would access the site via the entrance off Sanchez Street. No road or lane closures are anticipated to be necessary during the construction process. During construction, ingress and egress to the site and surrounding properties, particularly for emergency response vehicles, would be maintained at all times. Main Street has been designated as a “selected disaster route” in the City of Los Angeles General Plan Safety Element. As part of standard specifications, construction that would disrupt Main Street would be coordinated with applicable emergency service providers prior to start of construction so that alternative route planning can occur and be implemented if required. In addition, access to emergency vehicles would be maintained at all times during construction. Construction and operation of the proposed project would utilize the current access areas at the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not affect emergency access or result in inadequate emergency access. No impact would occur.

**Alternative Transportation**

Four bus lines serve the project area: Metro Lines 33, 92, 728, and 733. Rerouting of lines or relocations of bus stops would not be required during construction or operation of the proposed project. A bike lane on Main Street, from 9th Street to Cesar E. Chavez Avenue, exists adjacent to the project site and other bike lanes exist in the project area on North Spring Street and North Los Angeles Street. However, bike lanes in the project area would
not be affected by project construction or operation. As such, no impact to alternative transportation modes or supporting programs would occur.

Q. Utilities and Service Systems

Initial screening determined that the proposed project would cause less than significant impact. (see Appendix A)

**Wastewater Treatment Requirements**

As discussed above, a SWPPP would be prepared for the proposed project that would specify appropriate Best Management Practices to control runoff from the site during construction. Additionally, any wastewater discharged by the proposed project must comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System requirements. Construction activities associated with both phases of the proposed project would comply with all applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The construction impact would be less than significant.

The proposed project includes retrofits to the Masonic Hall and Merced Theatre plumbing systems. Due to the structures being vacant for an extended period of time, wastewater generation will increase slightly to accommodate new restroom and kitchen facilities. However, a total of 22 employees will work at the Channel 35 property. Therefore, increases in wastewater generation will be minimal and operational impacts will be less than significant.

**Water/Wastewater Treatment Facilities**

As discussed above, the proposed project is expected to generate minimal quantities of wastewater. The proposed project would accommodate restrooms and kitchen facilities, which would produce wastewater. The impact would be less than significant.

**Stormwater Drainage Facilities**

The proposed project involves the rehabilitation of two existing structures for Channel 35 studio use and a coordinated structural retrofit involving the adjacent Pico House. As discussed above, all drainage flows would be routed through existing storm water infrastructure serving the project site and surrounding area. Additionally, following construction of the proposed project, all areas would be returned to their existing conditions. As such, after construction, stormwater flows would be similar to the current condition as there would be no increase in the volume of runoff. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities. The impact would be less than significant.

**Water Supply**

The proposed project involves the rehabilitation of two existing structures for Channel 35 studio use and a coordinated structural retrofit involving the adjacent Pico House. Other than temporary construction water use and minimal increases in potable water associated with the new restrooms and kitchen facilities, the proposed project would not include new water uses. Therefore, the construction and operation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to water supply.
Landfills

Rehabilitation activities would generate some waste, such as demolition debris. As discussed in Section II Subsection C above, the proposed project construction would incorporate source reduction techniques and recycling measures and maintain a recycling program to divert waste in accordance with the Citywide Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance. These measures would minimize the amount of debris generated by the proposed project that would need to be disposed of in an area landfill. All recyclable waste would require disposal at Waste Management’s Downtown Diversion Facility, located at 2424 East Olympic Boulevard in Los Angeles, approximately 2.2 miles southeast of the project site. Any non-recyclable construction waste generated would be disposed of at a landfill approved to accept such materials, such as the Downey Area Recycling and Transfer Facility located at 9770 Washburn Road in Downey, approximately 11.7 miles southeast of the project site. Approximately 11,000 cubic feet of soil would be excavated during project construction and would be removed and transferred to the appropriate facility. City standards require demolition debris to be recycled where feasible; therefore, impacts associated with construction debris would be less than significant.

Operation of the proposed project would include Channel 35 studio facilities. Operational solid waste would be minimal and is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on landfill capacity.

Solid Waste

The proposed project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. As discussed above, construction debris would be recycled or disposed of according to local and regional standards. All materials would be handled and disposed of in accordance with existing local, state, and federal regulations. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure a less than significant impact.

R. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Based on the foregoing, it has been determined that:

No plant or animal species listed on any state or federal lists for endangered, threatened or special status species were identified on-site. The project site occurs in heavily-urbanized downtown Los Angeles and consists of historic structures and ornamental street trees, including Peruvian pepper (*Schinus molle*) and sycamore (*Plantanus* sp), which would not be removed as part of the proposed project. However, due to the presence of ornamental trees which may provide suitable nesting habitat for birds protected under the MBTA, impacts from noise and dust could occur if construction on the outside of the building occurs during the nesting bird season, generally considered to extend from February 15 through September 15. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would ensure that nesting birds protected under the MBTA are not significantly impacted. Additionally, the Masonic Hall, Merced Theatre, and Pico House are historic structures themselves and potential burial sites are located in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the area is culturally-sensitive, and there are known cultural resources within the immediate vicinity; Mitigation Measures CULT-1 and CULT-2 are provided to address the potential discovery of previously unknown archeological resources and the potential to disturb human remains, which reduces potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

As discussed in Section IV Subsection C above, the proposed project would generate additional air pollutant emissions during construction; however, these increases would be
short term and would not exceed the thresholds of significance established by the Great Basin Unified APCD. Therefore, the impact to air quality would not be cumulatively considerable. As discussed in Section IV Subsection G above, GHG emissions contribute to the global condition known as the greenhouse effect. Because this is an issue that is by its very nature cumulative, CARB has established a threshold of significance and climate reduction strategies. The proposed project would generate short-term emissions of GHGs during construction, but virtually no emissions during operations. The emissions generated during construction would be far below the established threshold of significance. The cumulative impact would be less than significant. As discussed in Section IV Subsection L above, construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in vehicle trips or other activity at the project site. As discussed above, construction activities would result in temporary increases in noise levels at the project site. Implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-10 would reduce significant impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable noise impact. As discussed in Section IV Subsection P above, construction activities would generate some additional vehicle trips on a short-term and temporary basis. However, these increases would not be substantial, and there would be no cumulative traffic impact during construction.

The project does not have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.

With implementation of the mitigation measures listed in Section V, the proposed project is not anticipated to have significant impacts that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, all potentially significant environmental effects associated with the proposed project can be mitigated to less than significant levels.

V. MITIGATION MEASURES

The following describes the mitigation measures that, if incorporated into the project, would reduce an effect to less than significant and briefly explains how each mitigation measure reduces the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).

**Biological Resources**

**BIO-1**

Exterior building improvements shall occur outside of the nesting season (February 15 through September 15). If avoidance of exterior construction work within this time period is not feasible, the following additional measures shall be employed:

1. A pre-construction nesting survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 3 days prior to the start of construction activities to determine whether active nests are present within or directly adjacent to the construction zone. All nests found shall be recorded.

2. If construction activities must occur within 300 feet of an active nest of any passerine bird or within 500 feet of an active nest of any raptor, a qualified biologist shall monitor the nest on a weekly basis and the construction activity shall be postponed until the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active.
If the recommended nest avoidance zone is not feasible, the qualified biologist shall determine whether an exception is possible and obtain concurrence from the appropriate resource agency before construction work can resume within the avoidance buffer zone. All work shall cease within the avoidance buffer zone until either agency concurrence is obtained or the biologist determines that the adults and young are no longer reliant on the nest site.

Cultural Resources

CULT-1 A qualified cultural resources specialist shall monitor ground-disturbing activities from the surface to at least the base of younger Quaternary alluvium. This monitor must have the authority to divert work to quickly and safely examine archaeological finds and evaluate and determine appropriate treatment for the resource in accordance with California PRC Section 21083.2(i) and Section 106 of the NHPA. In addition, a qualified Native American monitor shall monitor ground-disturbing activities from the surface to at least the base of younger Quaternary alluvium. This monitor must have the authority to divert work to quickly and safely examine potential Native American cultural materials. In the event Native American cultural material is encountered within the project site, further consultation with interested Native American parties should be conducted to apprise them of any such findings and solicit any comments they may have regarding appropriate treatment and disposition of the resources.

CULT-2 In accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are found during construction activities, the Los Angeles County Coroner shall be notified within 24 hours of the discovery. No further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the County Coroner has determined, within two working days of notification of the discovery, the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are or believed to be Native American, s/he shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento within 24 hours. In accordance with Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The descendants shall complete their inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative would then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains. Work may be resumed at the landowner’s discretion, but will only commence after consultation and treatment have been concluded. Work may continue on other parts of the project while consultation and treatment are conducted.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

HAZ-1 Prior to renovation, a State-certified asbestos abatement contractor shall perform removal of asbestos containing materials within the Merced Theatre and Pico House. A third party shall provide renovation oversight to ensure that the contractor complies with the specifications, proper protective equipment is used, and proper disposal procedures are followed.
The following precautions shall be taken prior to any renovation activities involving less than 100 square feet of ACM:

- ACM shall not be cut, sanded, or drilled;
- Prior to the initiation of renovation activities that would disturb ACM, the area shall be thoroughly wetted to prevent possible release into the air;
- Dust shall be removed with a high-efficiency particulate air vacuum and/or wet wipe with disposable towels;
- Compliance with State and local regulations for proper disposal of ACM.

**HAZ-2**

Any flaking or peeling LBP shall be removed by a licensed lead abatement contractor and disposed of following federal, State, and local regulations. LBP may be disposed as construction debris as long as it remains on the substrate and representative samples of the substrate with paint attached is tested and is found to have lead concentrations below the level that would require it to be classified as a hazardous waste. Further, the renovation contractor shall not recycle wood painted with LBP, but shall dispose of it in accordance with federal, State, and local regulations. Additionally, the renovation contractor should implement precautions to comply with OSHA 29 CFR 1926.62, Lead in Construction.

The following precautions shall be taken prior to any renovation activities that would disturb LBP:

- Materials containing LBP shall not be cut, sanded, or drilled without taking proper precautions to prevent exposures to workers and/or the environment;
- Prior to the initiation of renovation activities that would disturb LBP, the area shall be thoroughly wetted to prevent possible release into the air;
- Dust shall be removed with a high-efficiency particulate air vacuum and/or wet wipe with disposable towels;
- Compliance with State and local regulations for proper disposal of LBP.

**HAZ-3**

Other hazardous materials, such as fluorescent light bulbs and associated ballasts shall be removed, handled, and packaged by personnel with appropriate training. These materials shall be disposed of in accordance with federal, State, and local regulations for proper disposal.

**Noise and Vibration**

**NOI-1**

Construction activity shall comply with the City’s Noise Ordinance No. 144,331 and 161,574, and any subsequent ordinances, which prohibit the emission or creation of noise beyond certain levels at adjacent uses unless technically infeasible.

**NOI-2**

Construction activity shall be restricted to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturday.

**NOI-3**

Construction equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with mufflers and other suitable noise attenuation devices.
NOI-4 A temporary noise barrier shall be erected between the project site and the Los Angeles Plaza Park. The barriers shall be constructed of acoustic material, be at least six feet tall, and block the line-of-sight from equipment engines to the receptors.

NOI-5 Construction activity shall use rubber-tired equipment rather than track equipment.

NOI-6 Stockpiling of materials and vehicle staging areas shall be located away from noise-sensitive receivers.

NOI-7 A public liaison shall be established to address public concerns about construction activities.

NOI-8 Construction supervisors shall be informed of project-specific noise requirements.

NOI-9 Prior to construction work, the public shall be notified of the anticipated construction schedule.

NOI-10 Construction supervisors shall coordinate with the site administrator for institutional land uses, including the Chinese American Museum, LA Plaza de Cultura y Artes, and Our Lady Queen of Angels Church. Coordination between the site administrators and the City shall continue on an as-needed basis while construction is occurring adjacent to these land uses to minimize potential disruption to the land uses.

NOI-11 Prior to commencement of construction activity, a qualified structural engineer licensed in California shall survey the existing foundation and other structural aspects of the Masonic Hall, Merced Theatre, the Pico House, the Chinese American Museum, and the Old Plaza Fire House. The survey shall provide a shoring design to protect the identified land uses from potential damage. The qualified structural engineer shall submit a pre-construction survey letter establishing baseline conditions at the historic buildings. These baseline conditions shall be forwarded to the lead agency and to the mitigation monitor prior to issuance of any foundation only or building permit. At the conclusion of vibration causing activities, the qualified structural engineer shall issue a follow-on letter describing damage, if any, to the historic buildings. The letter shall include recommendations for any repair, as may be necessary, in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards. Repairs to historic buildings shall be undertaken and completed in conformance with all applicable codes including the California Historical Building Code (Part 8 of Title 24) prior to issuance of any temporary or permanent certificate of occupancy for the new building.

NOI-12 The construction contractor shall coordinate with the site administrators for the Chinese American and Old Plaza Fire House Museums to discuss construction activities that generate high vibration levels and notify site administrators when periods of peak vibration producing construction activities are likely to occur. Coordination between the site administrator and contractor shall continue on an as-needed basis throughout the construction process. When vibration generated by construction activity interferes with activities at the Chinese American and Old Plaza Fire House Museums according to the site administrators, the contractor shall take appropriate corrective action.
administrator, construction activity shall be stopped and a less intense construction method shall be employed by the contractor (e.g., smaller equipment).
VI. PREPARATION AND COORDINATION/CONSULTATION

A. Name of Preparers

Fareeha Kibriya, Project Director, AECOM
Shannon D. Ledet, Project Manager, AECOM
Jerry Flores, Deputy Project Manager, AECOM
Erin Murphey, Environmental Analyst, AECOM
Jason Paukovits, Air Quality Analyst, AECOM
Art Popp, Senior Biologist, AECOM
Marc Beherec, Archaeologist, AECOM
Jeremy Hollins, Architectural Historian, AECOM
Ronald Miller, Certified Asbestos Consultant, AECOM
Thomas Zdeb, Senior Project Scientist, AECOM
Jang Seo/Aziz Bakkoury, GIS Specialist, AECOM
Sam Silverman, Senior Environmental Scientist, Terry A. Hayes Associates
Brian Marchetti, Project Manager, KOA Corporation

B. Coordination/Consultation

Catalina Hernandez
Environmental Specialist II
Environmental Management Group
Bureau of Engineering
Department of Public Works

Ohaji Abdallah
Project Manager
Architectural Division
Bureau of Engineering
Department of Public Works
VII. DETERMINATION - RECOMMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

A. Summary

The initial study concluded that the proposed project would result in no impacts and/or less than significant impacts to aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems. The proposed project would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation incorporated to biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise and vibration.

B. Recommended Environmental Documentation

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

Prepared By:

Shannon D. Ledet, Senior Project Manager
AECOM

Reviewed By:

Catalina Hernandez
Environmental Supervisor I

Approved By:

Maria Martin, Manager
Environmental Management Group
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IX. CLARIFICATIONS AND MODIFICATIONS

The clarifications and modifications section is intended to update the IS/MND in response to comments received during the public review period. During the Channel 35 Studio Relocation Project IS/MND public review period, a total of one (1) comment letter was received via email. The comment did not state a specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the IS/MND; therefore, no updates to the IS/MND are necessary. As such, no clarifications or modifications are included as part of this Final IS/MND.
X. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

A. Introduction

The Channel 35 Studio Relocation Project IS/MND was distributed on February 25, 2016, for public review pursuant to CEQA Section 21091 and State CEQA Guidelines 15105. The 20-day public review period concluded on March 16, 2016. The IS/MND was distributed to interested or involved public agencies and organizations for review. The IS/MND was also made available for general public review at the following locations: Little Tokyo Branch Library, 600 East 3rd Street, Los Angeles, CA 90013; Chinatown Branch Library, 639 North Hill Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012; Council District 14 - District Office, 200 North Spring Street, Room 465, Los Angeles, CA 9012; El Pueblo De Los Angeles, 125 Paseo De La Plaza - Suite 400, Los Angeles, CA 90012; and Bureau of Engineering, Environmental Management Group, 1149 South Broadway, Los Angeles, CA 90015. In addition, an electronic version of the IS/MND was made available on the City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Engineering website at: http://eng.lacity.org/techdocs/emg.

During this public review period, a total of one (1) comment letter was received via email. A response to the comment is included in the following pages.

B. Responses to Comments That Address Environmental Issues in the IS/MND

The comment letter received on the IS/MND was from the Bilingual Foundation of the Arts, signed Luis Vela. The comment letter was received via email on March 14, 2016.

The comment letter has been assigned a number code and individual comments (if any) in the letter have also been coded to facilitate responses. A copy of the comment letter is provided prior to the response. The individual comment in the letter has been numbered and is referred to in the response that directly follows the comment letter. Comments that raise issues not directly related to the substance of the environmental analysis in the IS/MND are noted but, in accordance with CEQA, did not receive a detailed response.
Channel 35 Studio Relocation Project

Luis Vela <bfamarketing@sbcglobal.net>  Mon, Mar 14, 2016 at 4:22 PM
Reply-To: Luis Vela <bfamarketing@sbcglobal.net>
To: "catalina.hernandez@lacity.org" <catalina.hernandez@lacity.org>
Cc: Rick Coca <rick.coca@lacity.org>, Odalys Naran <machathatre@aol.com>

Dear Mrs. Hernandez,

Bilingual Foundation of the Arts and Macha Theatre/Films would like the opportunity to share the space of Pico House. Although we are very pleased with the renovation of the historic buildings we believe that it is important to have a representation of the minorities of Los Angeles. Our plans would include providing plays of the history of Los Angeles to audiences. In our repertoire we already have a play about "Pico Pico" and about Diego Rivera's Mural, "A Sunday at Alameda Park". We think that the space at Olvera Street would benefit from our representation of the Hispanic Community and the LGBT Community.

Best regards

Luis Vela
Marketing Manager
Bilingual Foundation of the Arts
Phone: (213) 437-0500, Ext 145
Comment Letter 1: Bilingual Foundation of the Arts

Response 1-1

The commenter expresses that the Bilingual Foundation of the Arts and Macha Theatre/Films would like to share the space of the Pico House to provide plays about the history of Los Angeles. The commenter also commends the renovation of the historic buildings. This comment does not state a specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the IS/MND. No further response to this comment is required. Notwithstanding, the comment is acknowledged for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-making bodies for their review and consideration.
ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING CHECKLIST

A brief explanation is provided for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AESTHETICS – Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project introduces incompatible visual elements within a field of view containing a scenic vista or substantially alters a view of a scenic vista. Reference: 31 (Thresholds A.1 &amp; A.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: No scenic vistas exist on or in close proximity to the project site. Retrofits would require the use of several pieces of construction equipment as well as several temporary scaffolding structures up to 40 feet in height. The proposed project also involves the construction of an elevator structure, which would be taller than the existing structures. Although the Central City Community Plan does not designate any views as scenic vistas within the project area, the proposed project is located within a historic area in the City of Los Angeles. However, architectural design would be subject to review by the Board of Cultural Affairs Commissioners to ensure that the project is designed to be aesthetically compatible with its surroundings. Reference: 29 (General Plan - Central City Community Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur where scenic resources within a state scenic highway would be damaged or removed as a result of the proposed project. Reference: 31 (Thresholds A.1 &amp; E.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: No state-designated scenic highways are located within the vicinity of the project site. Reference: 23 (Scenic Highway)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project introduces incompatible visual elements to the project site or visual elements that would be incompatible with the character of the area surrounding the project site. Reference: 31 (Thresholds A.1 and A.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The proposed project would not make any significant changes to the visual character that currently exists. Retrofits would require the use of several pieces of construction equipment as well as several temporary scaffolding structures up to 40 feet in height. However, rehabilitation of the existing structures would be relatively minor and short-term in nature. Architectural design would be subject to review by the Board of Cultural Affairs Commissioners to ensure that the project is designed to be aesthetically compatible with its surroundings. Any new structures would also meet the site’s scale and massing requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact would occur if the proposed project caused a substantial increase in ambient illumination levels beyond the property line or caused new lighting to spill-over onto light-sensitive land uses such as residential, some commercial and institutional uses that require minimum illumination for proper function, and natural areas. Reference: 31 (Thresholds A.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: New outdoor lighting will be limited to the minimum levels necessary for safety. The new light fixtures will be designed to prevent spill-over. There are no near-by natural areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:

#### a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Reference: 9 (Ag. Land Eval.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: No prime or unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance exists within the project area or vicinity. Reference: 10 (Farmland Map)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to result in the conversion of land zoned for agricultural use, or indicated under a Williamson Act contract, from agricultural use to another non-agricultural use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The project site and adjacent parcels are not is zoned for agricultural uses and not subject to a Williamson Act contract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard: In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Reference: 10 (Farmland Map)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: There is no forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production on or near the project site. Reference: 30 (ZIMAS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issues

| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | [x] |

**Standard:** In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

**Explanation:** There is no forest land on or near the project site

| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | [x] | |

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if a project results in the conversion of farmland to another non-agricultural use.

**Explanation:** Refer to discussion under Item 2(a) and 2(b) above.

#### 3. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:

| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | [x] | |

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the project was inconsistent with or obstruct the implementation of the Air Quality Element of the City’s General Plan or the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). Reference: 31 (Thresholds B.1 to B.3)

**Explanation:** The project would not increase the assumptions for off-road equipment use in the AQMP. Consistency with the AQMP is also determined through evaluation of whether the project would exceed the estimated emissions used as the basis of the AQMP, which are based, in part, on population projections developed by the SCAG. However, the proposed project would be a relocation of existing land uses and would not substantially increase population or employment in the planning area. The proposed project would not generate vehicle trips that exceed the current assumptions used to develop the General Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, and AQMP. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the intensity of operational emissions have been accounted for in the 2012 AQMP. References: 51 (SCAQMD AQMP)

| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | [x] | |

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project violated any SCAQMD air quality standard. The SCAQMD has set thresholds of significance for reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NOₓ), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and particulate matter (PM₁₀) emissions resulting from construction and operation in the South Coast Air Basin. Reference: 31 (Thresholds B.1, B.2),

**Explanation:** The maximum daily construction-generated emissions of ROG, CO, NOₓ, PM₁₀, and PM₂.5 would not exceed applicable mass emission or localized significance thresholds established by SCAQMD. Therefore, construction emissions would not violate an ambient air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing violation. In addition, operational emissions would not exceed any of the SCAQMD’s mass daily operational significance thresholds. Reference: 1 (Appendix B)
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the South Coast Air Basin exceeds federal and state ambient air quality standards and has been designated as an area of non-attainment by the USEPA and/or California Air Resources Board. The South Coast Air Basin is a non-attainment area for carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, particulate matter (PM$_{10}$), and fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$). Reference: Reference: 31 (Thresholds B.1, B.2), 49 (AQMD Handbook)

Explanation: Construction and operational emissions of the project would not exceed the SCAQMD’s thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants. For those emissions generated during construction, the minor generation of criteria pollutants would be temporary and short-term in nature. Reference: 1 (Appendix B)

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard: A significant impact may occur if construction or operation of the proposed project generated pollutant concentrations to a degree that would significantly affect sensitive receptors. Reference: 31 (Thresholds B.1 to B.3)

Explanation: As discussed above, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in substantial pollutant concentrations. The project area is primarily commercial, and there are no sensitive receptor locations near the project site. The Los Angeles Plaza Park is located adjacent to the project site, but it not considered a location for sensitive receptors for the purposes of the air quality analysis. Reference: 1 (Appendix B)

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Reference: 31 (Thresholds B.2)

Explanation: During construction, sources of odor are diesel emissions from construction equipment and volatile organic compounds from sealant applications or paving activities. However, these odors would be temporary and localized. Nonetheless, applicable best management practices such as those in SCAQMD Rule 431 (Diesel Equipment) would, in addition to minimizing air quality impacts, also help minimize potential construction odors.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would remove or modify habitat for any species identified or designated as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulation, or by the state or federal regulatory agencies cited. Reference: 31 (Thresholds C)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The CNDDB indicates that species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species occur or have occurred historically within the larger project area. However, the habitat for these species does not exist adjacent to or within project boundaries. However, due to the presence of ornamental trees which may provide suitable nesting habitat for birds protected under the MBTA, impacts from noise and dust could occur if construction on the outside of the building occurs during the nesting bird season, generally considered to extend from February 15 through September 15. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would ensure that nesting birds protected under the MBTA are not significantly impacted. References: 21 (CNDDB), 20 (CDFW Special Animals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if riparian habitat or any other sensitive natural community were to be adversely modified. Reference: 31 (Thresholds C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The site occurs in heavily-urbanized downtown Los Angeles and no natural vegetation communities occur on-site. As a result, the proposed project will not adversely affect any sensitive natural community or riparian habitat. References: 44 (Holland), 19 (CDFW Natural Communities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act would be modified or removed. Reference: 31 (Thresholds C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: There are no wetlands within or adjacent to the project site. Reference: 53 (USC Title 33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project interferes or removes access to a migratory wildlife corridor or impedes the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Reference: 31 (Thresholds C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The project site occurs in heavily-urbanized downtown Los Angeles and there are no surface waters, drainages, or other corridors that allow for wildlife movement on or within the vicinity of the project site. However, as described above, ornamental trees on-site may provide suitable nesting habitat for birds protected under the MBTA. Nesting birds may avoid the project vicinity due to increased levels of noise or dust during construction on the outside of the building, if it occurs during the nesting bird season (February 15 through September 15). Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would reduce potential impacts on the movement and behavior of nesting birds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would cause an impact that is inconsistent with local regulations pertaining to biological resources. Reference: 31 (Thresholds C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Explanation:** Ornamental sycamore trees are present on the south side of the structures, along North Main Street. These trees will not be impacted by the project and as a result, no impacts to trees protected under a tree preservation policy or ordinance would occur. References: 27 (Tree Ord.), 35 (Tree Policy), 36 (Urban Forest Program)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Explanation:** No habitat conservation plan, or any plan as cited above, is known to exist for the project site or immediate vicinity. Reference: 18 (CDFW Conservation Plans)

#### 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

**a)** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Explanation:** The assessment concluded that the proposed alterations planned for the Masonic Hall, Merced Theatre, and Pico House are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, particularly the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings. Reference: 2 (Appendix D)

**b)** Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Explanation:** A known archaeological site was encountered during utilities excavation in the basement of the Merced Theatre and preserved-in-place. The background research and survey indicate a high probability for buried archaeological resources within the project area. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-1 would ensure potential impacts related to archaeological resources during construction activities would be less than significant. Reference: 2 (Appendix D)

**c)** Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Explanation:** It is not anticipated that paleontological resources would be discovered during ground-disturbing activities since geologic maps and previous studies indicate that work will be limited to deposits of younger Quaternary alluvium deposited by the nearby Los Angeles River, which is too young to typically contain significant fossil deposits. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.
## Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

| Standard: A significant impact may occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the proposed project would disturb interred human remains. Reference: 24 (Guidelines 15064.5), 31 (Thresholds D.2) |
| Explanation: Archival research revealed that burials have the potential to be encountered during project construction. Therefore, construction of the proposed project could potentially disturb human remains. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CULT-2 would ensure impacts related to the discovery of human remains would be less than significant. Reference: 2 (Appendix D) |

## 6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

### a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

#### i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

| Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within a state-designated Alquist-Priolo Zone or other designated fault zone and appropriate building practices were not followed. References: 16 (CDC 42), 31 (Thresholds E.1) |
| Explanation: The project site is not located within a State of California Earthquake Fault Zone/Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone. The project site is located in a seismically active area, as is most of southern California. However, no active faults are known to cross the project site. The proposed project would retrofit the Masonic Hall, Merced Theatre, and Pico House in accordance with the latest version of the City of Los Angeles Building Code and other applicable federal, state, and local codes relative to seismic criteria. Reference: 12 (Special Studies Zone – Los Angeles Quad), 13 (Fault Zone – Hollywood Quad) |

#### ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

| Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project design did not comply with building code requirements intended to protect people from hazards associated with strong seismic ground shaking. Reference: 31 (Thresholds E.1) |
| Explanation: As with most locations in southern California, the project site is susceptible to ground shaking during an earthquake. As indicated in Item 6(a)(i) above, the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone, and thus the potential for hazards associated with strong seismic ground shaking such as ground surface rupture affecting the site is considered low. The proposed project would retrofit the structures in accordance with the latest version of the City of Los Angeles Building Code and other applicable federal, state, and local codes relative to seismic criteria. Reference: 12 (Special Studies Zone – Los Angeles Quad), 13 (Fault Zone – Hollywood Quad) |

#### iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

| Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would be located in an area identified as having a high risk of liquefaction and appropriate design measures required within such designated areas were not incorporated into the project. Reference: 31 (Thresholds E.1) |
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Explanation:** The project site is located within a state and City-designated liquefiable area. However, the proposed project would retrofit the structures in compliance with the latest version of the City of Los Angeles Building Code. Reference: 29 (General Plan), 11 (Seismic Hazard Zone – Los Angeles Quad), 14 (Seismic Hazard Zone – Hollywood Quad)

iv) **Landslides?**

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in a hillside area with soil conditions that would suggest high potential for sliding and appropriate design measures were not implemented. Reference: 31 (Thresholds E.1)

Explanation: The project is identified as a potential landslide hazard area by the California Department of Mines and Geology. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure a less than significant impact to landslides. Reference: 11 (Seismic Hazard Zone – Los Angeles Quad), 14 (Seismic Hazard Zone – Hollywood Quad), 29 (General Plan)

b) **Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to expose large areas to the erosion effects of wind or water for a prolonged period of time. Reference: 31 (Thresholds E.2)

Explanation: The project site is entirely paved and would remain so after project rehabilitation is complete. Construction would result in ground surface disruption, such as grading and excavation to complete the retrofits. These activities could result in potential erosion at the project site. However, soil exposure would be temporary and short-term and applicable Department of Building and Safety erosion control techniques would limit potential erosion. All construction would need to comply with Best Management Practices to prevent erosion or loss of topsoil.

c) **Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?**

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were built in an unstable area without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for project buildings, thus posing a hazard to life and property. Reference: 31 (Thresholds E.2)

Explanation: As discussed in Item 6(a)(iii) and 6(a)(iv), the project site is located in an area identified as being at risk for potential liquefaction. All remodel work would adhere to the latest version of the City of Los Angeles Building code and other applicable federal, state, and local codes relative to liquefaction criteria. Additionally, proper geotechnical engineering and seismic retrofits would reduce the hazard of geologic instability.

The proposed project does not anticipate the extraction of any groundwater, oil, or gas from the project site. Therefore, no impacts to subsidence would occur. Reference: 11 (Seismic Hazard Zone – Los Angeles Quad), 14 (Seismic Hazard Zone – Hollywood Quad)

d) **Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?**

Standard: Reference: 31 (Thresholds E.2)

Explanation: The proposed project is in an area identified as having alluvium soils. Prior to any construction and as a standard practice, a geotechnical evaluation would be prepared which would prescribe methods, techniques, and specifications for: site preparation, treatment of undocumented fill and/or alluvial soils, fill placement on sloping ground, fill characteristics, fill placement and compactions,
## Issues

| temporary excavations and shoring, permanent slopes, treatment of expansive soils, and treatment of corrosive soils. Design and construction of the proposed project would conform to recommendations in the geotechnical evaluation. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were built on soils that were incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal system, and such a system was proposed. Reference: 31(Thresholds E.3)

**Explanation:** The project area is served by the City's wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment systems.

### 7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Standard:**

**Explanation:** Since the proposed project would include commercial land uses, the proposed SCAQMD threshold of 3,000 MT CO2e per year will be used for this analysis. As shown in Table 4 in Section IV Subsection G of the discussion, the project-related GHG efficiency, including amortized construction and annual operational GHG emissions, is below the SCAQMD proposed threshold. Reference: 50 (Stakeholder Working Group #14).

| b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Standard:**

**Explanation:** The proposed project would be a relocation of existing land uses, and any building construction activities would be consistent with current Title 24 standards, which would improve energy efficiency of the building. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the AB 32 Scoping Plan, GreenLA CAP, or ClimateLA. As discussed earlier, the proposed project would also not generate GHG emissions that would have a significant impact on the environment. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. References: 7 (Scoping Plan); 42 (Green LA); 28 (Climate LA)

### 8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project involved the use or disposal of hazardous materials as part of its routine operations and would have the potential to generate toxic or otherwise hazardous emissions. Reference: 31 (Thresholds F.1, F.2)

**Explanation:** The proposed project does not involve the use, transport, or disposal of any hazardous materials. Any development would comply with applicable laws and regulations for use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials.
## Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project involved a risk of accidental explosion or utilized substantial amounts of hazardous materials as part of its routine operations that could potentially pose a hazard to the public under accident or upset conditions. Reference: 31 (Thresholds F.1, F.2)

**Explanation:** The proposed project does not involve the use, transport, or disposal of any hazardous materials. Refer to discussion under item 8(a) above.

As discussed in Item 8(a) above, construction activities for both phases of the proposed project may involve limited transport, storage, use, or disposal of some hazardous materials, such as on-site fueling/servicing of construction equipment, and the transport of fuels, lubricating fluids, and solvents. These types of materials are not acutely hazardous, and compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations would ensure that construction impacts related to reasonably foreseeable upset and accident.

An investigation of on-site materials indicated that the existing structures contain ACM, LBP, and other OHM, which could create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the release if not properly removed and handled during retrofit activities. The pre-renovation survey consisted of a visual inspection of the buildings, a review of available building information, sampling and laboratory analysis of affected building materials. The surveys found that the structures contain hazardous materials including ACM, LBP, and OHM. Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-3 would ensure impacts related to the release of these hazardous materials would be less than significant.

Operation of the proposed project would involve television studio use for the City’s local government access channel, Channel 35. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and no operational impacts would occur. Reference: 3 (Appendix E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school site and were projected to release toxic emissions which pose a hazard beyond regulatory thresholds. Reference: 31 (Thresholds F.2)

**Explanation:** There are no existing or proposed schools located within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site. Construction and operation of the project would not involve substantial quantities of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Reference: 25 (GeoTracker), 22 (EnviroStor), 34 (NavigateLA Schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reference:** 31 (Thresholds F.2)

**Explanation:** The project site is not listed in the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker or the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor Data Management System which includes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project site were located within a public airport land use plan area, or within two miles of a public airport, and would create a safety hazard. Reference: 31 (Thresholds F.1, K.2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The project is not located within a public airport land use plan area, or within two miles of a public airport, and would create a safety hazard. Reference: 6 (Airnav)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the project would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area because of its location near a private airstrip. Reference: 31 (Thresholds F.1, K.2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: No private airstrip is located within the vicinity of the project site. Reference: 6 (Airnav)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to substantially interfere with roadway operations used in conjunction with an emergency response plan or evacuation plan or would generate sufficient traffic to create traffic congestion that would interfere with the execution of such plan. Reference: 31 (Thresholds F.1, K.2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The proposed project would not alter the adjacent street system. As applicable, any traffic detour plans during construction would address emergency response or emergency evacuation for implementation during construction. No road or lane closures are anticipated to be necessary during the construction process. During construction, ingress and egress to the site and surrounding properties, particularly for emergency response vehicles, would be maintained at all times.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in a wildland area and poses a significant fire hazard, which could affect persons or structures in the area in the event of a fire. Reference: 31 (Thresholds K.2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The project site is not located within a wildland or a very high fire hazard severity zone. Reference: 29 (General Plan)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |
## Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project discharged water which did not meet the quality standards of agencies which regulate surface water quality and water discharge into storm-water drainage systems. Reference: 31 (Thresholds G.2)

**Explanation:** For implementation of the proposed project, prior to the start of rehabilitation, BOE would be required to obtain a General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit, issued by the State Water Resources Control Board. One of the conditions of the General Permit is the development and the implementation of a SWPPP, which would identify structural and nonstructural BMPs to be implemented during the construction phase. As discussed in Section II Subsection G, BOE would also develop and implement an erosion control plan for the proposed project. Upon completion of the proposed project, storm flows would be directed to the existing storm drain system, similar to existing conditions. There would be no exposed soil remaining at the completion of rehabilitation activities.

**b)** Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

**Standard:** A project would normally have a significant impact on groundwater supplies if it were to result in a demonstrable and sustained reduction of groundwater recharge capacity or change the potable water levels sufficiently that it would reduce the ability of a water utility to use the groundwater basin for public water supplies or storage of imported water, reduce the yields of adjacent wells or well fields, or adversely change the rate or direction of groundwater flow. Reference: 31 (Thresholds G.2, G.3)

**Explanation:** No groundwater wells are located within the project site. Therefore, it is not anticipated that groundwater would be encountered during excavation, as deep excavations would not be necessary. Additionally, the proposed project does not involve any direct extraction of groundwater. Reference: 47 (Groundwater Wells)

**c)** Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in a substantial alteration of drainage patterns that resulted in a substantial increase in erosion or siltation during construction or operation of the project. Reference: 31 (Thresholds G.1, G.2)

**Explanation:** The proposed project would be located within the existing structures. Interior and exterior retrofits would occur within the building footprints and surrounding areas within the parcel that have been previously disturbed with development. As discussed, following rehabilitation, the area would be returned to its existing condition. As such, the proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. As discussed in Item 9(a), the project would result in temporary soil disturbance activities during construction during which time a SWPPP for the control of soil erosion and sediment runoff would be implemented.

**d)** Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in increased runoff volumes during construction or operation of the proposed project that would result in flooding conditions affecting the project site or nearby properties. Reference: 31 (Thresholds G.1)

**Explanation:** As discussed above, the proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. All retrofits would occur within the existing building footprints and surrounding areas within the already disturbed parcel. Following rehabilitation activities, all areas would be returned to their existing condition. As such, after rehabilitation, stormwater flows would be similar to existing conditions. In addition, as discussed in Item 9(a) above, BMPs would be implemented to control runoff from the project sites during construction.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the volume of runoff were to increase to a level which exceeded the capacity of the storm drain system serving a project site. A significant impact may also occur if the proposed project would substantially increase the probability that polluted runoff would reach the storm drain system. Reference: 31 (Thresholds G.2)

**Explanation:** As discussed above, implementation of the proposed project would result in similar amounts of permeable surfaces as under existing conditions. Additionally, BMPs would be identified in the SWPPP developed for the proposed project pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit requirements to control runoff from the project sites during construction.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if a project included potential sources of water pollutants and potential to substantially degrade water quality. Reference: 31 (Thresholds G.3)

**Explanation:** Other than the sources described for construction activities (i.e., potential soil erosion and fuels for construction equipment), the proposed project does not include other potential sources of contaminants that could potentially degrade water quality. Additionally, as discussed in Item 9(a) above, a SWPPP would be developed and implemented for the proposed project construction to prevent the degradation of water quality.

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project placed housing within a 100-year flood zone. Reference: 31 (Thresholds G.1 to G.4)

**Explanation:** The proposed project does not include housing.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within a 100-year flood zone and would impede or redirect flood flows. Reference: 31 (Thresholds G.4)

**Explanation:** The project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone. Reference: 54 (FIRM Panel 06037C1636F)
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in an area where a dam or levee could fail, exposing people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death. Reference: 31 (Thresholds E.1, G.3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The proposed project is not located within an inundation area. However, the project site is located near the inundation area of the Los Angeles River. Following rehabilitation of the structures, all areas would be returned to their existing condition. Additionally, no habitable structures would be included as part of the proposed project. Reference: 15 (Inundation Maps), 29 (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in an area with inundation potential due to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Reference: 31 (Thresholds E.1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: Thus, there is no potential for seiches impacting the project site. Additionally, the project site is located approximately 14 miles from the Pacific Ocean and is not within a tsunami hazard area. As discussed in Item 6(a)(iv), the project site is located within a City-designated hillside area. However, the proposed project would adhere to the City Hillside Grading Ordinance during construction. Reference: 29 (General Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community? | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were sufficiently large or otherwise configured in such a way as to create a physical barrier within an established community. Reference: 31 (Thresholds H.2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The proposed project would not introduce a physical barrier. The project site is confined to a single parcel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were inconsistent with the General Plan, or other applicable plan, or with the site’s zoning if designated to avoid or mitigate a significant potential environmental impact. Reference: 31 (Thresholds H.1, H.2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The proposed project would be consistent with the current zoning designation due to it being owned by the City of Los Angeles. The proposed project would not conflict with planned land uses that would surround the site and would contribute to the Civic Center District as a whole by providing a mix of uses. The proposed project is also consistent with the goals and policies set out in the City’s community plan. Additionally, the proposed project is consistent with the El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument’s 2013-2015 Strategic Plan. Reference: 30 (ZIMAS), 29 (General Plan), 40 (El Pueblo 2013-2015 Strategic Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issues

| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within an area governed by a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan and would conflict with such plan. Reference: 31 (Thresholds H.1, H.2) |
| Explanation: See discussion under 4(f) above. |

### 11. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the project were located in an area used or available for extraction of a regionally important mineral resource, if the project converted an existing or potential present or future regionally-important mineral extraction use to another use, or if a project affected access to such a site. Reference: 31 (Thresholds E.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The project site is not located within an area that contains known mineral resources. Reference: 17 (Well Finder), 29 (General Plan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if a project were located in an area used or available for extraction of a locally-important mineral resource and the project converted such a resource to another use or affected access to such a site. Reference: 31 (Thresholds E.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The project site is not located within an area that contains known mineral resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12. NOISE – Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the project generated noise levels exceeding the standards for ambient noise as established by the General Plan and Municipal Code or exposed persons to that increased level of noise. Reference: 29 (General Plan), 31 (Thresholds Section I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The proposed project would likely result in temporary higher-than-average noise levels in the local community during construction. However, the Bureau of Engineering Standard Project Specifications for public works construction is designed to comply with the City’s General Plan Noise Element and related Municipal Code Noise Ordinance. Given that the proposed project would be implemented in accordance with these standards and Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-10, significant adverse impacts to noise levels are not expected. Reference: 52 (Appendix F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard: A significant impact may occur if the project were to expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. Reference: 29 (General Plan), 31 (Thresholds Section I)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issues

**Explanation:** Construction activities associated with the project could generate ground-borne vibration from use of heavy equipment. These effects would be temporary and short-term in nature. With implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-11 and NOI-12, significant adverse impacts to vibration level are not expected. Reference: 52 (Appendix F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the project were to substantially and permanently increase the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project. Reference: 29 (General Plan), 31 (Thresholds Section I)

**Explanation:** Refer to discussion under 12 (a) above. Reference: 52 (Appendix F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the project were to create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project. Reference: 29 (General Plan), 31 (Thresholds Section I)

**Explanation:** Refer to discussion under 12 (a) above. Reference: 52 (Appendix F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** Reference: 31 (Thresholds Section I)

**Explanation:** The project is not located within two miles of an airport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** Reference: 31 (Thresholds Section I)

**Explanation:** No private airstrips are located within the vicinity of the project area.

### 13. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if population growth is induced in an area, either directly or indirectly, such that the population of the area may exceed the planned population of that area. Reference: 31 (Thresholds Section J.1)

**Explanation:** Population density is managed by the City’s land use and planning designations (see above) and building codes. The proposed project will not involve changing the City’s land use and planning designations to a more intense use and therefore will not induce substantial population growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** Reference: 31 (Thresholds Section I)
## Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Standard: Normally, there would be no significant impact if the project will not result in a net loss of 15 single-family dwellings or 25 dwellings in multi-family housing. Reference: 31 (Thresholds J.1 and J.2)

Explanation: The proposed project will not displace any housing.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Standard: Normally, there would be no significant impact if the project will not result in a net loss of 15 single-family dwellings or 25 dwellings in multi-family housing. Reference: 31 (Thresholds J.2)

Explanation: The proposed project will not displace any housing.

### 14. PUBLIC SERVICES –

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

i) Fire protection?

Standard: A significant impact may occur if LAFD could not adequately serve the proposed project based on response time, access, or fire hydrant/water availability. Reference: 31 (Thresholds K.2)

Explanation: The proposed project would not result in an increase in population and thus would not generate a need for new or altered fire protection facilities. The proposed project would be constructed in accordance with all applicable fire codes set forth by the state Fire Marshall and Los Angeles Fire Department. Reference: 41 (LAFD)

ii) Police protection?

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to result in an increase in demand for police services that would exceed the capacity of the police department responsible for serving the site. Reference: 31 (Thresholds K.1)

Explanation: The proposed project would not require additional police protection beyond what is currently provided. Reference: 43 (LAPD)

iii) Schools?

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project includes substantial employment or population growth that could generate demand for school facilities that exceeded the capacity of the school district responsible for serving the project site. Reference: 31 (Thresholds K.3)

Explanation: The proposed project is not a growth inducing project, either directly or indirectly, and would therefore not increase the demand for schools in the area

iv) Parks?

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the recreation and park services available could not accommodate the population increase resulting from the implementation of the proposed project. Reference: 31 (Thresholds K.4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The proposed project will not cause a population increase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard: Projects that do not result in a net increase of 75 residential units normally would not have a significant impact on public libraries. Reference: 31 (Thresholds K.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: The project would not result in a net increase of 75 residential units or more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. RECREATION –

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project includes substantial employment or population growth that may generate demand for public park facilities that exceed the capacity of existing parks. Reference: 31 (Thresholds K.4)

Explanation: The proposed project will not cause a population increase. (see Item 13 above)

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Standard: Reference: 31 (Thresholds K.4)

Explanation: The proposed project does not include or require a recreational facility.

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersection, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project causes an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Reference: 31 (Thresholds L.1 to L.4, L.8)

Explanation: Traffic may be affected temporarily due to construction activities. Once constructed, the project will not cause increased traffic. During construction, all study intersections would continue to operate at LOS A during the AM and PM peak hours. However, as discussed in Section II Subsection G, BOE would be required to implement a construction worksite traffic control plan to minimize the effect on roadway operations in the vicinity of the construction site. Reference: 46 (Appendix G)

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Standard: A significant impact may occur if the proposed project causes a conflict with an applicable congestion management program. Reference: 31 (Thresholds L.1 to L3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong> Based on the trip generation and distribution of the proposed project, 50 or more new project trips per hour would not be added at the nearest CMP intersection. The proposed project would add less than 150 new trips per hour to any freeway segments. Reference: 48 (LACMTA CMP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard:</strong> A significant impact may occur if the proposed project changed air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location the resulted in substantial safety risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong> There would be no impact to air traffic patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard:</strong> A significant impact may occur if the proposed project substantially increased road hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. Reference: 31 (Thresholds L.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong> The project is compatible with the land use and would not include any design features that would result in a safety hazard to pedestrians, personnel, visitors, or nearby neighbors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard:</strong> A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in inadequate emergency access. Reference: 31 (Thresholds L.5, L.8, and J2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong> The proposed project does not propose any permanent changes to the surrounding street system and would not introduce incompatible vehicles to surrounding roadways. Temporary traffic control elements would be subject to review, including safety, and approval by Los Angeles Department of Transportation. Reference: 29 (General Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard:</strong> A significant impact may occur if the proposed project conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Reference 31 (Thresholds L.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong> The proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Reference: 37 (LACMTA Bus Routes); 38 (LACMTA Bikeways)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** – Would the project:

| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? |
| **Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project exceeds wastewater treatment requirements of the local regulatory governing agency. Reference: 31 (Thresholds M.2) |
| **Explanation:** As discussed above, a SWPPP would be prepared for the proposed project that would specify appropriate Best Management Practices to control runoff from the site during construction. Additionally, any wastewater discharged by the proposed project must comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System requirements. Construction activities associated with both phases of the proposed project would comply with all applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional .
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Water Quality Control Board.

Due to the structures being vacant for an extended period of time, wastewater generation will increase slightly to accommodate new restroom and kitchen facilities. However, a total of 22 employees will work at the Channel 35 property. Therefore, increases in wastewater generation will be minimal.

**b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in the need for new construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities that could result in an adverse environmental effect that could not be mitigated. Reference: 31 (Thresholds G.1, M.1 and M.2)

**Explanation:** As discussed above, the proposed project is expected to generate minimal quantities of wastewater. The proposed project would accommodate restrooms and kitchen facilities, which would produce minimal amounts of wastewater.

**c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the volume of stormwater runoff from the proposed project increases to a level exceeding the capacity of the storm drain system serving the project site. Reference: 31 (Thresholds G.1 and M.2)

**Explanation:** As discussed in Item 9(e) above, all drainage flows would be routed through existing stormwater infrastructure serving the project site and surrounding area. Additionally, following construction of the proposed project, all areas would be returned to their existing conditions. As such, after construction, stormwater flows would be similar to the current condition as there would be no increase in the volume of runoff. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities.

**d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project’s water demands would exceed the existing water supplies that serve the site. Reference: 31 (Thresholds M.1)

**Explanation:** Other than temporary construction water use and minimal increases in potable water associated with the new restrooms and kitchen facilities, the proposed project would not include new water uses.

**e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would increase wastewater generation to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the project site would be exceeded. Reference: 31 (Thresholds M.2)

**Explanation:** See Item 17(a) above.
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to increase solid waste generation to a degree that existing and projected landfill capacities would be insufficient to accommodate the additional waste. Reference: 31 (Thresholds M.3)

**Explanation:** Rehabilitation activities would generate some waste, such as demolition debris. As discussed in Section II Subsection C of the discussion, the proposed project construction would incorporate source reduction techniques and recycling measures and maintain a recycling program to divert waste in accordance with the Citywide Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance.

Operation of the proposed project would include Channel 35 studio facilities. Operational solid waste would be minimal.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would generate solid waste that was in excess of or was not disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations. Reference: 31 (Thresholds M.3)

**Explanation:** The proposed project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. As discussed in Item 17(f) above, construction debris would be recycled or disposed of according to local and regional standards.

### 18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** Preceding analysis

**Explanation:** Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would ensure that nesting birds protected under the MBTA are not significantly impacted. Additionally, the project area is culturally-sensitive, and there are known cultural resources within the immediate vicinity; Mitigation Measures CULT-1 and CULT-2 are provided to address the potential discovery of previously unknown archeological resources and the potential to disturb human remains, which reduces potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** Preceding analysis
**Issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Explanation: The proposed project would generate short-term emissions of GHGs during construction, but virtually no emissions during operations. The emissions generated during construction would be far below the established threshold of significance. The cumulative impact would be less than significant. Additionally, implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through N-10 would reduce significant impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable noise impact.

c) **Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Standard: Preceding analysis

Explanation: Impacts associated with the proposed project would be mainly construction related, with no long-term environmental goals. No impact is anticipated.

d) **Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Standard: Preceding analysis

Explanation: All potentially significant environmental effects associated with the proposed project can be mitigated to less than significant levels.