

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY

**FINDINGS OF FACT
AND
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

NBC UNIVERSAL EVOLUTION PLAN

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2007071036

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND	1
II.	PROJECT DESCRIPTION (ALTERNATIVE 10)	1
III.	FINDINGS REQUIRED TO BE MADE BY RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	3
IV.	IMPACTS DETERMINED IN THE INITIAL STUDY NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT	5
V.	IMPACTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT PRIOR TO MITIGATION	6
VI.	IMPACTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT PRIOR TO MITIGATION, WHERE MITIGATION NONETHELESS PROVIDED TO FURTHER REDUCE IMPACTS	44
VII.	IMPACTS FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT AFTER MITIGATION	48
VIII.	SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WHICH REMAIN SIGNIFICANT AFTER MITIGATION MEASURES	101
IX.	ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT	120
X.	FINDINGS REGARDING GENERAL IMPACT CATEGORIES	138
XI.	ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBLE AGENCY CONSIDERATIONS UNDER CEQA	140
XII.	STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS	141

CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

Universal City Studios LLC (the “Applicant”) proposes the NBC Universal Evolution Plan (“the Project”), which sets forth the framework to guide the development of an approximately 391-acre site located in the east San Fernando Valley near the north end of the Cahuenga Pass. The Project site (the “Project Site”) is generally bounded by the Los Angeles River Flood Control Channel to the north, Barham Boulevard to the east (except in the area of the Hollywood Manor residential area), the Hollywood Freeway to the south (except for the southwest corner of the Project Site which abuts existing off-site hotel and office towers), and Lankershim Boulevard to the west. The Project Site is located in two jurisdictions, and currently includes approximately 296 acres (76 percent of the total Project Site area) within unincorporated County of Los Angeles (“County”) and the remaining 95 acres (24 percent of the total Project Site area) within the City of Los Angeles (“City”).

The Project was reviewed by the City (serving as lead agency) in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Public Resources Code § 21000 *et seq.*) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, § 15000 *et seq.*). The County served as a responsible agency and worked jointly and in cooperation with the City in the preparation and evaluation of an Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”), pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding between the County and the City.

On November 14, 2012, the City approved the Project, certified the EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2007071036) and adopted CEQA Findings of Fact, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”). The Project approved by the City (Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative) eliminates the residential portion of the originally proposed project studied in the EIR while increasing Studio Office, Hotel, and Entertainment uses. As approved, the Project (Alternative 10) would provide approximately 2.68 million square feet of net new Studio, Studio Office, Office, Entertainment, Entertainment Retail, Amphitheater, and Hotel uses on the Project Site. The certified EIR contains technical reports supporting the environmental analysis for Alternative 10 as additional appendices to the Final EIR. The Alternative 10 technical reports do not change any of the analysis or conclusions in the EIR but were provided as additional information for the public and decision makers prior to the City’s certification of the EIR.

The County is considering several discretionary actions to implement those portions of the Project within the County, including: adoption of the Universal Studios Specific Plan (“County Specific Plan”), a General Plan amendment, a zone change, and a development agreement (the “County Entitlements”). Implementation of the Project in the County portions of the Project Site would occur through the County Specific Plan.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION (ALTERNATIVE 10)

The project as originally proposed and analyzed in the Draft EIR consisted of the development of approximately 1.83 million square feet of net new entertainment, studio, office, and related uses, which included up to 500 hotel guest rooms and related hotel facilities. In addition, 2,937 residential dwelling units and 115,000 square feet of retail/commercial uses and up to 65,000 square feet of community serving uses were to be constructed. Approximately 638,000 square feet of existing studio, office, and entertainment uses were to be demolished as

part of the proposed project, although the majority of existing on-site uses and facilities would remain.

Many comment letters submitted during the public comment period for the Draft EIR raised concerns about the proposed project's plan to construct 2,937 residential dwelling units, and suggested augmenting the existing land uses. In addition, after the close of the public comment period, elected officials sent letters to the Applicant urging reconsideration of the residential part of the proposed project. As such, in response to these public comments and requests from elected officials, a new Alternative—the No Residential Alternative (or Alternative 10)—was included in the Final EIR which deleted the residential portion of the proposed project. For purposes of these findings, “the Project” shall refer to Alternative 10, not the project as proposed and analyzed in the EIR. The project as proposed and analyzed in the EIR shall be referred to in these findings as “the originally proposed project.”

Alternative 10 represents a significant reduction in the overall density of the originally proposed project by eliminating the entire residential portion of the originally proposed project while increasing the Studio Office, Hotel, and Entertainment uses of the originally proposed project. Alternative 10 eliminates the proposed 2,937 residential units and 180,000 square feet of neighborhood retail and community-serving commercial uses of the originally proposed project and adds approximately 210,000 additional net new square feet of Studio Office uses, an additional 150,000 net new square feet of Entertainment uses in the Entertainment Area, and an additional 450,000 square feet of Hotel uses (up to 500 guest rooms) in the Entertainment Area. In addition, Alternative 10 includes additional parking structures.

Due to the elimination of the proposed residential, neighborhood and community serving commercial uses in the existing Back Lot Area, identified as the Mixed-Use Residential Area under the originally proposed project, Alternative 10 would also retain the existing 42,240 square feet of Entertainment uses in the existing Back Lot Area proposed to be demolished under the originally proposed project. Thus, Alternative 10 would result in an additional 192,240 net new square feet of Entertainment uses as compared to the originally proposed project (the 150,000 new square feet described above and the retained 42,240 existing square feet).

Overall, the approximately 852,240 additional square feet of net new Studio Office, Hotel, and Entertainment uses under Alternative 10 would be in addition to the approximately 1.8 million square feet of net new Studio, Studio Office, Office, Entertainment, Entertainment Retail and Hotel uses proposed under the originally proposed project.

Alternative 10 would involve the detachment of approximately 30 acres of the Project Site from the City's jurisdiction into the County. Alternative 10 would also involve the annexation of approximately 3 acres of the Project Site from the County's jurisdiction into the City of Los Angeles. The jurisdictional boundary adjustments proposed under Alternative 10 would therefore result in an overall net change of approximately 27 acres from the City to the County. Should the annexation and detachment process be completed through the Los Angeles Local Agency Formation Commission, approximately 68 acres of the Project Site would be located within the City, and the remaining approximately 323 acres of the Project Site would be located within the unincorporated area of the County.

Should the proposed annexation and detachment not occur under Alternative 10, the 95 acres within the Project Site currently located within the City would remain located in the City, while the balance, 296 acres, would remain under the jurisdiction of the County. If the proposed annexation and detachment does not occur, Alternative 10's proposed development of

approximately 2.68 million square feet of net new Studio, Studio Office, Office, Entertainment, Entertainment Retail, Amphitheater, Hotel and related space that supports the various on-site production and entertainment activities would still occur; however, these uses would be situated based on existing jurisdictional boundaries.

Under Alternative 10, development in the County portions of the Project Site would occur in accordance with the provisions set forth in the County Specific Plan (as modified for Alternative 10), the boundaries of which would reflect the above discussed annexation and detachment actions. Development in the County portions of the Project Site would include the Studio, Studio Office, Office, Entertainment, Entertainment Retail, and Amphitheater uses and 450,000 square feet of Hotel uses (500 guest rooms) proposed in the County under the originally proposed project, an additional 192,240 net new square feet of Entertainment uses as compared to the originally proposed project, as well as an additional 125,000 square feet of Studio Office uses. Overall, development under the County Specific Plan would allow for the construction of 2,433,000 square feet of gross new development, less 544,460 square feet of demolition, for a total of 1,888,540 square feet of net new development. In addition, as with the originally proposed project, Alternative 10 would also include an equivalency program in the County that would allow for the development of a different land use mix consistent with the provisions of the County Specific Plan as long as the overall character of development within the County Specific Plan area and each Development Area located in the County is maintained.

Development in the City portions of the Project Site would occur in accordance with the [Q]C2-1-SN Zone, pursuant to City of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 182321 (the "City [Q]C2 Zone"), the boundaries of which reflect the above discussed annexation and detachment actions. Development in the City portions of the Project Site would include 50,000 square feet of Studio uses, 450,000 square feet of Hotel uses (500 guest rooms), as well as approximately 330,000 gross new square feet of Studio Office uses. Alternative 10 would also include a 5,000 square foot expansion to the existing child care center in the northeastern portion of the Project Site (included in the 330,000 gross new square feet of Studio Office uses), which would be located within the City.

III. FINDINGS REQUIRED TO BE MADE BY RESPONSIBLE AGENCY

In considering the County Entitlements, the County is acting as a responsible agency under CEQA pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21069 and CEQA Guidelines § 15096. CEQA Guidelines § 15096 requires a responsible agency to consider the environmental effects of the project as shown in the EIR prepared by the lead agency and reach its own conclusions on whether and how to approve the project involved. CEQA Guidelines § 15096(h) also requires the responsible agency to make certain findings required by CEQA Guidelines § 15091 for each significant effect of the project. CEQA Guidelines § 15091(a) provides that:

No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

(2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

Under CEQA Guidelines § 15096(g)(1), a responsible agency has responsibility for mitigating or avoiding only the direct or indirect environmental effects of those parts of the project which it decides to carry out, finance, or approve. When an EIR has been prepared for a project, CEQA Guidelines § 15096(g)(2) provides that the responsible agency shall not approve the project as proposed if the agency finds any feasible alternative or feasible mitigation measures within its powers that would substantially lessen or avoid any significant effect the project would have on the environment.

CEQA Guidelines § 15096(h) also requires a responsible agency to make the findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15093, if necessary. Pursuant to § 15093, when an agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record.

The findings reported in the following pages incorporate the facts and discussions of the environmental impacts that are found to be significant in the EIR for the Project as fully set forth therein. Although CEQA Guidelines § 15091 does not require findings to address environmental impacts that an EIR identifies as merely “potentially significant,” these findings would nevertheless fully account for all such effects identified in the Final EIR for the purpose of better understanding the full environmental scope of the Project. For each of the significant impacts associated with the Project, either before or after mitigation, the following sections are provided:

- a) Description of Significant Effects - A specific description of the environmental effects identified in the EIR, including a judgment regarding the significance of the impact.
- b) Project Design Features – Identified project design features or actions that are included as part of the Project.
- c) Mitigation Measures - Identified mitigation measures or actions that are required as part of the Project.
- d) Finding - One or more of three specific findings in direct response to CEQA Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091.
- e) Rationale for Finding - A summary of the reasons for the finding(s).
- f) Reference - A notation on the specific section(s) in and technical appendices to the EIR which include the evidence and discussion of the identified impact.

IV. IMPACTS DETERMINED IN THE INITIAL STUDY NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning prepared an Initial Study dated July 10, 2007, for the originally proposed project, which determined that the originally proposed project would not have the potential to cause significant impacts in the following areas: Agricultural Resources and Mineral Resources. Therefore, these issue areas were not examined in detail in the EIR. In addition, as these issue areas deal generally with the location of the Project Site, the Project (Alternative 10) would also not have the potential to cause significant Agricultural Resources and Mineral Resources impacts. The rationale for the conclusion that no significant impact would occur in each of these issue areas is summarized below, and based on that rationale, and other evidence in the administrative record relating to the originally proposed project and the Project (Alternative 10), the County finds and determines that the following environmental impact categories will not result in any significant impacts and that no mitigation measures are needed:

A. Agricultural Resources

The Project would involve the construction of urban uses within the existing urbanized Project Site. The Project Site is not used, nor has it been used in the recent past, for agricultural purposes. The site is not zoned for agricultural use nor is it designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resources Protection. Thus, the Project would not 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 nonagricultural use. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation measures are required.

The Project would involve the construction of urban uses within the existing urbanized Project Site. The Project Site is not zoned nor has it been used in the past for agricultural purposes. The Project Site is currently zoned for residential and commercial/industrial land use and is not enrolled under the Williamson Act. Thus, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract, and no impact would occur.

The Project would involve the construction of urban uses within the existing urbanized site. The Project Site is located in an urbanized area of Los Angeles and does not contain any agricultural uses, nor are any agricultural uses located in the vicinity of the Project Site. Thus, development of the Project would not convert any farmland to non-agricultural use, and no impact would occur.

B. Mineral Resources

The Project Site is not located within an area containing significant mineral deposits (i.e., Mineral Resource Zone 2 Areas- MRZ-2), nor is it located within a surface mining district. Thus, the Project would not 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 and no significant impacts would occur.

The Project Site is not designated as a locally recognized area containing notable mineral deposits. Thus, the Project would not 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 and no significant impacts would occur.

V. IMPACTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT PRIOR TO MITIGATION

The Los Angeles Department of City Planning prepared an Initial Study for the Project in which it required analysis of the following environmental impact areas in an EIR: Land Use; Traffic/Access; Noise; Visual Qualities; Light and Glare; Geology and Soils; Water Resources; Air Quality; Biota; Cultural Resources; Public Services; Utilities; Environmental Safety; Employment, Housing and Population; and Climate Change.

The following impact areas were determined to be less than significant prior to mitigation, and based on that analysis and other evidence in the administrative record relating to the Project, the County finds and determines that the following environmental impact categories will not result in any significant impacts and that no mitigation measures are needed:

A. Land Use

1. Land Use Plans

Development of the Project Site is currently guided by several adopted land use plans and policies. Regional land use plans applicable to the Project are those prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments which includes the 1996 Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, the 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan, and 2004 Compass Blueprint Growth Vision. As the Project Site is located within both the County of Los Angeles and the City of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Los Angeles River Master Plan are applicable to the County portions of the Project Site, whereas, the land use plans that are administered by the City of Los Angeles applicable to the Project are the City of Los Angeles General Plan, including the Sherman Oaks-Studio City-Toluca Lake-Cahuenga Pass Community Plan, the Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan (and proposed River Improvement Overlay), and the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan. Although not formally adopted as regulatory “plans”, the City of Los Angeles Planning Department’s Urban Design Principles and Walkability Checklist are recognized in planning future development throughout the City, and thus are also applicable to the Project. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority (Metro) has prepared two transportation planning documents to improve mobility in the region through the use of bicycles: The Metro Bicycle Strategic Plan and the Bicycle Transportation Account Compliance Document.

The Project would be consistent with the provisions of Southern California Association of Governments, County of Los Angeles, and City of Los Angeles land use plans, and would not preclude the attainment of the primary intent of the land use plans or policies for the Project Site. The Project would also implement a number of key land use and transportation policies by locating the Project’s growth at a regional transportation hub and furthering the existing character of the Project Site as a major regional employment center. In addition, the proposed development of Studio, Studio Office, Entertainment, Entertainment Retail, Amphitheater, Hotel, and Office uses would support land use objectives to accommodate a diversity of uses that support the needs of the area’s existing and future residents, businesses and visitors.

Since key regional, County, and City, land use plan objectives and policies would be implemented under the Project, land use impacts would be less than significant as the Project is not inconsistent with adopted and future land use designations and applicable land use plans. Though the Project would not develop the Project Site with residential units as would the originally proposed project, and thus not provide the beneficial effects of such development, the Project would provide a greater level of commercial growth at a regional transportation hub than

the originally proposed project, and a greater expansion to the entertainment and tourism industries, key economic engines in Southern California, than the originally proposed project. With the granting of the requested land use approvals by the County and City of Los Angeles, the Project would not be inconsistent with the goals, policies, objectives, and land use/zoning designations established by both the County and City General Plans and zoning codes, as well as the goals and objectives established by land use plans prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments. Project design features to reduce potential impacts with regard to land use plans have been incorporated into the proposed Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and County Specific Plan. No mitigation measures are required as the Project impacts with regard to land use plans would be less than significant.

a. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The Project would involve the annexation of approximately 3 acres of the Project Site from the County's jurisdiction into the City of Los Angeles. The Project would also involve detachment of approximately 30 acres of the Project Site from the City's jurisdiction into the County. Should the proposed annexation and detachment not occur under the Project, the 296 acres within the Project Site currently located within the County of Los Angeles would remain located in the County of Los Angeles, while the balance, 95 acres, would remain under the jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles. Further, while adjustments to the County Specific Plan and the City [Q]C2 Zone and would be required, the Project's proposed development would still occur; however, the proposed uses would be located based on existing jurisdictional boundaries. As no changes to the Project's consistency with adopted land use plans would occur as a result of maintaining existing City/County jurisdictional boundaries under the No Annexation scenario, land use plan impacts under the No Annexation scenario would also be less than significant.

b. Cumulative Impacts

It is anticipated that the projects under consideration in the area surrounding the Project would implement and support important local and regional planning goals and policies and that any new project, as necessary, would incorporate mitigation measures required to reduce potential land use plan impacts to a less than significant level. With implementation of the County Specific Plan and the City [Q]C2 Zone, and upon approval of the requested actions, development of the Project and related projects are anticipated to not be inconsistent with the intent of the City or County General Plans or with other applicable land use plans, and the County and City Planning and Zoning Codes regarding future development in and around the Project Site. Therefore, development of the Project, in conjunction with the related projects, would not be expected to result in cumulatively considerable impacts with respect to applicable land use plans and regulations.

2. Physical Land Use

The growth in development under the Project would occur within generally the same areas of the Project Site as the originally proposed project, with the exception of the elimination of the proposed residential, neighborhood retail and community-serving commercial uses in the existing Back Lot Area under the Project.

The Project Site is surrounded by a mix of commercial (e.g., hotel, office, retail), single- and multi-family residential, and public and private recreational land uses, most of which are physically separated from the site by intervening facilities. With regard to development within the

Studio, Entertainment, and Business Areas, improvements consistent with the County Specific Plan and the City [Q]C2 Zone would not create a material change with regard to the Project Site's existing physical relationship with adjoining land uses. This occurs because development under the Project would consist of the same types of land uses as currently exist within this portion of the Project Site and thus, the Project development would reinforce existing on-site land use patterns. Furthermore, the Project would not disrupt, divide, or isolate existing neighborhoods or communities.

With regard to the existing Back Lot Area, the Project would not develop any of the residential, neighborhood retail and community-serving commercial uses that the originally proposed project would develop. Instead, the Project would develop additional Studio Office uses in the northeastern portion of the Project Site (in the City) and Studio uses in the existing County portion of the existing Back Lot Area. In addition, as provided in Section 6.E.7 and Exhibit 2-C of the County Specific Plan, no permanent structures or parking facilities would be permitted within a greenspace area along the eastern property boundary that abuts the Hollywood Manor (Blair Drive) community. In sum, as compared to the originally proposed project, the Project would include substantially less development within the existing Back Lot Area. Project design features to reduce potential physical land use impacts have been incorporated into the County's MMRP and County Specific Plan. Impacts with regard to physical land use under the Project would be less than significant.

a. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The proposed annexation/detachment of areas between the County and City would not alter the potential for physical land use impacts as the analysis is independent of jurisdictional boundaries. As such, potential impacts under the No Annexation scenario would remain the same as those identified above. As such, physical land use impacts under the No Annexation scenario would be less than significant.

b. Cumulative Impacts

Development of the Project in combination with the related projects would result in an intensification of the existing prevailing land uses in the vicinity of the Project Site. However, it should be noted that all of the related projects are subject to local zoning and land use designations for each of the related project sites (i.e., City of Los Angeles and Burbank). These requirements would regulate future land uses and provide development standards for such land uses that would further preclude potential land use compatibility impacts. Therefore, the Project would not combine with the related projects to create an incompatibility with surrounding communities with respect to land use, density, or building height. As the Project would not combine with the related projects to adversely change the existing relationship with all off-site areas and would not disrupt, divide or isolate existing communities, the Project combined with the related projects would result in cumulative physical land use impacts that would be less than significant.

B. Traffic/Access (Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Vehicular Safety)

1. Environmental Impacts

Under the Project, a number of entry points to the Project Site would be available. All new on-site driveway locations from City streets would be required to conform with City standards and would be required to provide adequate sight distance, sidewalks, crosswalks,

and pedestrian movement controls that meet the City's requirements to protect pedestrian safety. Signalization meeting City standards would be provided at the access locations requiring signalization to provide for proper vehicular and bicycle movement controls. Thus, the Project would not substantially increase hazards to pedestrians, bicyclists, or vehicles and a less than significant impact would occur.

2. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The proposed annexation/detachment of land areas between the County and City would not alter the potential for traffic/circulation impacts nor the significance level of any impact. Annexation has no bearing on which jurisdictional intersection or recommended improvement to various intersections could occur with the Project. The jurisdictions responsible for implementation of the mitigation measures would also be unaffected. As such, potential impacts would remain the same if the proposed annexation/detachment actions are not implemented.

3. Cumulative Impacts

Impacts associated with bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular safety would be less than significant. Additionally, the applicants of the other related projects would be required to design and construct the related projects in conformance with applicable standards regarding sight distance, sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian movement controls. Therefore, the Project's contribution to cumulative bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular safety impacts would not be considerable, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

C. Traffic/Access (Parking)

1. Construction Impacts

During construction of the Project, an adequate number of on-site parking spaces would be available at all times or a shuttle to an off-site parking location would be provided for the construction workers. Therefore, construction of the Project would result in a less than significant impact with regard to the availability of parking spaces.

Currently the Project Site provides an additional 1,200 parking spaces than required (i.e., a parking surplus of 1,200 spaces). The anticipated demolition of existing on-site uses would reduce the Project Site's parking requirements by 5,121 parking spaces, from 15,972 to 10,851 parking spaces. In terms of parking supply, the anticipated demolition of existing on-site uses would reduce the amount of available parking at the Project Site by a total of 3,728 spaces, from 16,940 to 13,212 parking spaces. These changes in parking requirements and parking supply serve to increase the parking surplus at the Project Site from 1,200 parking spaces (accounting for interim projects) to 2,271 parking spaces. Therefore, Project demolition would result in a less than significant parking impact.

2. Operational Impacts

The placement of structures and subsequent parking under the Project would be developed per the City [Q]C2 Zone and County Specific Plan.

The proposed County Specific Plan requirements provide for equal or more parking than that required by the Los Angeles County Code. The required parking for the Project

development is approximately 8,430 spaces. The Project includes 9,984 parking spaces for development under the proposed County Specific Plan. Considering the number of existing parking spaces, the number of parking spaces that would be added as part of interim projects, the number of parking spaces that would be removed during the Project's demolition phases, and the number of proposed additional parking spaces, the Project would result in a surplus of 4,942 parking spaces at Project buildout, based on the parking requirements outlined in the proposed County Specific Plan. Thus, the Project would provide sufficient parking to accommodate the proposed development within the County's jurisdiction. Therefore, impacts related to parking under the proposed County Specific Plan would be less than significant.

The estimated City parking requirement for proposed uses would be approximately 1,010 spaces. The Project includes 2,143 parking spaces for development in the City portions of the Project Site. When including existing parking spaces, the number of parking spaces that would be added as part of interim projects, the number of parking spaces that would be removed during the Project's demolition phases, and the number of proposed additional parking spaces, the Project would result in a surplus of parking spaces at Project buildout, based on the parking planned in the City portions of the Project Site. Thus, the Project would provide sufficient parking to accommodate the proposed development within the City's jurisdiction. Therefore, impacts related to parking under the City [Q]C2 Zone would be less than significant.

Future parking demand from the continued growth of the Project Site would also be met through continued sitewide management of parking facilities. Project design features to reduce parking impacts have been incorporated into the proposed Project. Overall, parking impacts under the Project would be less than significant.

3. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

If the proposed annexation/detachment does not occur, the Project's land use plan would not change. As such, the provision of on-site parking would comply with all applicable parking requirements of the County Specific Plan for the County portions of the Project Site and the City [Q]C2 Zone for the City portions of the Project Site. Adherence to these parking requirements would mitigate all the Project parking impacts. As such, impacts associated with the No Annexation scenario would be less than significant.

4. Cumulative Impacts

The parking demands associated with the Project would not contribute to the cumulative demand for parking in the vicinity of the Project Site as a result of development of the related projects. Land uses associated with the Project are isolated from parking areas outside of the Project Site. Thus, visitors and employees associated with the Project are not anticipated to park elsewhere due to topographical and access limitations. Additionally, the Project's demand for parking would be accommodated on-site. Therefore, cumulative parking impacts would be less than significant.

D. Noise (Operational)

1. On-Site Sources

Operational noise sources on the Project Site would include those related to maintenance/operations, traffic, parking areas, building mechanical and electrical equipment, Universal Studios Hollywood attractions (operating from 7:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M.), Universal

CityWalk tenants and public areas, as well as from special events. New major noise sources from the Project were included in the analysis based on the proposed Project Conceptual Plan and assumed to operate simultaneously. Each new Universal Studios Hollywood attraction source was assumed to be similar to an existing attraction source and thus a corresponding sound level was used in the computer model. It was assumed that the Universal Studios Hollywood tour trams operate at a maximum capacity of 23 trips per hour. This condition is not the norm; however, this method was utilized to provide a conservative approach to analyzing the potential noise levels from this particular noise source.

The selection of the significance thresholds for on-site operational noise sources analyzed the applicable provisions of the County Noise Ordinance, the City Noise Ordinance, and the *City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide* to determine which was more restrictive and in turn would yield a more conservative assessment of potential on-site operational noise impacts. As explained on Pages 991 to 992 of the Draft EIR, the analysis concluded that the County Noise Ordinance was the most restrictive, and thus the most conservative, methodology for analyzing noise impacts for operations. Accordingly, the restrictions in the County Noise Ordinance were selected as the significance thresholds for on-site operational noise sources.

The Project's noise sources were modeled based on their normal operating hours and the County Noise Ordinance's differentiation between noise standards for daytime and nighttime hours. For example, the normal operating hours for the Universal Studios Hollywood theme park are 7:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M. and the analysis and model was completed using the Project's new theme park noise sources during that timeframe. In addition, any new noise sources in the public areas (Universal CityWalk) were included in the model until their closing time at 2:00 A.M..

The results of this modeling of all noise sources simultaneously indicated that the new Project sound sources would be in compliance with the established significance thresholds, which follow the County Noise Ordinance. As on-site noise sources would not generate noise levels that exceed the established significance criteria, impacts from on-site sources would be less than significant.

2. Roadway Sources

Traffic noise models of the surrounding community area were constructed using Federal Highway Administration's Traffic Noise model modeling software to determine ambient noise increases due to traffic increases. All of the traffic receptors would experience an increase in traffic noise levels from the Project that is less than 3 dB with mitigation measures. increases in noise from the Project traffic at the receptor locations, which are all below 3 dB, would not be perceptible. Accordingly, with the use of the more restrictive CEQA threshold of a 3 dB noise increase for traffic noise, Project conditions for the existing year as well as 2030 would not exceed the established significance criteria, and thus impacts from roadway sources would be less than significant.

3. Project Design Features

No Project Design Features are applicable to development in the County for this environmental issue. Project Design Feature C-3 adopted by the City is not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction.

4. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The significance thresholds used in the noise analysis are based on a combination of the noise standards in use by both the County and City. The significance thresholds that were selected for this analysis reflects the City or County noise standard, that would yield the more conservative analysis. As such, the jurisdiction within which Project development is located would not result in the use of a significance threshold that would be more restrictive than that which is used in the various analyses presented in the EIR. Therefore, the location of jurisdictional boundaries has no effect on the assessment of impacts whether under the Project or the No Annexation scenario. As such, impacts associated with the No Annexation scenario would be the same as those identified above with regard to the Project.

5. Cumulative Impacts

As noted above, noise from on-site operations would not result in a significant impact at any receptor locations. However, when the Project and related project developments are completed, the operational noise of these related projects could cumulatively impact the analyzed receptor areas. The cumulative analysis considered likely stationary source noise from these related projects and determined that the noise levels at all of the receptor sites would still fall below the stated thresholds of significance. Accordingly, cumulative operational noise would not exceed the established significance criteria and thus the impacts would be less than significant.

Regarding cumulative traffic noise, the anticipated impact onto the receptors due to traffic generated noise from all Project and related project development was evaluated. The analysis showed that all changes in noise levels from cumulative traffic noise would fall below the 3 dBA threshold, with the majority of the cumulative noise increases ranging from 1-2 dBA, with a maximum impact of 2.4 dBA. Based on these roadway noise levels, the increases in noise from cumulative traffic at all receptor locations would not be noticeable when added to the existing noise levels. Accordingly, because the impact on all receptor areas is less than 3 dBA, cumulative roadway noise impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

E. Visual Qualities

1. Construction Impacts

On-site construction of some structures under the Project would include the use of temporary towers and cranes that could interfere with existing view lines. Construction activities under the Project could potentially be visible from viewpoints that currently have views of the Project Site. In terms of visual character, construction activities under the Project would result in temporary changes to the visual environment when viewed from these off-site locations. The extent to which the construction of the Project's buildings would affect the field of view and result in changes in contrast, coverage or prominence would be the same as the Project's buildings when framing is completed and less than the Project prior to that point. As such, Project construction impacts would be less than significant and would be comparable to but not exceed, those identified below once framing is complete and less than that before framing is completed.

With respect to views, construction activities under the Project would result in a variety of structures and equipment potentially including scaffolding, cranes, and support vehicles to the visual environment. This activity would have the same effect with respect to view blockage as the Project once framing is complete, and a lesser effect before framing is completed. On-site construction activities would not substantially block views of existing prominent visual resources

since construction under the Project would occur over varying lengths of time. As such, construction impacts of the Project would be less than significant.

2. Operational Impacts

Development under the Project would be focused mostly within the currently developed portions of the Business, Entertainment, Studio and Back Lot Areas. With respect to the Studio, Business, and Entertainment Areas, development in those Areas would include Studio, Studio Office, Office, Amphitheater, and Entertainment Retail uses, as well as an overall increase in Entertainment Uses and additional Hotel Uses (as compared to the originally proposed project). The introduction of new development under the Project may affect the visual character of those three Areas and views of valued visual resources. Potential visual character impacts from all off-site geographic areas would be less than significant in that not all three criteria (i.e., contrast, coverage, and prominence) would be impacted. Similarly, existing views of valued visual resources would not be significantly affected, as there would be no coverage of a prominent view resource under the Project.

Development within the Back Lot Area would be greatly reduced under the Project (as compared to the originally proposed project) with the elimination of the residential, neighborhood retail and community serving commercial uses. New Studio and Studio Office uses that would occur under the Project within the existing Back Lot Area would occur at quite a distance from locations within the Cahuenga Pass West, Universal City Metro Red Line Station and Campo de Cahuenga, Weddington Park (South), City View Lofts, Toluca Estates, and Toluca Lake geographic areas, and would be situated so as not to impact views of valued visual resources. While there is the potential for an impact to occur due to an increase in development over what exists currently, potential visual character impacts from these geographic areas would be less than significant in that not all three criteria (e.g., prominence, contrast, and coverage) would be significantly impacted. Overall, visual character impacts under the Project would be less than significant due to the location of the geographic areas in relation to the proposed Studio and Studio Office uses in the Back Lot Area, as well as the Project's elimination of the residential, neighborhood retail and community-serving commercial uses. Similarly, existing views of valued visual resources from these geographic areas would not be significantly affected, as there would be no coverage of a prominent view resource under the Project.

From those geographic areas close to and with views oriented towards the Back Lot Area, potential visual character impacts could occur from development within the Back Lot Area under the Project. However, as with the originally proposed project this impact is less than significant as not all three criteria (e.g., prominence, contrast, and coverage) would be significantly impacted. Though new Studio and Studio Office uses would occur within the existing Back Lot Area under the Project, the removal of the residential, neighborhood retail and community-serving commercial uses and inclusion of a greenspace area along the eastern boundary of the County portion of the property (pursuant to Section 6.E.7 and Exhibit 2-C of the County Specific Plan) would result in potential visual impacts that would be less than those of the originally proposed project. In addition, the coverage of a prominent view resource would not occur for those vantage points with views in a northerly direction towards the Verdugo Mountains and San Fernando Valley or in a westerly direction towards the Cahuenga Pass West areas. Project design features to reduce visual resource impacts have been incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and County Specific Plan. View impacts under the Project would be less than significant.

3. Project Design Features

No Project Design Features are applicable to development in the County for this environmental issue. Project Design Features D-1 to D-4 adopted by the City are not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction.

4. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The proposed annexation/detachment of areas between the County of Los Angeles and City of Los Angeles would not alter the potential for impacts to visual character and views, as the impact analysis and conclusions are independent of jurisdictional boundaries. As such, impacts to identified geographic areas under the No Annexation scenario would be the same as described above, and thus, would be less than significant.

5. Cumulative Impacts

Development of the Project Site in combination with other future projects in the immediately surrounding area could contribute to cumulative visual impacts, resulting in a gradual change in the perception of the Project Site and surrounding areas over time. Development of low-rise structures and lower intensity development would not be anticipated to have a substantial aesthetic effect since the vicinity of the Project Site is already urbanized. However, related project development could include mid- and/or high-rise structures that may change the skyline in this area over time. However, after the release of the Draft EIR, it was announced that Related Project 65, the Metro Universal project, is no longer proposed. Accordingly, the potential incremental effect on visual character and views in the vicinity of the Project Site would not be cumulatively considerable, and thus, cumulative impacts are concluded to be less than significant.

F. Light and Glare (Artificial Light)

1. Construction Impacts

Potential artificial light impacts during construction of the Project are limited to what is required to support nighttime construction activities. As such, nighttime construction activities could affect adjacent residential and other light-sensitive uses, but would not be anticipated to affect those light-sensitive uses located farther away. Given the temporary nature and short duration of nighttime construction activities associated with the Project construction activities and the requirement in Project Design Feature E.2-1 (for the City portion of the Project Site) and the proposed County Specific Plan that lighting for such activities be shielded or directed to restrict any direct illumination of property located outside the Project Site, impacts associated with nighttime construction lighting, should they occur at all, would be less than significant.

2. Operational Impacts

During operations, structures built under the Project could result in creating additional sources of high brightness illuminated surfaces. Potential structures in the Studio, Business, and Entertainment Areas could be placed in areas along Lankershim Boulevard that could emit significant levels of artificial light near off-site light sensitive uses. In addition, the potential placement of structures in the Back Lot Area could also potentially create a significant artificial lighting impact to off-site light sensitive uses. However, the Project would eliminate the proposed residential, neighborhood retail and community-serving commercial uses in the existing Back Lot Area and replace those uses with Studio and Studio Office uses, resulting in a reduced geographic extent of development. Potential impacts would be reduced to less than

significant levels through compliance with Project Design Feature E.2-1 (for the City portion of the Project Site) and proposed County Specific Plan guidelines that would limit the overall amount and direction of lighting from Project structures. Overall, operational lighting exposure impacts due to brightness and light trespass would be less than significant for all locations surrounding the Project Site, since application of the lighting standards in Project Design Feature E.2-1 (for the City portion of the Project Site) and the proposed County Specific Plan would reduce brightness ratios experienced at off-site residential locations to less than 30:1 and since light trespass onto adjacent properties would not be permitted to exceed 2.0 footcandles. Artificial light impacts under the Project would be less than significant.

3. Project Design Features

No Project Design Features are applicable to development in the County for this environmental issue. Project Design Feature E.2-1 adopted by the City is not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction.

4. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The proposed annexation/detachment of areas between the County of Los Angeles and City of Los Angeles would not alter the potential for impacts resulting from new artificial light sources as the impact analysis and conclusions are independent of jurisdictional boundaries. Thus, light aesthetics impacts from structures, landscaping, and lighted signage under the No Annexation scenario would be the same as those identified for the Project, based on the existing light environment and distance to off-site receptors.

5. Cumulative Impacts

Most of the related projects are located too distant from the Project Site to result in a cumulative impact. However, development of the Project in combination with some future developments in proximity to the Project Site could contribute to increased artificial light emissions as seen by off-site sensitive uses. This increase in artificial light levels would occur within the context of an already highly lit urban environment and cumulative impacts would be anticipated to be relatively minor. While the Project would increase artificial light levels in the vicinity of the Project Site, the standards set forth in Project Design Feature E.2-1 (for the City portion of the Project Site) and the proposed County Specific Plan control the Project's potential artificial light sources to a sufficient degree so as to not be considered cumulatively considerable. Therefore, development of the Project would result in less than significant cumulative lighting impacts.

G. Light and Glare (Glare)

1. Construction Impacts

Any potential glare generated during construction activities would be highly transitory and short-term, given the movement of construction equipment and materials within the Project Site. The potential for nighttime glare associated with construction activities would be limited as most construction activities occur during the day. In addition, large surfaces that are usually required to generate substantial glare are typically not an element of construction activities. Thus, potential construction impacts under the Project would be less than significant.

2. Operational Impacts

With regards to operational glare, development under the Project would create additional sources of daytime and nighttime glare from structures, signage, and thematic elements. Potential structures under the Project would be developed in accordance with the provisions of the County Specific Plan and the City [Q]C2 Zone that would prohibit the use of highly reflective building materials. Further, some Project-generated glare would be blocked by existing topography, vegetation fencing, and other factors. As such, glare impacts under the Project would be less than significant.

3. Project Design Features

No Project Design Features are applicable to development in the County for this environmental issue. Project Design Feature E.3-1 adopted by the City is not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction.

4. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The proposed annexation/detachment of areas between the County of Los Angeles and City of Los Angeles would not alter the potential for impacts resulting from daytime or nighttime glare as the impact analysis and conclusions are independent of jurisdictional boundaries. As such, potential impacts would remain the same (i.e., less than significant), if the proposed annexation/detachment actions are not implemented.

5. Cumulative Impacts

Development of the Project in combination with the related projects would result in an intensification of land uses in an already urbanized area of the County and City that currently maintains an elevated level of daytime glare. Similar to the Project, the related projects would be expected to incorporate project design features and/or implement mitigation measures to minimize or avoid the use of highly reflective materials. As the Project would preclude glare-related impacts through project design features, it would not contribute to a cumulative impact with respect to glare and therefore cumulative glare impacts would be less than significant.

H. Geotechnical (Fault Rupture, Strong Seismic Ground Shaking, Groundwater Seepage, Flooding and Inundation, Geologic and Soil Instabilities, Sedimentation and Erosion, and Landform Alteration)

1. Construction and Operational Impacts

a. Fault Rupture

The Project Site is not located within either a designated Earthquake Fault Zone or an Alquist-Priolo Hazard Zone and the potential for fault rupture is considered to be low. Therefore, Project impacts related to fault rupture would be less than significant.

b. Strong Seismic Ground Shaking

The Project Site is not exposed to a greater than normal seismic risk than other areas of southern California. Conformance with applicable building code requirements would reduce the potential for structures on the Project Site to sustain damage during an earthquake event, and the Project impacts related to ground shaking would be less than significant.

c. Groundwater Seepage

During grading, temporary excavations and cut slopes in the natural soils or the bedrock may reveal unanticipated occurrences of groundwater seepage. This could require dewatering during construction, which would occur in accordance with all applicable permit requirements. As a result, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

d. Flooding and Inundation

The Project Site is not located in a County or City of Los Angeles flood or inundation hazard zone and is not mapped on flood rate insurance maps as a location that is subject to risks from flooding. The Los Angeles River Flood Control Channel is not considered a flood hazard with respect to the Project Site. Further, the Project Site is not located in close proximity to large bodies of water and potential adverse effects related to seicheing are unlikely. Therefore, Project impacts related to flooding and inundation would be less than significant.

e. Geologic and Soil Instabilities

The Project Site is not located within an area of known subsidence (ground settlement) associated with fluid withdrawal (groundwater or petroleum), peat oxidation, or hydrocompaction and temporary dewatering during construction is not anticipated to result in subsidence. Recommendations for the design of any required dewatering systems shall be included in the site-specific geotechnical investigations and recommendations for new construction. As a result, Project impacts related to geologic and soil instabilities would be less than significant.

f. Sedimentation and Erosion

Grading, excavation, and other earth-moving activities could potentially result in erosion and sedimentation. The grading requirements as set forth in the City or County building codes, as applicable, would be followed with regard to drainage and the planting of slopes. For any grading performed during the “rain season” (generally November to April) provisions would need to be made to control erosion, and an erosion control plan would be submitted to the appropriate building department. With the implementation of the proposed project design feature, which requires compliance with all construction site runoff controls and implementation of construction “Best Management Practices” under applicable State and local requirements, Project impacts with regard to sedimentation and erosion would be less than significant. Additional discussion of erosion and sedimentation during construction is included in the Drainage and Surface Water Quality sections of the Draft EIR.

g. Landform Alteration

(1) Grading

Proposed grading would not alter any significant canyons, ravines or outcrops; nor would it reduce the overall height of the north-south trending ridge at its highest point within the Back Lot Area. Therefore, no distinct and prominent geologic or topographic features would be adversely affected by the Project, and Project impacts with regards to landform alteration would be less than significant.

(2) Cut and Fill

Grading proposed to occur at the Project Site would require both excavation and the placing of compacted fills. The reuse of soil on-site would be implemented to the extent possible in lieu of exporting the material to an off-site location and a stockpile would be utilized, as required. The stockpile would be located in a manner such that it would not alter any noteworthy canyons, ravines or outcrops, and no distinct or prominent geologic or topographic features would be adversely affected by the Project. If a stockpile were to remain in place after the completion of discrete developments within the Back Lot Area, the exterior slopes of the stockpile would be treated as permanent slopes with drainage requirements consistent with the requirements of the City of Los Angeles or the County of Los Angeles, as applicable. Therefore, Project impacts related to landform alteration during grading would be less than significant.

2. Project Design Features

- F-1:** All Project construction would conform to the requirements of the applicable building code, including all provisions related to seismic safety.
- F-2:** As part of Project grading, erosion and sedimentation control measures would be implemented during site grading to reduce erosion impacts. The Project Applicant or its successor would also comply with all construction site runoff control and implement construction "Best Management Practices" under applicable state and local requirements, as discussed further in Section IV.G.1.b, Water Resources – Surface Water Quality of the Draft EIR.
- F-3:** Dewatering activities would be conducted in accordance with the applicable permit requirements, as discussed further in Section IV.G.1.b, Water Resources – Surface Water Quality of the Draft EIR.
- F-4:** A total of 300,000 cubic yards of import or export of earth shall be permitted to/from the City portions of the Project Site. Movement of earth within the combined boundaries of the County and City portions of the Project Site shall not count toward this total.

3. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

In the event that the proposed annexation/detachment does not occur, construction would comply with all applicable building codes of the County of Los Angeles for the County portions and City of Los Angeles building codes as applicable for the City portions of the Project Site. While there would be differences between code requirements, adherence to either code would mitigate all geologic impacts. As such, impacts with respect to geotechnical conditions associated with the No Annexation scenario would be less than significant.

4. Cumulative Impacts

Geotechnical impacts related to future development in the County and City of Los Angeles would involve hazards associated with site-specific soil conditions, erosion, and ground-shaking during earthquakes. The impacts on each site would be specific to that site and its users and would not be common or contribute to (or shared with, in an additive sense) the impacts on other sites. In addition, development on each site would be subject to uniform site development and construction standards that are designed to protect public safety.

Therefore, cumulative geology and soil impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

I. Water Resources – Surface Water (Surface Water Quality)

1. Construction Impacts

The Project would involve earth-moving activities and could generate storm water pollutants of concern during construction. Construction impacts due to the Project development would be minimized during all phases of construction through compliance with a Construction General Permit issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan would be developed as required by, and in compliance with, the Construction General Permit and applicable County and/or City ordinances. In addition, the Project would comply with County of Los Angeles or City of Los Angeles local requirements, depending upon the jurisdiction within which the construction project is located, thereby implementing all applicable measures to meet the minimum requirements of the County Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit. As Best Management Practices would be selected and implemented based on the Best Available Technology Economically Achievable and Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology, construction of the Project is not anticipated to create pollution, contamination or nuisance or cause a regulatory standard to be violated, as defined in the applicable National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System stormwater permit or Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the receiving water body. Thus, impacts to surface water quality from construction would be less than significant.

2. Operational Impacts

No appreciable dry weather flows are anticipated to be discharged to the Los Angeles River Flood Control Channel following implementation of the Project. Based on the pollutant loading models of baseline and Project conditions, pollutant loads and average concentrations from the Project Site compared to baseline conditions, with the existing and proposed Best Management Practices and other project design features, would decrease for all modeled pollutants. Average pollutant concentrations for all modeled metals for the Project are also projected to be less than the in-stream wet weather Total Maximum Daily Load targets. Project development would incorporate applicable Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan Best Management Practices, which would cause additional pollutant reductions beyond those accounted for in the model. In addition, the County portions of the Project Site would comply with the County Low Impact Development Standards, as applicable pursuant to the County Specific Plan.

Overall, the Project is not anticipated to create pollution, contamination or nuisance as defined in Section 13050 of the California Water Code or cause a regulatory standard to be violated, as defined in the applicable National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System storm water permit or Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan). With continued implementation of Best Management Practices, and plans, programs, and policies, and implementation of the proposed project design features, including source control and site design Best Management Practices, and operation and maintenance Best Management Practices, the Project is not expected to result in any potentially significant surface water quality impacts.

3. Project Design Features

G.1.b-1: Prior to the issuance of grading permits for Projects (not including sets/façades or temporary uses), pursuant to the City's Department of Public Works and Bureau of Engineering regulations, and as that term is defined in the County Specific Plan, that are expected to disturb one acre or more of land, the Project Applicant, its successor, or authorized agent (i.e., contractor) shall provide proof to the applicable jurisdiction (the City or County Department of Public Works), as appropriate, with evidence that a Notice of Intent has been filed with the State Water Resources Control Board for coverage under the General Construction Permit and a certification that a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program has been prepared. Such evidence shall consist of a copy of the Notice of Intent stamped by the State Water Resources Control Board or Regional Board, or a letter from either agency stating that the Notice of Intent has been filed. The Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan shall include a menu of Best Management Practices to be selected and implemented based on the phase of construction and the weather conditions to effectively control erosion, sediment, and other construction-related pollutants to meet the Best Available Technology Economically Achievable/Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology standards. The Best Management Practices to be implemented during construction shall address the following:

- Erosion Control;
- Sediment Control;
- Waste and Materials Management;
- Non-stormwater Management;
- Training and Education; and
- Maintenance, Monitoring, and Inspections.

The construction site management Best Management Practices shall be implemented for the Project during the dry season and wet season as necessary depending upon the phase of construction and weather conditions. As required by the Construction General Permit, during all phases of construction, the Project shall implement Best Management Practices consistent with the Best Available Technology Economically Achievable/Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology standards.

G.1.b-2: For individual Projects (pursuant to the City Department of Public Works and Bureau of Engineering regulations, and as that term is defined in the County Specific Plan), that may occur over time that disturb less than one acre, prior to receiving a grading permit from either the City of Los Angeles or the County of Los Angeles, the Project Applicant or its successor shall certify to the satisfaction of the City or County Department of Public Works, dependent upon the location of the Project, that the Project Applicant or its successor understands and

shall implement all applicable Best Management Practices meeting the minimum requirements contained in the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit No. CAS00400) including:

- Retaining sediments generated on the Project Site using adequate Treatment Control or Structural Best Management Practices;
- Retaining construction-related materials, wastes, spills, or residues at the Project Site;
- Containing non-storm water runoff from equipment and vehicle washing and any other activity at the Project Site; and
- Controlling erosion from slopes and channels by implementing an effective combination of Best Management Practices.

G.1.b-3: Prior to issuance of a B-Permit or building permit for any Project, (pursuant to the City's Department of Public Works and Bureau of Engineering regulations, and as that term is defined in the County Specific Plan), that triggers the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan requirements, the Project Applicant or its successor shall prepare and submit a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan to the City of Los Angeles or County of Los Angeles to the satisfaction to the applicable jurisdiction, as applicable, for review. In addition, drawings and specifications of the proposed permanent stormwater quality Best Management Practices, including continuous deflection separator units and media filters (or Best Management Practices of similar technology with equivalent treatment or pollutant removal performance) in Drainage Areas A, D, E, F, J, L, M and O as shown on Attachment F to this MMRP, and bioswales and bioretention/underdrains (or Best Management Practices of similar technology with equivalent treatment or pollutant removal performance) in Drainage Areas M, R and S, as applicable, shall be submitted for review to the City of Los Angeles or County of Los Angeles, as applicable.

4. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

If annexation/detachment does not occur, the appropriate lead agency's policies and procedures would remain applicable to the areas within the City/County boundaries. While there are some differences between the policies and procedures of the respective jurisdictions, adherence to the policies and procedures of the applicable jurisdiction would mitigate any potential impacts. As such, impacts associated with the No Annexation scenario would be less than significant.

5. Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts to surface water quality in the Los Angeles River Flood Control Channel considers the potential impacts from the Project in conjunction with other related projects in the region. Since these related projects are generally in an already highly urbanized

area, other changes or development are not likely to cause substantial changes in regional surface water quality. In addition, it is anticipated that such projects would also be subject to Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan requirements and implementation of measures to comply with Total Maximum Daily Loads. Also, increases in regional controls associated with other elements of the County Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit would improve regional water quality over time. Therefore, with compliance with all applicable laws, rules and regulations, no significant cumulative impacts to surface water quality are anticipated.

J. Water Resources – Groundwater

1. Construction Impacts

a. Groundwater Hydrology

Groundwater under the Project Site is not currently pumped for beneficial uses. In addition, no water supply wells are located at the Project Site that could be impacted by construction and the Project would not include the construction of water supply wells. Therefore, due to the distance to existing water supply wells (over one mile) and the fact that drinking water, industrial or agricultural supply wells would not be constructed as part of the Project, construction is not anticipated to change potable water levels sufficiently to reduce the ability of water utilities to use the groundwater basin for public water supplies or in a manner that would reduce the yields of adjacent public or private wells or well fields.

If construction dewatering is required, local groundwater flow direction and depth may be temporarily affected. Dewatering is not anticipated to draw water across any substantial distance and impacts are considered negligible from a local and regional basin perspective. Since no water supply wells would be affected and construction dewatering is not anticipated to adversely impact the rate or direction of flow of groundwater, no significant impact from construction of the Project is anticipated to groundwater hydrology.

b. Groundwater Quality

During on-site grading and building construction, hazardous materials such as fuels, paints, solvents, and concrete additives could be used. Compliance with all applicable federal, state and local requirements concerning the handling, storage and disposal of hazardous waste would effectively reduce the potential for the construction of the Project to release contaminants into groundwater that could affect existing contaminants, expand the area of existing contamination, increase the level of groundwater contamination or cause the violation of regulatory water quality standards at an existing production well. In addition, as there are no groundwater production wells or public water supply wells within one mile of the Project Site, no construction impacts are anticipated to existing wells. Therefore, Project construction would not result in any substantial increase in groundwater contamination through hazardous materials releases, and a less than significant impact would occur.

If construction dewatering is required, based on the estimated maximum depth of excavation and anticipated dewatering requirements, adverse impacts are not anticipated relative to the rate, or direction of flow of shallow groundwater, or the area affected by, or level of, groundwater contamination. Therefore dewatering is not anticipated to draw water across any substantial distance and impacts are considered negligible from a local and regional perspective. In addition, a majority of the Project Site does not overlay or have a connection with the Basin, and there are no groundwater production wells or public water supply wells

within one-mile of the Project Site. If dewatering is required, with existing project design features, no operational impacts are anticipated to existing wells and no regulatory water quality standards at an existing production well would be violated as a result of the Project. Additionally, with compliance with well abandonment guidelines as noted in Project Design Features, a less than significant impact would occur with respect to groundwater quality from construction of the Project. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur with respect to groundwater quality from construction of the Project.

2. Operational Impacts

a. Groundwater Hydrology

No water supply wells are located at the Project Site and no drinking water, industrial, or agricultural supply wells would be impacted, installed, or operated as part of the Project. Therefore, no impact on public water supplies and no reduction in yields of adjacent public or private well or well fields are anticipated as a result of the Project. Development associated with the Project is not expected to include activities that would require groundwater remediation that could affect groundwater hydrology. In addition, no long-term dewatering is anticipated with the operation of the Project. However, if permanent dewatering systems are necessary adverse impacts are not anticipated relative to the rate or direction of flow of shallow groundwater from long-term dewatering because the maximum anticipated permanent dewatering rates are anticipated to be 0.9 to 4.0 gallons per minute and its radius of influence on groundwater is limited. Dewatering is not anticipated to draw water across any substantial distance and impacts are considered negligible from a local and regional basin perspective. Development associated with the Project would result in a net decrease in impervious surface from approximately 66 percent to approximately 62.4 percent of the Project Site. As operation of the Project would not change potable water levels, affect groundwater recharge capacity, or impact public water supplies, it is anticipated that a less than significant impact would occur.

b. Groundwater Quality

Although there is potential for an adverse effect due to a potential increase in the number of on-site underground storage tanks, the existing hazardous materials and underground storage tanks management programs are assumed to continue with implementation of the Project. Compliance with all applicable existing regulations and plans at the Project Site would prevent the Project from expanding the area affected by contaminants, cause an increased level of groundwater contamination or cause regulatory water quality standards at an existing production well to be violated. In addition, as there are no groundwater production wells or public water supply wells within one mile of the Project Site, no operational impacts are anticipated to existing wells. Therefore, the Project operation would not cause substantial adverse effects with respect to groundwater contamination with hazardous substances, and no significant impacts are anticipated.

No permanent dewatering systems are anticipated with development of the Project. However, if below ground structures associated with the Project extend into the groundwater table (e.g., subterranean parking), those structures may require permanent dewatering systems. If a dewatering system is necessary, it would be designed and operated in accordance with all applicable regulatory and permit requirements. A majority of the Project Site does not have a hydrologic connection with the San Fernando Groundwater Basin and no significant areas of groundwater contamination have been encountered beneath the Project Site. The estimated maximum flow of dewatering is low and dewatering is not anticipated to draw water across

any substantial distance. As such, no substantial impacts are anticipated to the rate or direction of movement of any existing contaminants beneath the Project Site or the area affected by or the level of groundwater contaminants. In addition, as there are no groundwater production wells or public water supply wells within one mile of the Project Site, with continued implementation of existing project design features, no operational impacts are anticipated to existing wells and no regulatory water quality standards at an existing production well would be violated. Since the Project operation would not cause substantial alterations in groundwater contaminants beneath the site due to dewatering, a less than significant impact is anticipated.

3. Project Design Features

G.2-1: Should a groundwater monitoring well be discovered during construction, the abandonment or removal of the well shall be in accordance with the applicable guidelines of the California Department of Water Resources, and the California Department of Health Services. As part of the abandonment process, a Well Abandonment Permit shall be obtained from the Los Angeles County Department of Health Services.

4. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

While there are some differences between the policies and procedures of the respective jurisdictions, adherence to the policies and procedures of the applicable jurisdiction would mitigate any potential impacts. Additionally, because groundwater quality is regulated on a federal, state and regional level, the potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Project would not change if the proposed annexation/detachment does not occur. As such, impacts associated with the No Annexation scenario would be equivalent to those of the Project, and thus, would be less than significant.

5. Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative groundwater hydrology impacts could result from the overall utilization of respective groundwater basins located in proximity to the Project and related- project sites. All or most of the related-projects would depend on public water supply systems. To the extent there is a cumulative increase in water demand, it would have to come from other sources (i.e., water conservation and recycled and imported water). In addition, a majority of the Project Site does not overlay or have a connection with the San Fernando Groundwater Basin. Consequently, no significant cumulative impacts to groundwater hydrology (including not reducing the ability of the water utility to use the groundwater basin for public water supplies) are anticipated. As such, cumulative impacts on groundwater hydrology would be less than significant.

Development associated with the related projects will likely result in a net increase in impervious surfaces in the Project area. The extent to which the related projects would increase impervious surface that might affect groundwater hydrology is not possible to assess. Operation of the Project is not expected to result in any decrease in local groundwater levels and would not result in reductions of groundwater recharge capacity. A majority of the Project Site does not overlay or have a connection with the San Fernando Groundwater Basin. As such, the Project's contribution to a reduction in groundwater recharge is not cumulatively considerable and, therefore, less than significant.

Although development of the related projects could include groundwater remediation, development associated with the Project is not expected to include activities that would require groundwater remediation that could affect groundwater hydrology; therefore, no cumulative groundwater impacts are anticipated. Additionally, the related projects are unlikely to cause or increase groundwater contamination because existing statutes prohibit contamination of groundwater by existing and future land uses and also require remediation of existing contamination. As such, and in light of existing statutes that apply to the Project and other projects, and the Project's control measures, the Project's contribution to groundwater quality impacts is not cumulatively considerable and, therefore, is less than significant.

K. Air Quality (Construction: Toxic Air Contaminants; Operational: Toxic Air Contaminants, Airborne Odor, Consistency with Air Quality Plans)

1. Construction Impacts: Toxic Air Contaminants

Emissions associated with construction within the Project Site include certain toxic air contaminants. A health risk assessment was conducted to calculate the potential impacts of those toxic air contaminant emissions. Toxic air contaminants emitted during construction include diesel particulate matter from construction vehicles (e.g., excavators, bulldozers, scrapers, graders, etc.). Risk impacts are in proportion to the amount of diesel particulate matter emissions. Health impacts were evaluated at selected receptors that represent locations where either long- or short-term exposure could plausibly occur. Locations included receptors located at residential, worker, and recreational areas. Individual cancer risk, chronic non-cancer hazard index, and acute non-cancer hazard index were calculated for each applicable receptor. Health risk calculations assumed an exposure duration consistent with the estimated construction schedule.

Cancer risk is an estimate of the potential increase in the likelihood of a person contracting cancer after exposure to the projected emissions. The maximum calculated cancer risk associated with construction toxic air contaminant emissions for construction within the Project Site was 1.3 in a million for the nearest residential receptor and 3.9 in a million for the nearest worker receptor, both of which are below the Southern California Air Quality Management District significance threshold of 10 in a million. These risk impacts for construction were modeled using a conservative "construction zone" approach for new development areas. The "construction zone" approach uses conservative air quality modeling based on where construction and new Project developments are planned. The Project development is represented by ten different construction zones located around the Project Site. The combined impact of construction in multiple construction zones was evaluated to identify the maximum potential impacts due to Project construction. As a conservative assumption, this analysis assumes that maximum construction activity will occur in all construction zones at the same time, even though this is unlikely to occur in practice.

Furthermore, chronic and acute non-cancer hazards for all scenarios were estimated to be below the Southern California Air Quality Management District's hazard index threshold of 1.0 for all off-site receptors types included in the analysis. Overall, toxic air contaminant impacts due to Project construction would be less than significant.

2. Operational Impacts: Toxic Air Contaminants

A health risk assessment was conducted to calculate potential impacts associated with operational emissions that include toxic air contaminants. Maximum health risks for residential,

worker, and recreational receptors are 3.4 in a million, 2.5 in a million, and 0.03 in a million, respectively, which is below the Southern California Air Quality Management District threshold. As the maximum cancer risk is estimated to be below the Southern California Air Quality Management District threshold for residences, workers, and recreational receptors within the vicinity of the Project Site, a less than significant impact would occur. Maximum acute hazard indices were also determined to be below the Southern California Air Quality Management District acute hazard significance threshold for all receptor types. As a result, acute hazard levels attributable to the Project are less than significant.

The health risk assessment also evaluated the potential impacts from the Project construction and operations. This conservative analysis is based on the assumption that a person is located in a single location for the entire construction and a subsequent period of time such that the total assumed exposure duration for each type of receptor is met (e.g., residential receptors for 70 years, workers for 40 years). Note that the analysis includes conservative assumptions, including the use of the Southern California Air Quality Management District meteorological data set and conservative exposure assumptions amongst others, which likely lead to overestimated risks. As a result, the actual risk may be lower than that reported. The results of the risk analysis from construction and operational activities demonstrated that the maximum incremental off-site risk estimates from Project construction and operations are below the Southern California Air Quality Management District threshold; therefore, impacts were concluded to be less than significant.

3. Operational Impacts: Airborne Odor

According to the Southern California Air Quality Management District CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The Project does not include any uses identified by the Southern California Air Quality Management District as being associated with odors. Therefore, implementation of the Project is not expected to create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people, and impacts would be less than significant.

4. Operational Impacts: Consistency with Air Quality Plans

The determination of consistency with the Southern California Air Quality Management District's Air Quality Management Plan is primarily concerned with the long-term influence of the Project on air quality in the Basin. While development of the Project would result in short-term localized impacts, development would not have a long-term impact on the region's ability to meet State and federal air quality standards.

A project is also consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan in part if it is consistent with the population and employment assumptions that were used in the development of the Air Quality Management Plan. The Project is consistent with the types, intensity and patterns of land use envisioned in the 1996 Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide. The population and employment forecasts which are adopted by SCAG's Regional Council are based on the local plans and policies applicable to the specific area. Thus, consistency with Southern California Air Quality Management District's Air Quality Management Plan results in a determination of consistency with applicable SCAG policies that support the Air Quality Management Plan.

In addition, the Project meets or exceeds all applicable policies of the City of Los Angeles Air Quality Element as well as all of the air quality provisions of the County of Los Angeles General

Plan. As a result, the Project would be consistent with the City of Los Angeles Air Quality Element as well as the air quality provisions of the County of Los Angeles General Plan.

5. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

Both the County and the City of Los Angeles are located in the South Coast Air Basin and as such both jurisdictions rely on the South Coast Air Quality Management District for guidance regarding air quality issues and significance thresholds. Therefore, the location of jurisdictional boundaries has no effect on the assessment of impacts whether under the Project or the No Annexation scenario. As such, impacts associated with the No Annexation scenario would be the same as those identified above with regard to the Project. The No Annexation scenario would similarly not affect the Project's consistency with applicable plans and policies, as discussed above.

L. Public Services (Parks and Recreation)

1. Construction Impacts

As the Project would result in a reduction in the overall extent of development as compared to the originally proposed project, the extent of construction required would be less than under the originally proposed project. No aspect of construction under the Project would occur within or would restrict access to Weddington Park (South) and thus would not interfere with existing park usage. Vehicular and pedestrian access to County and City parks and recreational facilities would be maintained during construction of the Project. Construction workers are not anticipated to utilize County and City park facilities near the Project Site due to limited break times. Thus, the construction of the Project would result in a less than significant impact on park and recreational facilities.

2. Operational Impacts

Given the increase in operational (post-construction) employment that would occur under the Project, it is anticipated that the use of park facilities would increase under the Project. This is especially true at the City's Weddington Park (South), which is located across Lankershim Boulevard from the Project Site. However, even with the increased on-site employment under the Project, the Project would result in a minor increase in the demand for City parks services since employees would likely utilize parks for short periods of time during non-peak park usage time periods (i.e., weekdays). The County has indicated that County parks facilities are located too far from the Project Site to be utilized by on-site employees. As such, the Project would result in a less than significant impact on park facilities as the exclusion of the residential units further decrease the demand for park facilities.

3. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

Though the jurisdiction wherein development would be located could possibly result in a slight change in potential impacts to respective County and City parks facilities, the No Annexation scenario would not add any increase in the overall demand for park facilities. Impacts to parks and recreation facilities under the No Annexation scenario would be less than significant.

4. Cumulative Impacts

Based on the projected increase in cumulative demand, it is assumed that forecasted growth would result in a less than significant impact on City neighborhood and community parks and recreational facilities. Similarly, a less than significant cumulative impact from forecasted growth on County parks and recreational facilities would be anticipated. Department of Recreation and Parks' planned parks acquisitions, Quimby fees collected from related County and City residential land division projects, as well as the use of school playgrounds (within the City), would address additional demand. As such, the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be considerable and a less than significant cumulative impact would result.

M. Public Services (Libraries)

1. Construction Impacts

Construction workers under the Project are not anticipated to utilize library facilities near the Project Site because of distance and the resulting inconvenience. Thus, the Project construction would result in a less than significant impact on library facilities.

2. Operational Impacts

Regarding operation, residents are considered to be the primary users of library services. As the Project would not include residential development, it would result in substantially less of an impact to library facilities than the originally proposed project.

Although the County of Los Angeles Public Library has indicated nearby library facilities are operating over capacity, the Project would not increase the residential population in the County of Los Angeles Public Library's service area. Additionally, people who work, but do not live, at the Project Site are likely to use local library services during their time at work or while commuting to and from work. As a result of the relatively large distance between County Library facilities and the Project Site, use of the County Library facilities would mostly occur during the commute to and from work. While the Project would increase employment, the number of commuters visiting the County Library facilities would not result in a material increase in the demand for County of Los Angeles Library services. Thus, the Project would result in a less than significant impact to County of Los Angeles Public Library facilities.

In addition, the use of City of Los Angeles Public Library facilities by on-site employees and guests would be greater than under the originally proposed project, though that use would still be anticipated to be negligible compared to current and projected demand at the Los Angeles Public Library facilities. As the Project would not result in a residential population (the unit by which library services are measured), and would thus not cause either of the Los Angeles Public Library's service areas to exceed their capacity, the Project would result in a less than significant impact to Los Angeles Public Library facilities. As there would be no residential development associated with the Project, impacts to library services would be less than significant.

3. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

Under the No Annexation scenario, impacts from retail, commercial, entertainment, and hotel components on County and City facilities would be similar to those under the Project, as employees utilizing these facilities on their commute to and from work would not result in a

material difference in demand on County and City library facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

4. Cumulative Impacts

As there would be no residential development associated with the Project, the non-residential development associated with the Project would not result in a material increase in the demand for library services. Consequently, the Project would have a less than significant cumulative impact on County and City library services.

N. Utilities (Sewer)

1. Construction Impacts

No significant increase in wastewater flows from the Project Site is expected as a result of construction activities under the Project. The Project would eliminate the proposed residential, neighborhood retail and community-serving commercial uses of the originally proposed project, and would include some new construction within the Back Lot Area. Construction under the Project would require limited off-site improvements. These impacts would be temporary in nature and limited in their scope. Thus, impacts associated with the Project would be less than significant.

2. Operational Impacts

As the Project would represent an increase in wastewater generation over existing conditions. The total average and peak wastewater generated by the Project would be 0.55 million gallons per day and 1.03 million gallons per day, respectively. Under the Project, the average and peak flow rates would be 0.86 cubic feet per second and 1.60 cubic feet per second, respectively. As the Project would include increased development over existing conditions, there would be a corresponding increase in wastewater flows to area sewers. As the City's Valley Relief Sewer is operating at an approximate flow level of 53 percent and the 42-inch sewer lines are operating at a current approximate flow level of 47 percent, there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the Project's increased wastewater flows. Thus, the Project would result in a less than significant impact to existing sewer capacity.

The Hyperion Treatment Plant currently has a treatment capacity of 450 million gallons per day, with 88 million gallons per day in unused capacity. the Project's average wastewater generation of 0.55 million gallons per day would represent 0.63 percent of the remaining capacity at the Hyperion Treatment Plant. A less than significant impact to Hyperion Treatment Plant capacity would occur under the Project.

3. Project Design Features

- L.1-1:** Prior to the development of a new building, the capacity of the on-site sewer lines serving the building shall be evaluated and replacement or new sewer lines shall be installed as necessary.
- L.1-2:** Gauging stations shall be installed in the proposed sewer lines in the County areas of the Project Site at the point of connection with the City-owned sewer for wastewater flows to pass through before entering a City-owned sewer.

L.1-3: New sanitary sewers in the City areas of the Project Site shall be designed to conform to the standards of the City's Bureau of Sanitation. New sanitary sewers in the County areas of the Project Site shall be designed to conform to the standards of the County of Los Angeles Sanitation District. The Applicant or its successor shall construct the additional on-site sanitary sewer system improvements required to support the additional development per these standards.

4. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

If the proposed detachment/annexation does not occur, all wastewater collection and treatment would continue to be provided by the City, as all wastewater facilities serving the Project Site are maintained by the City of Los Angeles. As such, there would be no change in the nature of the Project's impacts from those described above, except that the on-site replacement sewer line constructed along Universal Hollywood Drive would not require a gauging station where it joins the City sewer in Lankershim Boulevard. A gauging station is only needed when the line connects across property located in a jurisdiction other than the City of Los Angeles (i.e., the County of Los Angeles in the case of the originally proposed project). The gauging stations that would be required under the No Annexation scenario would vary as jurisdictional boundaries would not change.

Under the No Annexation scenario, the total projected increases in wastewater flows from the Project Site would be the same, although the levels of wastewater generated within each jurisdiction (i.e., City vs. County) would change. As total wastewater flows under the No Annexation scenario are the same as those of the Project, impacts with regard to wastewater flows would be less than significant under the No Annexation scenario.

5. Cumulative Impacts

The potential need for future development projects to require upgraded wastewater lines to accommodate wastewater generated by these projects is site-specific and as such, would be appropriately addressed during the review and approval process for each related project. Moreover, as off-site wastewater improvements under the Project are limited in nature, the potential for concurrent construction is very low. As such, cumulative wastewater-related construction impacts are concluded to be less than significant.

With respect to cumulative operational wastewater impacts, the forecasted growth within the Hyperion Treatment Plant service area would result in an increase in cumulative wastewater generation of 86.82 million gallons per day under average conditions, including wastewater flows from the Project. Based on the Hyperion Treatment Plant's current treatment capacity of 544 million gallons per day, this cumulative wastewater generation would represent approximately 92.5 percent of the daily remaining capacity at the Hyperion Treatment Plant in 2030. The Hyperion Service Area would have sufficient wastewater treatment capacity, with remaining excess treatment capacity, to treat the wastewater flows from future development, including the Project.

Cumulative wastewater flows from areas that are tributary to the Valley Relief Sewer are forecasted to be 28.5 million gallons per day under average conditions and 39.3 million gallons per day under peak flows when combined with the Project's flows. The increase under average conditions equates to approximately 19.9 percent of the current average flow rate and the increase under peak conditions equates to approximately 27.5 percent of the current

average flow rate of the Valley Relief Sewer. As the Valley Relief Sewer is currently operating at 53 percent of capacity, the Valley Relief Sewer has sufficient additional capacity available to accommodate increased cumulative flows, including the Project, and a less than significant cumulative impact would result.

With respect to capacity in the City sewers located in Lankershim Boulevard, these two sewer lines are operating at 19 percent capacity and 39 percent capacity, respectively. Thus, there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the increased flows from the Project and no significant impact to these sewer lines would occur. Cumulative impacts on the Barham Boulevard line are concluded to be less than significant. Similar to the Project, each related project that contributes to the forecasted off-site growth would be required to comply with local requirements that would reduce cumulative impacts with regard to local connections to a less than significant level.

O. Utilities (Solid Waste—Construction and Solid Waste—Operational: Solid Waste Plan Consistency & Solid Waste Collection)

1. Construction Impacts

Overall construction and associated solid waste would be less under the Project than under the originally proposed project due to the reduced development under the Project. Specifically, construction of the Project would generate approximately 51,747 tons of construction solid waste (or approximately 9.33 tons per day). New buildings under the Project would implement a construction project design feature to recycle and/or salvage for reuse of 65 percent of all nonhazardous demolition and construction debris. As the Project construction would incorporate the stated recycling practices, the Project would be in compliance with applicable County and City plans.

Demolition and construction debris would likely be disposed of at the Peck Road Gravel Pit, which has a maximum daily intake of 1,210 tons. Thus, demolition and construction debris under the Project would constitute 0.27 percent of the maximum daily intake of the Peck Road Gravel Pit. As such, sufficient inert waste disposal capacity is available.

Further, hazardous materials used during construction activities that are not completely used during the construction process would require proper disposal in accordance with all the requirements of applicable regulatory agencies, which could include the City Fire Department, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board, and/or California Environmental Protection Agency Department of Toxic Substances Control. In addition, in the event that contaminated soils are unexpectedly encountered during the proposed grading and excavation activities, such soils may be required to be removed and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state and local requirements. Compliance with such requirements would reduce the potential for an impact associated with the disposal of construction-related hazardous waste to a less than significant level. Overall, construction solid waste impacts under the Project would be less than significant.

2. Operational Impacts

a. Solid Waste Plan Consistency

The proposed project design feature would help meet and exceed both County and City waste diversion goals and policies, including the City's Solid Waste Management Policy Plan,

Source Reduction and Recycling Element, Solid Waste Integrated Resources Plan, Framework Element, Solid Resources Infrastructure Strategy Facilities Plan, RENEW LA Plan, and Los Angeles Municipal Code requirements, as well as the County's Countywide Integrated Waste Management Summary Plan, County Source Reduction and Recycling Element, County Green Building Standards, and Countywide Siting Element. As such, the Project is consistent with the policies and programs expressed in these plans and documents. Thus, a less than significant impact would occur with regard to consistency with applicable solid waste plans, policies, and programs.

b. Solid Waste Collection

The Project would not result in a significant impact associated with solid waste collection, as the Project would utilize existing solid waste collection routes to adequately handle project-generated waste.

3. Project Design Features

L.3-1: During new construction a minimum of 65 percent of the non-hazardous demolition and construction debris by weight from construction of new Project buildings (not including sets/facades, production activities, and temporary uses) shall be recycled and/or salvaged for reuse.

4. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The change of jurisdictional boundaries would have no effect on the generation of construction waste resulting from construction of the Project. In addition, the Project's approach to on-site solid waste management would be unchanged under the No Annexation scenario. As such, development under the No Annexation scenario would have a less than significant impact with regard to solid waste collection routes, the disposal of non-hazardous and hazardous wastes and consistency with applicable solid waste plans, policies or programs.

5. Cumulative Impacts

With respect to construction debris, cumulative development would result in a potentially significant impact with respect to inert landfill capacity. However, as the Project's non-hazardous construction debris would account for less than 0.16 percent of the total cumulative amount of construction debris generated, the Project's contribution is not cumulatively considerable, and therefore, the Project's cumulative solid waste construction impacts would be less than significant.

It is also anticipated that, similar to the Project, the related projects would not conflict with, and instead would act to implement applicable County and City waste diversion goals and policies, including the City's Solid Waste Management Policy Plan, Source Reduction and Recycling Element, Solid Waste Integrated Resources Plan, Framework Element, Solid Resources Infrastructure Strategy Facilities Plan, RENEW LA Plan and City Municipal Code, and the County's Countywide Integrated Waste Management Summary Plan, the Source Reduction and Recycling Element for the Unincorporated Portions of Los Angeles County, County Green Building Standards, and the Countywide Siting Element. Thus, cumulative impacts with regard to consistency with solid waste plans, policies, and programs would be less than significant.

Cumulative solid waste generation associated with the development of the related projects could create a need for additional solid waste collection routes to adequately handle solid waste generated by related project development, which is considered a potentially significant cumulative impact. However, as no impacts would occur under the Project, cumulative impacts are concluded to be less than significant.

P. Utilities (Electricity)

1. Construction Impacts

Electrical power would be consumed to construct the new buildings and facilities of the Project. This demand would be supplied from existing electrical services within the Project Site. As there is sufficient existing electrical service to support the Project's construction activities, impacts would be less than significant.

2. Operational Impacts

a. Southern California Edison Service Area – Electricity Consumption and Demand

Southern California Edison would serve the County portions of the Project Site. The total projected electrical consumption of the Project for the portion of the Project Site serviced by Southern California Edison is 46.17 million kilowatt hours per year. This increase in consumption only accounts for 0.05 percent of Southern California Edison's current demand for electricity. The Project's percentage of Southern California Edison's current demand for electricity is sufficiently low to support the conclusion that the Project's electricity consumption within the Southern California Edison service area would be less than significant. Additionally, this projection does not account for the Project's incorporation of project design features and other energy conservation measures, which would substantively decrease the electrical consumption of the Project.

The operation of the Project would increase electrical demand in the portion of the Project Site served by Southern California Edison by a total of 11,831.8 kilovolt amperes. Southern California Edison has indicated that it has the capacity in its existing supply system to handle the increase in demand for power supplied by its facilities. However, in order to deliver this increased demand to the Project Site, a new 66 kilovolt kV line would need to be installed and this installation requires expansion of the Southern California Edison facilities on-site. With this new line and expanded substation, increased electrical loads can be supplied and distributed on-site, thereby resulting in a less than significant impact.

b. Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Service Area – Electricity Consumption and Demand

Los Angeles Department of Water and Power would serve the portions of the Project within the City's jurisdiction. The projected increase in electrical consumption under the Project that would be serviced by Los Angeles Department of Water and Power is estimated to be 9.67 million kilowatt hours per year at the Project's, which accounts for only 0.15 percent of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power's projected increase in electrical consumption over the Project's buildout. The Project's percentage of the total increase in consumption is sufficiently low to support the conclusion that the Project's electricity consumption within the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power service area would be less than significant. Additionally, this

projection does not include project design features and other energy conservation measures, which would decrease the electrical consumption of the Project.

The projected electrical demand associated with the operation of the Project would be 4,268.7 kilovolt amperes for the portion of the Project Site served by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. Los Angeles Department of Water and Power has indicated that the existing distribution facilities have the capacity to supply the increase in electrical demand for the City portion of the Project Site under the Project. As such, a less than significant impact would result.

3. Project Design Features

L.4-1: Where available, spare conduits in the existing underground cable and conduit system within the Project Site would be utilized in lieu of providing new conduits. For areas with no spare conduits, additional conduits would be provided. New cables, electrical lines, and facilities would be provided for the Project in currently underdeveloped areas.

L.4-2: Under the Project, additional power would be supplied to meet the increased demand for the County portion of the Project Site through relocation of the Studio Master Substation and upgrades to the substation owned and operated by Southern California Edison. Specifically:

- A new Project Applicant-owned and operated distribution substation would be located east of the existing Studio Master Substation. The Project Applicant-owned facility currently housed within the existing Studio Master Substation would be relocated and expanded with new equipment to the new location.
- Additional electricity would be supplied to the existing Studio Master Substation through an additional 66kV transmission line for an additional 60 MVA for the Project Site, which will increase the total capacity of the existing Studio Master Substation to 100 MVA. The substation would also be equipped with an outdoor 66kV Gas Insulated Switchgear which would be configured in an operating and transfer bus arrangement. All 66kV lines and transformer bank feeders would enter the Gas Insulated Switchgear equipment by means of an underground riser pedestal. The substation would also have a Mechanical-Electrical Equipment Room to house all controls, switches, relay protection equipment, alarms, meters, batteries, HVAC and the station AC and DC distribution panels.
- Once expanded, operation of the existing Studio Master Substation facility would transfer from the Project Applicant or its successor to Southern California Edison, and the substation would be connected to the Edison Universal Substation via subterranean electrical lines on Southern California Edison's 66kV subtransmission system. The Edison Universal Substation has an existing capacity of 22 MVA. The combined substations that would be operated by Southern California Edison would have a total capacity of 122 MVA and would supply power to the new Applicant-owned and operated distribution substation, which would distribute electricity within the County portion of the Project Site.

- The private on-site electrical system would have new electrical lines to serve new buildings constructed as part of the Project.

L.4-5: Each of the Project's buildings would be subject to the State Energy Conservation Standards for New Non-Residential Buildings (Title 24, Part 6, Article 2, California Code of Regulations). The Project shall incorporate energy conservation measures to exceed Title 24 (2005) requirements by 15 percent. In the event Title 24 is amended such that the energy conservation requirements exceed Title 24 (2005) by more than 15 percent, the Project shall comply with the amended Title 24.

L.4-6: Install efficient lighting and lighting control systems.

L.4-7: Install light colored "cool" roofs.

L.4-8: Install energy efficient heating and cooling systems, appliances (e.g., ENERGY STAR) and equipment, and control systems.

L.4-9: Install light-emitting diodes for private on-site traffic and street lighting.

L.4-11: Provide education on energy efficiency, water conservation, waste diversion, and recycling services to the Applicant's employees through new employee orientation materials and three times annually through the company website, exhibits, or meetings on energy conservation.

Project Design Features L.4-3 and L.4-4 adopted by the City are not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction.

4. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

With respect to the Southern California Edison service area, additional consumption under the No Annexation scenario would constitute a less than significant impact on Southern California Edison supplies. The total increase in electrical consumption for the County portion of the Project Site served by Southern California Edison under the No Annexation scenario is 42.32 million kilowatt hours per year. This level of consumption represents 0.04 percent of Southern California Edison's total existing consumption. Under the No Annexation scenario, the increase in electrical demand in the County portion of the Project Site would be 15,344 kilovolt amperes per year, a decrease when compared to the Project. As is the case with the Project, Southern California Edison has indicated that it has capacity in its existing supply system to handle the increase in demand for power supplied by its facilities with installation of a new 66 kilovolt line, however, a new substation may be required on-site. With the proposed upgrades and new substation facilities, increased electrical loads would be supplied and distributed on-site. Thus, with implementation of these improvements, impacts associated with the No Annexation scenario would be less than significant.

As is the case with the Project, the additional consumption within the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power service area would constitute a less than significant impact relative to consumption under the No Annexation scenario. The total projected electrical consumption within the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power service area under the No Annexation scenario is 13.52 million kilowatt hours per year, an increase when compared to the Project. This total increase in electrical consumption under the No Annexation scenario

represents 0.21 percent of the total Los Angeles Department of Water and Power projected increase in consumption over the Project's buildout. The total increase in electrical demand for Los Angeles Department of Water and Power under the No Annexation scenario would be 6,015.5 kilovolt amperes. Los Angeles Department of Water and Power has indicated that the existing distribution facilities have the capacity to supply the increase in electrical demand for the City portion of the Project Site under the Project. As such, a less than significant impact would result.

5. Cumulative Impacts

Forecasted growth between 2008 and 2030 is projected to consume an additional 5,440 gigawatt hours per year of electricity within the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power service area. While these forecasts represent very large increases in electricity consumption, the Project represents only 0.16 percent of cumulative consumption. As this level of cumulative consumption is consistent with the projections of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power for 2030, a less than significant cumulative impact would result.

Potential impacts from the identified growth within the service area, exclusive of the Project, would be anticipated, as an expansion of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power facilities would likely be required to accommodate the demand attributable to the forecasted off-site growth. In addition, developers of individual future projects, as well as the Project, would provide for all Los Angeles Department of Water and Power required improvements to facilitate the provision of electrical services to each individual development site. Therefore, the Project would not contribute to any cumulative impacts to Los Angeles Department of Water and Power services, and the Project's cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Forecasted growth between 2008 and 2030 is projected to consume an additional 34,047 gigawatt hours per year of electricity within the Southern California Edison service area. While these forecasts represent very large increases in electricity consumption, the Project represents only approximately 0.1 percent of the cumulative consumption. As this level of cumulative consumption is consistent with the ability of the Southern California Edison to deliver electricity within its service area, a less than significant cumulative impact would result.

Forecasted growth between 2008 and 2030 is projected to result in an additional electricity demand of 8 to 10 million kilovolt amperes within the Southern California Edison service area, which includes the demand attributable to the Project. Development within the Project Site would represent approximately 0.09 to 0.12 percent of the total projected increase in demand within the Southern California Edison service area. Even without development of the Project, an expansion of Southern California Edison facilities would likely be required to accommodate the increase in demand. In addition, developers of individual future projects, as well as the Project, would provide for all Southern California Edison required improvements to facilitate the provision of electrical services to each individual development site. Furthermore, the Project related impacts would not contribute to cumulative off-site effects in the surrounding area since the Project related impacts would be fully mitigated by the Project's proposed project design features. Therefore, the Project would not contribute to any cumulative impacts to Southern California Edison services, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Q. Utilities (Natural Gas)

1. Construction Impacts

The construction of buildings and facilities under the Project would not require the consumption of natural gas. Thus, as with the originally proposed project, construction under the Project would not impact natural gas supplies. As development would occur in limited areas of the existing Back Lot Area, improvements to the natural gas infrastructure would be limited to on-site connections. As such, off-site improvements would not be required under the Project. Impacts attributable to additional on-site connections would be temporary in nature. Thus, construction impacts under the Project would be less than significant.

2. Operational Impacts

With respect to operation, as the quantity of development, the Project would increase natural gas consumption over existing conditions. Operation of the Project would increase natural gas consumption by approximately 8.2 million cubic feet per month. The Southern California Gas Company would continue to provide natural gas to the Project Site under the Project. As the Southern California Gas Company indicated that it would have adequate supplies and facilities to accommodate the originally proposed project, it would similarly have adequate supplies and facilities to accommodate the Project given the substantially reduced consumption levels under this alternative. Thus, natural gas impacts under the Project would be less than significant.

The Project would utilize energy conservation measures outlined as project design features that go beyond existing standards, and a less than significant impact would occur with regard to this issue. Impacts to the natural gas supply and natural gas delivery infrastructure under the Project would be less than significant.

3. Project Design Features

- L.5-3:** A portion of the existing gas main located beneath Universal Hollywood Drive shall be removed and relocated by the Project Applicant or its successor to the extent necessary in connection with the proposed re-alignment of the road. The relocation of this line would not impact its capacity nor its ability to supply natural gas to the Project Site, as the relocated line would be fully operational prior to abandoning the existing line.
- L.5-4:** State Energy Conservation Standards for New Non-Residential Buildings, pursuant to Title 24, Part 6, Article 2, California Code of Regulations (Title 24) (2005), shall be exceeded by 15 percent. In the event Title 24 is amended such that the energy conservation requirements exceed Title 24 (2005) by more than 15 percent, the Project shall comply with the amended Title 24.
- L.5-5:** Install energy efficient heating and cooling systems, appliances (e.g., ENERGY STAR) and equipment, and control systems.
- L.5-7:** Provide education on energy efficiency, water conservation, waste diversion, and recycling services to the Project Applicant's employees through new employee orientation materials and three times annually through company website, exhibits, or meetings on energy conservation.

4. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

As the Southern California Gas Company provides service to both the City and unincorporated portions of Los Angeles County, the Project's impacts would be the same whether the proposed annexation/detachment actions occur or not. As the impacts would be the same, the Project under the No Annexation scenario would result in less than significant impacts with regard to all of the issues relating to the delivery and use of natural gas at the Project Site as discussed above.

5. Cumulative Impacts

Based on forecasted growth within the Southern California Gas Company service area, an increase in demand amounting to approximately 9.80 billion cubic feet of natural gas per month would occur. With the addition of the Project's 8.2 million cubic feet per month, cumulative natural gas demand would increase to approximately 9.81 billion cubic feet per month. Based on these forecasts, the Project would constitute less than 0.2 percent of the forecasted cumulative natural gas demand. The Project as well as all forecasted growth would incorporate design features and energy conservation measures, as required by Title 24, which would lessen the impact on natural gas demand. Additionally, the Southern California Gas Company has indicated that it has existing facilities and supply to meet these projected future demands for natural gas. It is also anticipated that future developments would upgrade distribution facilities, commensurate with their demand, in accordance with all established policies and procedures. Therefore, the Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to impacts relative to natural gas. As a result, the Project would have a less than significant cumulative natural gas impact.

R. Employment, Housing and Population (Employment)

1. Construction Impacts

Construction under the Project would generate a substantial number of jobs directly associated with the construction itself, as well as a large number of indirect jobs in a wide range of industries throughout the County, resulting from purchases of construction related supplies, goods, and services. As increases in construction employment is seen as a benefit, impacts related to construction employment would be less than significant.

2. Operational Impacts

The Project would generate 6,368 permanent jobs with a corresponding economic benefit over existing conditions. The Project would not include the development of residential land uses, and so would not result in direct off-site jobs associated with household spending. The Project would be consistent with Southern California Association of Government's adopted growth forecasts for employment and the City of Los Angeles General Plan Framework Element. The Project would also be consistent with the jobs goal of the County's General Plan, which is to create jobs and increase incomes for County residents. As such, the Project would be consistent with employment goals and objectives of the applicable land use plans and, thus, potential impacts with regard to employment would be less than significant.

3. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

Inasmuch as potential employment and economic impacts are measured at the scale of the Los Angeles County economy, they would be the same under the Project and the No

Annexation scenario. Thus, employment impacts under the No Annexation scenario would be less than significant.

4. Cumulative Impacts

SCAG forecasts a total of 2,265,000 jobs within the City of Los Angeles Subregion in 2030, which results in an employment growth of 312,764 jobs within the City of Los Angeles Subregion between 2008-2030. This forecasted employment growth is used as a proxy for “related projects,” because the employment of individual developments that may actually occur between 2008 and 2030 cannot be reasonably foreseen over the period of Project buildout. Based on this forecast the Project’s total employment accounts for 0.52 percent of Subregional 2030 employment and 3.76 percent of the 2008-2030 Subregional employment growth forecast. In addition, cumulative employment (i.e., total Project employment plus forecasted 2008-2030 employment growth in the Subregion) represents 14.33% of 2030 employment in the Subregion. Thus, the Project’s incremental effect is not “cumulatively considerable” within the meaning of CEQA, and hence its cumulative impact is less than significant.

Furthermore, the film and television production and distribution industry plays a vital role in the Los Angeles regional economy, and it is reasonable to expect that because it is anchored in Southern California generally, and in Los Angeles County Region and the City of Los Angeles Subregion in particular, the industry will continue to grow over time. Therefore, some portion of the Project’s growth is likely to have already been included in the Subregional forecast, and therefore this analysis probably overstates the magnitude of cumulative growth and its relationship to forecasted 2030 employment in the Subregion. It should also be recognized that a portion of the Project’s job growth is a function of the synergistic relationships among entertainment industry and commercial businesses located on the Project Site. This means that some of the future job growth in the Subregion would only occur if additional development occurs at the Project Site.

S. Employment, Housing and Population (Housing)

1. Construction Impacts

Due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California, construction workers are not likely to relocate their households as a result of the construction job opportunities available under the Project. Therefore, it is assumed that construction workers associated with the Project would not relocate their places of residence as a result of working at the Project Site. As a result, construction-related impacts to City or subregional housing would be less than significant under the Project.

2. Operational Impacts

It is forecasted that 382 households would re-locate to the area from increased employee demand. The creation of an increase in indirect housing needs does not create a significant impact, since the Project would not substantially accelerate growth in the area or introduce unplanned infrastructure. The Project would have a less than significant impact to the Southern California Association of Government’s household forecast for the City of Los Angeles Subregion between 2008 and 2030 or to its policies within the 1996 Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide. Housing impacts under the Project would be less than significant.

3. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

As the Project's housing would not exceed SCAG's projections for the Subregion which includes the entire Project Site (including both the County and City components), the scale of housing impact relative to the regional forecast remains the same whether or not the proposed annexation/detachment actions occur.

4. Cumulative Impacts

SCAG forecasts a total of 1,663,000 households within the City of Los Angeles Subregion in 2030, which results in a household growth of 294,530 within the City of Los Angeles Subregion between 2008-2030. This forecasted household growth is used as a proxy for "related projects," because the household growth of individual developments that may actually occur between 2008 and 2030 cannot be reasonably foreseen over the period of Project buildout. Based on this forecast, the Project's households account for 0.02 percent of households in the Subregion in 2030, and 0.13 percent of projected household growth in the Subregion between 2008 and 2030. In addition, cumulative household growth (i.e., Project households plus forecasted 2008-2030 household growth in the Subregion) represents 17.73 percent of the forecasted number of households in the Subregion in 2030. Thus, the Project's incremental housing effect is not "cumulatively considerable" within the meaning of CEQA, and hence its cumulative housing impact is less than significant.

T. Employment, Housing and Population (Population)

1. Construction Impacts

Due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California, construction workers attributable to the Project would not be anticipated to relocate as a result of construction activities. Thus, a less than significant impact with regard to this issue would occur under the Project.

2. Operational Impacts

Under the Project, no residential development would occur and there would be no direct residential population increase. The Project would result in an increase in employment over both existing conditions and the originally proposed project. A portion (approximately 6 percent) of the net new employees under the Project would be anticipated to relocate closer to the Project Site. The Project would result in an indirect population impact from non-residential development of 1,146 persons. The Project's population impact would represent approximately 0.03 percent of the population growth forecast in the City of Los Angeles Subregion and approximately 0.39 percent of the remaining population growth forecast between 2008 and 2030 in this subregion. Thus, population impacts under the Project would be less than significant.

3. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The conclusions presented above apply regardless of whether the proposed annexation and detachment actions occur under the Project. Thus, impacts under the No Annexation Scenario would be less than significant.

4. Cumulative Impacts

SCAG forecasts a total of 4,413,000 persons within the City of Los Angeles Subregion in 2030, which results in a population growth of 294,363 within the City of Los Angeles Subregion

between 2008-2030. This forecasted population growth is used as a proxy for “related projects,” because the household growth of individual developments that may actually occur between 2008 and 2030 cannot be reasonably foreseen over the period of Project buildout. Based on this forecast, the the Project’s population represents 0.03 percent of the population in the Subregion in 2030, and 0.39 percent of forecasted population growth in the Subregion between 2008 and 2030. In addition, cumulative population (i.e., the Project population plus 2008-2030 forecasted population growth in the Subregion) represents 6.70 percent of the forecasted population in the Subregion in 2030. Thus, the Project’s incremental population effect is not “cumulatively considerable” within the meaning of CEQA, and hence its cumulative population impact is less than significant.

U. Climate Change

1. Construction Impacts

Construction emissions represent episodic greenhouse gas emissions and would be associated with site preparation, excavation, grading, and construction. Emissions are associated with the operation of construction equipment and the disposal of construction waste, as well as episodic water use for fugitive dust control and annual water consumption. Only greenhouse gas emissions from on-site demolition and construction activities and off-site hauling and construction worker commuting are considered as Project-generated. Total construction emissions vary based on construction phasing. Under the most conservative construction scenario, a total of 69,636 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent would be generated, which equates to 2,321 metric tons annually if amortized over the life of the Project.

2. Operational Impacts

Annual Project greenhouse gas emissions would total 31,960 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent at build out. Operational-phase emission reductions would be achieved from a combination of energy efficient project design features and green power purchasing from utilities. Actual greenhouse gas emission reductions may vary based on a number of factors, including the details of the developed land use, the mix of building sizes and types, and available technologies. The Project sets a series of performance targets that would guide design, construction, and operational practices throughout the life of the Project.

The Project would achieve energy savings via emission reduction strategies including: exceedance of Title 24 (2005) energy requirements by 15 percent; transportation demand management strategies (e.g., ridesharing, flexible work schedules, bicycle/pedestrian oriented environment, and shuttle service); outdoor and indoor water conservation measures to reduce potable water consumption; low and moderate water use landscaping and high efficiency irrigation systems; efficient lighting, cool roof technology; continued use of available reclaimed water; and solid waste diversion targets consistent with established objectives.

The Project’s design features would contribute to greenhouse gas reductions. These reductions represent a break from business as usual and establish consistency with governmental plans for emissions reduction. The Project’s greenhouse gas emissions would be approximately 23 percent less than a business as usual project. Based on the reductions achieved by implementation of the proposed project design features and emissions reductions strategies, and Project consistency with the goals and objectives of federal, State, and local emissions reduction plans and regulations, impacts associated with climate change would be less than significant.

3. Project Design Features

O-1: Construction of new buildings shall exceed Title 24 (2005) energy requirements by 15 percent. In the event Title 24 is amended such that the energy conservation requirements exceed Title 24 (2005) by more than 15 percent, the building shall comply with the amended Title 24.

O-3: The Project shall include the following energy saving and emission reducing features that would be implemented during the design and construction of each new building (other than sets/facades):

- Installing energy efficient heating and cooling systems, equipment, and control systems;
- Installing energy efficient appliances (e.g., Energy Star refrigerators, clothes washers, clothes dryers, dishwashers, ventilation fans, and ceiling fans);
- Installing efficient lighting and lighting control systems;
- Installing light-emitting diodes for private on-site traffic and street lighting;
- Installing light colored 'cool' roofs;
- Providing education on energy efficiency, waste diversion, recycling services to the Applicant's employees through new employee orientation materials and three times annually through company website, exhibits, or meetings on energy conservation;
- Prohibit Heating, Ventilation, and Air-Conditioning, refrigeration, and fire suppression equipment that contains banned chlorofluorocarbons;
- For mechanically or naturally ventilated spaces in the building, meet the minimum requirements of Section 121 of the California Energy Code or the applicable local code, whichever is more stringent;
- Adhesives, Paints, Stains, Coatings, and Carpet shall be low volatile organic compound; and
- Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value 6 or higher filters are installed on central air and heating systems.

O-5: The Project shall implement the following indoor and outdoor water conservation project design features:

Outdoor:

- Use of native/drought tolerant plant materials (for at least 25 percent of new landscaping) and use of water efficient landscaping proper hydro-zoning, turf minimization, and landscaping contouring (to minimize precipitation runoff) for new landscaping in areas other than production

activities, entertainment attractions, sets/facades, the theme park, and visitor entries to the theme park and Universal CityWalk. Other than the exempted areas described above, areas of the Project Site within the County's jurisdiction would also comply with the County's landscaping design regulations, as applicable;

- Use of available reclaimed water for landscape irrigation;
- Installation of the infrastructure to deliver and use reclaimed water;
- Expanded use of high efficiency irrigation systems, including weather-based irrigation controllers with rain shutoff technology or smart irrigation controllers for any area that is either landscaped or designated for future landscaping; and,
- Provide education on water conservation to the Applicant's employees through new employee orientation materials and three times annually through company website, exhibits, or meetings on energy conservation.

Indoor:

- High Efficiency Toilets: 1.28 gallons/flush or less;
- High Efficiency Urinals: 0.5 gallons/flush or less;
- Restroom Faucets: 1.5 gallons/minute or less;
- Pre-rinse Spray Valve: 1.6 gallons per minute or less for commercial kitchens;
- Public Restroom: self-closing faucets;
- High efficiency clothes washers (water factor of 7.5 or less); and
- Cooling tower conductivity controllers or cooling tower pH conductivity controllers, as applicable.

O-6: The Project shall implement the following:

- Establish a solid waste diversion target of 65 percent for non-hazardous operational waste (not including production activities and temporary uses);
- During new construction, a minimum of 65 percent of non-hazardous demolition and construction debris by weight from construction of new Project buildings (not including sets/facades, production activities, and temporary uses) would be recycled and/or salvaged for reuse; and
- Recycling Centers: Provide readily accessible areas to serve the entire building for depositing, storage, and collection of non-hazardous materials for recycling.

Project Design Feature O-2 adopted by the City is not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction.

4. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The conclusions presented above apply regardless of whether the proposed annexation and detachment actions occur under the Project. Thus, impacts under the No Annexation Scenario would be less than significant.

5. Cumulative Impacts

Due to the complex physical, chemical, and atmospheric mechanisms involved in global climate change, it is speculative to identify the specific impact, if any, to global climate change from one project's incremental increase in global greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, the significance of potential impacts from the Project's greenhouse gas emissions is determined on a cumulative basis. The Project would implement design features resulting in an overall reduction by 23 percent from business as usual. The Project would consider and implement feasible construction practices and energy-related technologies consistent with the recommendations and objectives of the responsible Federal, state and local agencies. Based on the Project's consistency with State regulatory actions, and County and City goals and objectives, as well as the proposed implementation of project design features and emissions reductions strategies, the Project's cumulative impact to global climate change would be considered less than significant.

VI. IMPACTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT PRIOR TO MITIGATION, WHERE MITIGATION NONETHELESS PROVIDED TO FURTHER REDUCE IMPACTS

The following effects associated with the Project were analyzed in the EIR and found not to be significant prior to mitigation. Nonetheless, mitigation measures have been incorporated to further reduce these effects.

A. Public Services (Schools)

1. Description of Effects

a. Construction Impacts

Project construction is not anticipated to result in adverse impacts to the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) school facilities and overall capacity levels due to the temporary nature of construction related activities. As construction workers are not anticipated to change their place of residence as a result of working at the Project Site, there would be no increase in student enrollment at the local schools serving the Project Site. Therefore, construction-related impacts associated with public schools would be less than significant.

b. Operational Impacts

Based on the application of generation factors developed by the LAUSD, the Project would generate approximately 136 new students. The number of students generated under the Project is substantially less than what is forecasted for the originally proposed project. The LAUSD forecasts indicate that Valley View Elementary School, Bancroft Middle School, and Hollywood High School would operate under capacity in the future. Implementation of the

Project would not result in overcrowding at any of those three schools. Therefore, the Project would result in less than significant impacts to LAUSD Schools.

Implementation of the mitigation measure identified below, requiring the mandatory payment of school fees pursuant to the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 (California Senate Bill 50), would further reduce the less than significant impacts.

c. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

As the Project Site is located entirely in the LAUSD, maintaining the existing City/County jurisdictional boundaries would have no effect on the Project's impacts described above. As such, impacts on LAUSD facilities under the No Annexation scenario are less than significant.

d. Cumulative Impacts

A cumulative increase in the demand for school services is anticipated to occur with the development of future residential and non-residential projects, the Project, and more specifically, the future household growth within the school boundaries currently servicing the Project Site. It is concluded that the Los Angeles Unified School District schools that would serve the Project would operate over capacity with cumulative student generation and new or expanded schools could be needed. As mandated by State law, California Senate Bill 50 sets a maximum level of fees a developer may be required to pay to mitigate a project's impact on school facilities. As such, all future projects, including the Project, would be required to pay a school fee to the Los Angeles Unified School District to help reduce cumulative impacts that may result to school services. Compliance with the provisions of California Senate Bill 50 is deemed to provide full and complete mitigation of school facilities impacts. Therefore, with the full payment of all applicable school fees, cumulative impacts to schools would be less than significant.

2. Project Design Features

No Design Features are identified in the Environmental Impact Report for this environmental issue.

3. Mitigation Measures

K.3-1: The Project Applicant or its successor shall pay all applicable school fees to the Los Angeles Unified School District to offset the impact of additional student enrollment at schools serving the Project area.

4. Findings

Although the Project would not result in significant impacts to Public Services—Schools prior to the implementation of mitigation measures, mitigation measures nonetheless have been incorporated into the Project which ensure compliance with State requirements and further reduce these less than significant environmental effects.

5. Rationale for Findings

As overall development would be reduced and residential land uses would be eliminated under this alternative, fewer students would be generated, and the Project would result in a less

than significant impact to LAUSD schools. The Project would be required to pay school fees in conformance with California Senate Bill 50, which provides full and complete mitigation of school impacts for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act.

6. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts related to the Project's impacts on schools, see (1) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection 3.k(3), Public Services—Schools, in Section II, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR; (2) Section IV.K.3, Public Services—Schools, in the Draft EIR; and (3) HR&A Advisors, *An Assessment of the Public School Enrollment and Capacity Impacts of the NBC Universal Evolution Plan* (March 2010), Appendix M-1 to the Draft EIR.

B. Water Resources—Surface Water (Drainage)

1. Description of Effects

a. Construction Impacts

On-site construction activities may cause short-term hydraulic erosion due to associated grading or construction-related soil disturbance. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and Erosion Control Plan would be implemented to provide for temporary storm water management. These plans would prevent construction from adversely affecting the amount of surface water in a water body. Construction of new drainage facilities would be required in a manner and sequence that would preclude on- and off-site flooding. In addition, there would be some construction off-site to install new connections and up to six new and relocated outfalls to the Los Angeles River Flood Control Channel. All other storm drain facilities would be constructed within the Project Site. Construction impacts would be confined to trenching for storm drain lines and removal of an existing water feature. Construction under the Project would not subject adjacent properties to the Project-related floodwaters because any alteration of flows on-site during construction would be conveyed to existing off-site regional storm drain facilities by temporary flood control improvements established in compliance with applicable regulatory standards. Therefore, no significant on-site or off-site flood impacts would result during the construction phases of the Project.

b. Operational Impacts

All new storm drains would be designed and sized to handle the 50-year frequency storm event (per the Los Angeles County Hydrology Manual), all 50-year frequency storm water flows would be collected and conveyed ultimately to the Los Angeles River Flood Control Channel, and there would be no flooding during a 50-year storm event. Development under the Project would require the construction of specific on-site flood control infrastructure to convey stormwater flows associated with each development site, or groups of development sites, to the major stormwater infrastructure. Future storm water conveyance facilities would be designed and constructed pursuant to all applicable County or City standards.

Project development would not increase overall peak flow rate with respect to the existing Project Site conditions. Peak flow rate measures the highest rate at which storm water is leaving the Project Site during a storm event. No additional detention features are proposed as a part of the Project since the overall peak flow rate resulting from the Project is less than the overall peak flow rate leaving the existing Project Site. Since there would be a slight decrease in

peak flow rate with the Project, it would not result in a permanent adverse change to the movement of surface water sufficient to produce a substantial change in the current or direction of water flow. With the implementation of the above modifications to the storm drain system, the Project would result in less than significant impacts.

c. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

Impacts related to surface water hydrology would not be affected by the proposed annexation/detachment, as impacts are analyzed using the County Hydrology Manual and method regardless of the portion of the Project Site that is proposed for individual development activities. In addition, all storm drain lines on the Project Site ultimately drain to the Los Angeles River Flood Control Channel and all proposed storm drain lines would also drain to the Los Angeles River Flood Control Channel.

d. Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative growth within the Los Angeles River Flood Control Channel catchment area could contribute to the increased utilization of the available capacity of the Los Angeles River Flood Control Channel. The Project would not result in an increase in peak flow rate of Project Site-related storm water runoff. Therefore, impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. As such, impacts would be less than significant on a cumulative basis

It is anticipated that individual buildings and facilities which constitute cumulative growth would be subject to building permit issuance processes which would require design features and characteristics which would reduce potential flood impacts on an individual, and thus, cumulative basis, to acceptable levels. The Project in association with other future projects would not contribute to flooding during the projected 50-year storm event, or have the potential to harm people or damage property or sensitive biological resources. Adherence to the existing requirements of the responsible jurisdictions and FEMA concerning development within flood plains would ensure that the Project and other future projects' volume and velocity changes would be within the carrying capacity identified by the Army Corps of Engineers for the Los Angeles River Flood Control Channel. As the Project development would not increase peak flow rates, the Project is not anticipated to have a cumulative effect on the surrounding area. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to potential drainage and flood hazards would be considered to be less than significant.

2. Project Design Features

- G.1.a-1:** The Project Applicant or its successor shall construct new storm drains as needed that shall be designed and sized using the Los Angeles County Hydrology Manual method for a minimum 50-year frequency storm event capacity.

3. Mitigation Measures

- G.1.a-1:** The Project Applicant or its successor shall prepare detailed drainage plans for each Project, pursuant to City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works and Bureau of Engineering requirements, and as that term is defined in the County Specific Plan, for review and approval by the appropriate responsible agency (i.e., Los Angeles County Department of Public Works or the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works) at the time that grading or building

permit applications are submitted. These drainage plans shall include detailed hydrologic/hydraulic calculations, as necessary, and drainage improvement plans, and show quantitatively how projected stormwater runoff in each drainage area of the Project Site would be conveyed to off-site stormwater conveyance facilities.

4. Findings

Although the Project would not result in significant impacts to Surface Water (Drainage) prior to the implementation of mitigation measures, mitigation measures nonetheless have been incorporated. These will ensure compliance with County and City requirements and further reduce the less than significant impacts relating to operation of the originally proposed project as identified in the Project.

5. Rationale for Findings

Although no significant impacts are anticipated that would reduce or increase the amount of surface water in a body of water; result in a substantial change in the current or direction of water flow having the potential to harm people or damage property or sensitive biological resources; or subject the Project Site to inundation by 100-year floodwaters or other possible flood hazards, Mitigation Measure G.1.a-1 in addition to the identified project design features would be implemented by the Project Applicant or its successor during the construction phase of the Project.

6. Reference

For a complete discussion of environmental impacts of Water Resources—Surface Water (Drainage), see (1) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection 3.g(1)(2), in Section II, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR; (2) Section IV.G.1.a, Water Resources—Surface Water (Drainage), in the Draft EIR; (3) Appendix I-1 to the Draft EIR; and (4) Appendix FEIR-21 to the Final EIR.

VII. IMPACTS FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT AFTER MITIGATION

The following impact areas were concluded by the EIR to be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures described in the EIR. Based on that analysis and other evidence in the administrative record relating to the project, the County finds and determines that mitigation measures described in the Final EIR, as revised in the City's MMRP and the County's MMRP, will reduce potentially significant impacts identified for the following environmental impact categories to below the level of significance:

A. Traffic/Access—Traffic/Circulation (Construction Impacts; Operational Impacts: Public Transit, Arterial Monitoring Stations, and Supplemental Caltrans Analysis: On- and Off-Ramps)

1. Description of Effects

a. Construction Impacts

Construction traffic and/or construction activities could cause travel delays on an intermittent basis during buildout of the Project. Potential impacts associated with physical

construction of the Project would be limited to those locations immediately adjacent to or those within the Project Site. The most notable of these impacts would occur with the widening of Lankershim Boulevard, Barham Boulevard, and Buddy Holly Drive, which would require a temporary reduction in lane capacity (one lane in one direction) and would cause delays for vehicles traveling in that direction. Otherwise, the physical effects of construction would be limited.

Construction of the curb cuts and access roadways and driveways would occur in concert with the completion of the development they would be serving. Delays from additional construction traffic and/or construction activities at other locations are not expected to cause substantial inconvenience to auto travelers, but would be noticeable to commuters who regularly use the streets adjacent to the Project Site. Impacts related to in-street construction would be less than significant with implementation of the identified mitigation measures. During the Project's construction, some temporary sidewalk closures at limited locations may also occur. Notwithstanding, pedestrian activity around the Lankershim Boulevard and Universal Hollywood Drive/Universal Terrace Parkway intersection would be maintained throughout the construction of the Project. Sidewalk closures are concluded to constitute a less than significant impact due to the temporary nature of the impact as well as the impact occurring at only limited locations.

Overall, the impact on the transportation system from construction activities would be temporary in nature and would cause an intermittent reduction in street and intersection operating capacity near the Project Site. Project construction is not expected to create hazards for roadway travelers, as long as commonly practiced safety procedures for construction are followed. Such procedures have been incorporated into the Project's traffic mitigation measures.

b. Operational Impacts (Public Transit System)

Furthermore, the Project would result in less than significant impacts to the public transit system. The Project is estimated to generate approximately 6,247 daily transit trips, including 673 morning peak-hour transit trips and 699 afternoon peak-hour transit trips. There is residual capacity on the existing transit system on all lines serving the Project Site except Metro Rapid 750 (serving the Ventura Boulevard corridor). The Project proposes to provide one additional articulated bus to alleviate the operating conditions along this route. Assuming that 25 percent of the capacity for the additional bus would be available for Project transit trips, the anticipated transit demand on a systemwide basis would be more than satisfied by the proposed supply.

c. Operational Impacts (Arterial Monitoring Stations)

The evaluation of the impact of a project on the regional transportation system (freeways, designated streets, and transit facilities) is guided by procedures outlined in the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan. A total of six arterial monitoring stations were analyzed. With proposed mitigation measures and Transportation Demand Management trip reductions, all six intersections would be fully mitigated during both analyzed peak hours.

d. Operational Impacts (Supplemental Caltrans Analysis: on- and off-ramps)

Caltrans requested that the impact analysis include an evaluation of potential effects on both on- and off-ramps. Based on this analysis, under the Future with the Project conditions, before Transportation Demand Management trip reductions and mitigation, the Project impacts

would be significant at 12 of the analyzed freeway on- and off-ramps. With the implementation of the identified mitigation measures, impacts to on- and off-ramp locations would be reduced to less than significant levels. However, if Caltrans does not implement improvements to reduce impacts on the on- and off-ramps that would be affected by the Project, the Project's on- and off-ramp impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

e. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The proposed annexation/detachment of land areas between the County and City would not alter the potential for traffic/circulation impacts nor the significance level of any impact. Annexation has no bearing on which jurisdictional intersection or recommended improvement to various intersections could occur with the Project. The jurisdictions responsible for implementation of the mitigation measures would also be unaffected. As such, potential impacts would remain the same if the proposed annexation/detachment actions are not implemented.

f. Cumulative Impacts

(1) Construction Impacts

Most of the related projects are not located in close proximity to the Project Site and may or may not be developed within the same construction schedule as the Project. In addition, since the release of the Draft EIR, the Metro Universal project (Related Project no. 65) is no longer proposed. As such, cumulative construction impacts would be less than significant.

(2) Operational Impacts (Public Transit System)

Implementation of the Project in conjunction with cumulative conditions would increase the demand for transit in the Project area. The Project's increased transit use would result in significant transit impacts that would be reduced to a less than significant level with the Project's mitigation measures. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

(3) Operational Impacts (Arterial Monitoring Stations)

The Project's contribution to cumulative traffic conditions would result in significant cumulative Level of Service impacts at six Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan arterial monitoring stations. With implementation of the proposed mitigation and Transportation Demand Management trip reductions, impacts to these arterial monitoring stations would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts at Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan arterial monitoring stations would not be considerable, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

(4) Operational Impacts (Supplemental Caltrans Analysis: on- and off-ramps)

The Project's contribution to cumulative traffic conditions would result in significant impacts at freeway on-ramps and off-ramps. Therefore, the Project's contribution to significant cumulative impacts at the on-ramps and off-ramps would be considerable. However, with the implementation of the proposed mitigation, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

2. Project Design Features

B-1: The Project Applicant or its successor shall prepare and implement a Transportation Demand Management program to reduce traffic impacts of the Project encouraging Project employees and patrons to reduce vehicular traffic on the street and freeway system during the most congested time periods of the day. The Transportation Demand Management program shall include implementation of several Transportation Demand Management strategies, which may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Flexible work schedules and telecommuting programs;
- Alternative work schedules;
- Bicycle and pedestrian-friendly environment (i.e., established and clear pedestrian networks, intersections, and built environments);
- Bicycle amenities;
- Rideshare/carpool/vanpool promotion and support;
- Mixed-use development;
- Education and information on alternative transportation modes;
- Transportation Information Center;
- Guaranteed Ride Home Program;
- Join an existing or form a new Transportation Management Association;
- On-site flex cars;
- Discounted employee and tenant transit passes; and
- Financial mechanisms and/or programs to provide for the implementation of the Transportation Demand Management program.

B-3: Buddy Holly Drive between Barham Boulevard and the US 101 northbound off-ramp shall be widened from its current configuration of two westbound lanes to three westbound lanes. The roadway shall continue to accommodate only westbound traffic on this section.

B-4: Buddy Holly Drive between the US 101 northbound off-ramp to Donald O'Connor Drive shall be widened to accommodate between four and five lanes. At the approach to Donald O'Connor Drive, a dedicated right-turn lane shall be provided, and a dedicated left-turn lane onto the northbound US-101 Freeway shall be provided.

B-5: The final segment of Buddy Holly Drive between Donald O'Connor Drive and Universal Studios Boulevard/Universal Center Drive may be widened to accommodate four westbound travel lanes and two eastbound travel lanes. If

this segment of Buddy Holly Drive is widened, the US 101 northbound on-ramp at Universal Studios Boulevard/Buddy Holly Drive shall be relocated maintaining the existing 12-foot travel lane, an 8-foot left shoulder, and a 6-foot right shoulder. Entrance to the on-ramp shall be reconfigured from the existing northbound right-turn lane off of Universal Studios Boulevard to a right-turn off the new westbound lanes on Buddy Holly Drive between Donald O'Connor Drive and Universal Studios Boulevard/Universal Center Drive. If operated under two-way flow, the westbound approach on Buddy Holly Drive would include two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and two free-flow right-turn lanes. Also, Universal Studios Boulevard would be restriped to provide a northbound right-turn lane, and the eastbound approach would be restriped to provide one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane. This configuration would not be needed if Buddy Holly remains a one-way eastbound street.

- B-7:** The new development calls for the realignment and widening of Universal Hollywood Drive, which extends between the Universal Tram stop east of Lankershim Boulevard and Universal Studios Boulevard, providing access to parking structures within Universal Studios Hollywood and the entrance to CityWalk near Universal CityWalk, to improve overall circulation both on-site and off-site.

Project Design Features B-6, B-8, B-9, B-10, B-11, and B-12 adopted by the City are not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction. For more information, see Attachment B to the County's MMRP.

3. Mitigation Measures

- B-6:** The Project Applicant or its successor shall implement the following Lankershim Boulevard Corridor improvements:
- a. [DELETED DUE TO SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVE 10];
 - b. [DELETED DUE TO SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVE 10];
 - c. Restripe James Stewart Avenue at its intersection with Lankershim Boulevard to provide one left-turn, one shared through/left-turn, and dual right-turn lanes in the westbound direction;
 - d. [SEE BELOW];
 - e. Widen Main Street at its intersection with Lankershim Boulevard to improve ingress/egress to/from the Project Site;
 - f. [DELETED DUE TO SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVE 10];
 - g. [SEE BELOW];
 - h. [SEE BELOW];
 - i. [SEE BELOW];

- j. Widen Universal Hollywood Drive at its intersection with Lankershim Boulevard to provide a separate westbound left-turn lane and additional signal equipment for protected left-turn phasing on the east-west approach;
- k. [SEE BELOW];
- l. [SEE BELOW];
- m. [DELETED DUE TO THE SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVE 10].

B-43: All construction workers shall be prohibited from parking on neighborhood streets offsite. To the extent that parking would not be available on-site, parking shall be provided by The Project Applicant or its successor at offsite locations. A construction worker shuttle service shall be provided if an offsite parking lot is not within reasonable walking distance of the Project Site.

B-44: The Project Applicant or its successor shall prepare construction traffic management plans, including but not limited to street closure information, detour plans, haul routes, and staging plans, satisfactory to the affected jurisdictions. The construction traffic management plans shall be based on the nature and timing of the specific construction and other projects in the vicinity of the Project Site, and shall include the following elements as appropriate:

- 1. Provisions to configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference;
- 2. Provisions for temporary traffic control during all phases of construction activities to improve traffic flow on public roadways (e.g., flag person);
- 3. Scheduling construction activities to reduce the effect on traffic flow on public roadways;
- 4. Rerouting construction trucks to reduce travel on congested streets;
- 5. Consolidating construction truck deliveries;
- 6. Provision of dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on- and off-site;
- 7. Construction-related vehicles shall not park on any residential street;
- 8. Provision of safety precautions for pedestrians and bicyclists through such measures as alternate routing, and protection barriers;
- 9. All contractors shall be required to participate in a common carpool registry during all periods of contract performance monitored and maintained by the contractor;
- 10. Schedule construction-related deliveries, other than concrete and earthwork-related deliveries to reduce travel during peak travel periods;

11. Construction vehicle travel through neighboring jurisdictions other than the City of Los Angeles shall be conducted in accordance with the standard rules and regulations established by the respective jurisdictions where such jurisdictions would be subject to construction impacts. These include allowable operating times for construction activities, truck haul routes, clearance requirements, etc.;
12. Prior to the issuance of any permit for the Project, required permits for the truck haul routes, if applicable, shall be obtained from the City of Los Angeles;
13. Obtain a Caltrans transportation permit for use of oversized transport vehicles on Caltrans facilities; and
14. Submit a traffic management plan to Caltrans for approval to avoid potential access restrictions to and from Caltrans facilities.
15. In order to facilitate coordination with funeral processions, the Applicant shall provide the Forest Lawn Memorial-Park Association 72-hour notice of major improvements to Forest Lawn Drive.
16. During construction, lane closures on Forest Lawn Drive shall be limited in terms of scope and duration to the extent feasible. A minimum of one lane of through traffic shall be maintained on Forest Lawn Drive in each direction at all times.

Mitigation Measures B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, B-5, B-6.d, g, h, i, k, and l, B-7, B-8, B-9, B-10, B-12, B-13, B-15, B-16, B-18, B-19, B-20, B-22, B-23, B-26, B-27, B-28, B-29, B-30, B-31, B-33, B-34, B-35, B-36, B-37, B-38, B-39, B-40, B-41, B-45, B-46, and B-47 adopted by the City are not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction. For more information see Attachment B to the County's MMRP.

4. Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects on Traffic/Circulation—Construction Impacts and Traffic/Circulation—Operational Impacts (Public Transit, Arterial Monitoring Stations, and Supplemental Caltrans Analysis: On- and Off-Ramps) as identified in the EIR and MMRP, to less than significant levels.

In addition, where changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency (the City) and not the agency making the finding (the County), such changes have been adopted by such other agency.

5. Rationale for Findings

No adverse impacts associated with Traffic/Circulation—Construction Impacts and Traffic/Circulation—Operational Impacts (Public Transit, Arterial Monitoring Stations, and Supplemental Caltrans Analysis: On- and Off-Ramps) would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of the mitigation measures described above, as

well as the above-cited mitigation measures adopted by the City, which have been incorporated into the Project in the City's MMRP.

6. Reference

For a complete analysis of impacts related to the Project's Traffic/Access—Traffic/Circulation impacts, please see (1) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection 3.b(1) of Section II, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR; (2) Section IV.B.1, Traffic/Access – Traffic/Circulation, of the Draft EIR; (3) Appendices E-1 and E-2 to the Draft EIR; and (4) Appendices FEIR-14 and FEIR-15 to the Final EIR.

B. Noise (Construction: Construction Vibration and Hauling Noise)

1. Description of Effects

a. Construction Vibration

Project construction activities could result in ground-borne vibration at the receptor areas. Pile driving equipment, which generates higher levels of ground-borne vibration than most construction equipment, would not be included in the Project's construction equipment mix. Construction within the Studio, Business, and Entertainment Areas would result in less than significant vibration impacts at all receptors. Construction within the Back Lot Area could potentially result in vibration impacts at the Hollywood Manor area, which is adjacent to and shares a common boundary with the east side of the Back Lot Area. Construction activity occurring within the northern and western parts of the Back Lot Area would not result in any significant impacts to the Hollywood Manor area. However, construction and grading activity within the southeastern-most portion of the Back Lot Area, has the potential to yield peak particle velocity levels in excess of 0.5 inch/second at the Hollywood Manor area. As such, without mitigation construction vibration impacts could be significant at the Hollywood Manor area. With the mitigation proposed, the impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. This relates only to impacts within the City of Los Angeles. There will be no impacts at receptor areas in the County.

b. Hauling Noise

Project construction activities would also require the hauling of materials to and from the construction sites. Construction haul routes anticipated to occur during construction within the Studio, Business, and Entertainment Areas could utilize Lankershim Boulevard, Forest Lawn Drive, or Universal Studios Boulevard to access area freeways. Hauling from the Back Lot Area construction could exit the Project Site at Buddy Holly Drive/Coral Drive to Universal Studios Boulevard to the US 101 Freeway or exit at Lakeside Plaza Drive and travel along Forest Lawn Drive to the Ventura Freeway (SR 134). The Forest Lawn Drive route could potentially impact the residential community in Burbank known as the "Rancho Neighborhood." The analysis evaluated these haul routes individually, as well as all haul routes being used at the same time. The analysis determined that due to the decreased level of development in the Back Lot Area under the Project, hauling under peak flow conditions along Forest Lawn Drive would result in a peak rate of approximately 45 haul trips per hour along Forest Lawn Drive. Because the Project would result in less than 78 haul trips per hour along Forest Lawn Drive, the rate at which a related noise impact could occur, no significant impact would occur at the "Rancho Neighborhood." Overall, none of the receptors along any of the haul routes would result in an

increase in community noise levels above the established threshold of 5 dBA. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

c. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The significance thresholds used in this analysis are based on a combination of the noise standards in use by both the County and City. The significance thresholds that were selected for this analysis reflects the City or County noise standard, that would yield the more conservative analysis. As such, the jurisdiction within which the Project development is located would not result in the use of a significance threshold that would be more restrictive than that which is used in the various analyses presented in the Draft EIR. Therefore, the location of jurisdictional boundaries has no effect on the assessment of impacts whether under the Project or the No Annexation scenario. As such, impacts associated with the No Annexation scenario would be the same as those identified above with regard to the Project.

d. Cumulative Impacts

Construction hauling from the off-site projects and the Project were considered in a cumulative construction analysis. The two roadway segments utilized in the construction hauling are Lankershim Boulevard and Forest Lawn Drive. As some of the off-site projects may utilize the same roadway segments, the cumulative impact for all projects may have the potential to exceed 5 dB.

As discussed above, noise from the Project hauling under peak flow conditions would result in a less than significant impact at the Rancho Neighborhood. Related projects along or adjacent to Forest Lawn Drive would potentially utilize the same hauling roadway segments as the Project. Since hauling information for the related projects along or adjacent to Forest Lawn Drive are not publicly available, and because such projects' haul trips have the potential to occur on the same segment of Forest Lawn Drive as the Project, it is conservatively assumed that noise increases with these additional trips could exceed 5 dBA at the Rancho Neighborhood under the Project. As such, without the incorporation of mitigation measures, cumulative construction hauling could result in a potentially cumulative significant impact at the Rancho Neighborhood. It is important to note that such significant impact only would occur if hauling from the related projects along or adjacent to Forest Lawn Drive is concurrent with the Project's hauling, and if such concurrent hauling resulted in more than 78 haul trips per hour. With incorporation of Mitigation Measure C-5, which has been adopted by the City, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

2. Project Design Features

C-1: The Project shall not utilize pile driving machinery as part of its construction equipment mix.

Project Design Features C-2 and C-3 adopted by the City are not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction. .

3. Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are applicable to development in the County for this environmental issue. Mitigation Measures C-3, C-5, C-6, and C-7 adopted by the City are not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction.

4. Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects on Noise (Construction Vibration and Hauling Noise), as identified in the EIR, to less than significant levels.

In addition, where changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency (the City) and not the agency making the finding (the County), such changes have been adopted by such other agency.

5. Rationale for Findings

No adverse impacts associated with Noise (Construction Vibration and Hauling Noise) would occur in the County as a result of the development of the Project.

6. Reference

For a complete discussion of environmental impacts of Noise (Construction Vibration and Hauling Noise), please see (1) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection 3.c, in Section II, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR; (2) Section IV.C of the Draft EIR; (3) Appendix C-1 to the Draft EIR; and (4) Appendix FEIR-16 to the Final EIR.

C. Light and Glare (Natural Light)

1. Description of Effects

a. Construction Impacts

Cranes, scaffolding, and other construction equipment associated with mid- and high-rise construction are potential sources of shadows. However, these shadows are highly transitory, given the frequency at which this construction equipment is moved and would not generate shadows for any considerable period. Therefore, any construction related shading associated with development of the Project would not be expected to cause a significant shading impact.

b. Operational Impacts

Potential shading impacts from the Project were analyzed at 13 geographic areas with off-site shadow-sensitive uses, which include routinely usable outdoor spaces associated with residential, recreational, and institutional uses, as well as certain commercial uses, and existing solar collectors. Shadow patterns, based on the Project's permitted building heights, were calculated and diagrammed for daily periods during the spring equinox, winter solstice, summer solstice and fall equinox. The analysis conservatively assumes future buildout of the proposed Height Zones and Height Exception areas. Based on this analysis, the proposed 850-foot MSL (Business and Entertainment) Height Zone could result in shading, the Campo de Cahuenga, for 3.5 hours during the spring equinox and the proposed 850-foot MSL Height Zone could add one-half hour of shading to an area currently fully shaded for 3.0 hours during the winter solstice. With regard to Toluca Estates, the proposed 850-foot MSL (Business and Entertainment) Height Zone would shade one property in the Toluca Estates Area for 4.5 hours

during the winter solstice. Nevertheless, mitigation has been proposed to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

No other shadow-sensitive uses would be shaded for three hours or more between 9:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M. during the spring equinox or winter solstice. Based on the duration of shading significant impacts would occur at these locations. No shadow-sensitive uses would be shaded for four or more hours between 9:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. during the summer solstice or fall equinox.

c. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The proposed annexation/detachment of areas between the County of Los Angeles and City of Los Angeles would not alter the potential for impacts to shadow-sensitive uses as the impact analysis and conclusions are independent of jurisdictional boundaries. As such, impacts to shadow-sensitive uses under the No Annexation scenario would be significant at the same locations identified above.

d. Cumulative Impacts

As with the analysis of the Project impacts, analysis of cumulative shadow impacts conservatively assumes future buildout of the proposed Height Zones and Height Exception areas. Development of the Project Site in combination with potential future cumulative development could contribute to the cumulative shading of off-site shadow sensitive uses. This is due both to existing plans for development as well as the City of Los Angeles' land use and zoning designations along Lankershim Boulevard, which permit development of multiple-story buildings which could shade local shadow-sensitive uses. However, the Metro Universal project (Related Project No. 65), across Lankershim Boulevard from the Project Site, is no longer proposed. Overall, with incorporation of proposed mitigation measures, cumulative impacts would be considered less than significant.

2. Project Design Features

No Design Features are identified in the Environmental Impact Report for this environmental issue.

3. Mitigation Measures

E.1-1: Prior to issuance of a building permit for structures proposed to be built within 560-feet of Lankershim Boulevard and 440-feet of Universal Hollywood Drive within the 850-foot or 890-foot MSL Height Zones, the Project Applicant or its successor shall submit a site specific shadow study that illustrates that the proposed structure would not cause the Campo de Cahuenga historic site to be shaded for more than 3.0 continuous hours between 9:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M. PST during the Spring Equinox or add shading to an area of the Campo de Cahuenga historic site already shaded continuously for 3.0 hours during the Winter Solstice.

E.1-2: Structures proposed to be built within the 850-foot MSL Height Zone shall conform with the Project's height limitations and setback requirements as shown on Attachment D to the MMRP.

4. Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects on Light and Glare (Natural Light), as identified in the EIR, to less than significant levels.

5. Rationale for Findings

No adverse impacts associated with Light and Glare (Natural Light) would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of Mitigation Measures E.1-1 and E.1-2.

6. Reference

For a complete discussion of environmental impacts of Light and Glare (Natural Light), please see (1) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection 3.e(1), in Section II, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR; (2) Section IV.E.1 of the Draft EIR; (3) and Appendix FEIR-18 to the Final EIR.

D. Geotechnical (Liquefaction, Landslides, Closed Landfill, Expansive Soils, Fill)

1. Description of Effects

a. Liquefaction

Based on on-site soil conditions, the potential for liquefaction to occur on the site ranges from high to low. Impacts would be considered significant for areas designated with a high or moderate potential for liquefaction. Mitigation is proposed to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

b. Landslides

An on-site slope stability hazard is present for most west, northeast, and north facing cut slopes. Excavation during Project grading in these areas could create geotechnical hazards related to landslides. Therefore, the Project's impacts related to landslides would be significant and mitigation is proposed to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

c. Closed Landfill

A closed landfill is located towards the central portion of the Project Site. Methane gas may be present at this closed landfill. Additionally, the closed landfill is subject to settlement. Mitigation is proposed to reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

d. Expansive Soils

Expansive soils are present within portions of the Project Site. As these soils are relatively impermeable, irrigation water could become trapped within the upper soils of landscaped areas particularly if the landscaped areas are covered with permeable planting materials. This trapped water could move laterally beneath slabs, curbs, and paving, thereby resulting in significant impacts. Mitigation is proposed to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

e. Fills (Engineered and Non-Engineered)

As a result of past on-site construction activities, both engineered and nonengineered fills are present at the Project Site. The non-engineered fills that are present may be weak and compressible, particularly with the addition of water. Without proper mitigation, construction in areas with non-engineered fills could lead to significant impacts. Mitigation is proposed to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

2. Project Design Features

- F-1:** All Project construction would conform to the requirements of the applicable building code, including all provisions related to seismic safety.
- F-2:** As part of Project grading, erosion and sedimentation control measures would be implemented during site grading to reduce erosion impacts. The Project Applicant or its successor would also comply with all construction site runoff control and implement construction "Best Management Practices" under applicable state and local requirements, as discussed further in Section IV.G.1.b, Water Resources – Surface Water Quality of the Draft EIR.
- F-3:** Dewatering activities would be conducted in accordance with the applicable permit requirements, as discussed further in Section IV.G.1.b, Water Resources – Surface Water Quality of the Draft EIR.
- F-4:** A total of 300,000 cubic yards of import or export of earth shall be permitted to/from the City portions of the Project Site. Movement of earth within the combined boundaries of the County and City portions of the Project Site shall not count toward this total.

3. Mitigation Measures

- F-1:** Prior to issuance of the building permit for a building or structure, a site-specific geotechnical report shall be prepared for each Project (not including sets/façades or temporary uses), pursuant to the City's Department of Building and Safety regulations, and as the term is defined in the County Specific Plan, in accordance with the City or County of Los Angeles requirements to the satisfaction of the applicable jurisdiction. The recommendations contained within these site-specific geotechnical reports, including those pertaining to site preparation, fill placement, and compaction; foundations; pavement design; footings; and pile foundations shall be implemented. The site-specific geotechnical reports shall include all applicable recommendations included in the *Report of Geotechnical Investigation NBC Universal Evolution Plan* (March 2010) prepared by Shannon & Wilson, Inc. included as Attachment E to this MMRP. The site specific study shall determine which mitigation measures listed in Mitigation Measures F-3 to F-14 below are applicable for implementation of the Project, required by the City's Department of Building and Safety, and as that term is defined in the County Specific Plan, the study is considering.
- F-2:** During construction, geotechnical observation and testing shall be completed during the placement of new compacted fills, foundation construction, buttresses, stabilization fills, ground improvement, and any other geotechnical-related

construction for each Project, as applicable, in accordance with the City or County of Los Angeles requirements to the satisfaction of the applicable jurisdiction. The geotechnical firm performing these services for locations within the City of Los Angeles shall be approved by the City of Los Angeles when work is occurring within its jurisdiction.

- F-3:** For slope stability hazards identified in Attachment E to the MMRP, such locations shall be mitigated by either reorienting the cut slopes, reducing the slope angle to the angle of the bedding or flatter, or by construction of buttress and stabilization fills. Site-specific geotechnical investigations shall be performed to the satisfaction of the applicable jurisdiction for the design of all cut and fill slopes in accordance with the City or County of Los Angeles requirements, as applicable.
- F-5:** Grading within the hillside areas shall address slope stability. Where favorable bedding exists, the slopes shall be constructed no steeper than a 2:1 (horizontal to vertical) inclination. If the bedding dips unfavorably out of the slopes, the slopes shall either be flattened to the angle of the bedding (or flatter), or the slopes shall be stabilized. The degree of stabilization would depend on the orientation of the bedding with respect to the final slope and the depth of the excavation. Where the bedding dips out of the slopes, buttress fills shall be provided. If the bedding is approximately parallel to the slopes, thinner stabilization fills will suffice. The design of the buttress or stabilization fills and specific design criteria for each slope shall be included to the satisfaction to the applicable jurisdiction in the site-specific geotechnical report prepared prior to construction of each Project, pursuant to the City's Department of Building and Safety regulations, and as that term is defined in the County Specific Plan, in accordance with the City or County of Los Angeles requirements, as applicable.
- F-6:** Site-specific liquefaction hazard studies shall be required to the satisfaction to the applicable jurisdiction for each Project (not including sets/façades or temporary uses), pursuant to the City's Building and Safety regulations, and as the term is defined in the County Specific Plan, within a liquefaction hazard area identified in Attachment E to this MMRP in accordance with the City or County of Los Angeles requirements, as applicable. For areas with a high liquefaction potential, identified in Attachment E to this MMRP, where there is potential for more than four inches of settlement resulting from liquefaction, and areas of moderate liquefaction potential, where there is a potential for between one and four inches of settlement resulting from liquefaction, the liquefaction hazard shall be mitigated to the satisfaction to the applicable jurisdiction in accordance with the applicable City or County of Los Angeles requirements. Mitigation for high liquefaction potential could include ground improvement or deep foundations extending through the potentially liquefiable soils and structurally-supported floor slabs. Mitigation for moderate liquefaction potential could include ground improvement, deep foundations, or special foundation design procedures, such as extra reinforcement and strengthening of building foundations and floor slab systems.
- F-7:** Deep foundations shall be provided for any structures located over waste in the closed landfill in accordance with the requirements of the County of Los Angeles. These foundations shall extend through the closed landfill and into the underlying

bedrock. Downdrag loads resulting from decomposition and settlement of the closed landfill shall be added to the design loads on the piles.

- F-8:** Any required fill shall be placed in loose lifts not more than 8 inches thick and compacted to the standard as determined by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Designation D1557 method of compaction. The fill shall be compacted in accordance with the applicable City or County of Los Angeles requirements to the satisfaction of the applicable jurisdiction. Cohesive fills shall be compacted to 90%. Granular, non-cohesive soil shall be compacted to at least 95%. Where deep fills are required a greater degree of compaction may be required to reduce the settlement of the completed fills.
- F-9:** The on-site excavated materials, less any debris or organic matter, may be used in required fills in accordance with the City or County of Los Angeles requirements, as applicable. On-site clayey soils shall not be used within one foot of the subgrade for floor slabs, walks, and other slabs. Cobbles larger than 4 inches in diameter shall not be used in fill. Any required import material shall consist of relatively non-expansive soils with an Expansion Index of less than 35. The imported materials shall contain sufficient fines (binder material) so as to be relatively impermeable and result in a stable subgrade when compacted. All proposed import materials shall be approved by the geotechnical consultant-of-record prior to being placed at the site.
- F-11:** All concrete slabs on grade shall be underlain by at least one foot of non-expansive soil with an Expansion Index less than 35 to minimize the expansion potential. In addition, subsurface cutoff walls shall be provided between landscaped and hardscape areas. The cutoff walls shall consist of a concrete-filled trench at least six inches wide and two feet deep. The cutoff walls shall extend at least six inches below any adjacent granular non-expansive material or the paving base course. Drain lines shall also be installed adjacent to landscaped areas.
- F-12:** The geotechnical engineer-of-record shall be provided with a copy of the hardscape and landscaping plans in order to review in terms of movement of water and expansive soils prior to final design.
- F-13:** During construction non-engineered fills shall be excavated, and replaced as compacted fill properly benched into suitable materials, to the satisfaction to the applicable jurisdiction, in accordance with the City or County of Los Angeles requirements, as applicable. In general, most of the excavated materials can be reused in the compacted fills. The suitability of the materials shall be confirmed during the site-specific geotechnical report prepared for the individual development.
- F-14:** For new buildings, surface water runoff shall be removed by subdrains from behind building basement walls and retaining walls to prevent development of damaging hydrostatic pressures and to avoid detrimental effects on the strength and compressibility of compacted fills, to the satisfaction to the applicable jurisdiction, in accordance with the City or County of Los Angeles requirements, as applicable.

Mitigation Measure F-4 adopted by the City is not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction.

4. Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects on the Geotechnical impacts of the Project to less than significant levels.

In addition, where changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency (the City) and not the agency making the finding (the County), such changes have been adopted by such other agency.

5. Rationale for Findings

No adverse impacts associated with Geotechnical impacts would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of Mitigation Measures F-1 to F-14.

6. Reference

For a complete discussion of environmental Geotechnical impacts, please see (a) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection 3.f, Geotechnical, in Section II, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR; (2) Section IV.F of the Draft EIR; (3) Appendix H-1 to the Draft EIR; and (4) Appendix FEIR-20 to the Final EIR.

E. Biota

1. Description of Effects

a. Listed or Sensitive Species

(1) Special Status Plants

While most of the site is developed with urban uses, biotic resources of interest are also found on the Project Site. No endangered or threatened species have been detected on the Project Site. It is anticipated that the Project would result in the loss of sensitive Southern California black walnut trees, which would be considered a significant impact; however, compliance with City protected tree requirements and implementation of Mitigation Measure I-1, requiring the planting of replacement walnut trees, would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. In addition, on-site walnut trees that would not be removed would be protected during Project construction through the implementation of Mitigation Measure I-4 which would reduce any indirect impacts to Southern California black walnut trees to less than significant.

(2) Special Status Wildlife

Sensitive reptile species (silvery legless lizard, coastal western whiptail, and San Bernardino ringneck snake) have potential to occur on-site and, if present, are likely to exist in small numbers due to the fragmented and/or disturbed habitat conditions and the Project Site's prolonged isolation, a situation that might lead to their eventual extirpation. Any potential impacts would be avoided through implementation of Project Design Feature I-3, which would involve avoidance and salvage of sensitive reptiles in the Back Lot Area.

A few sensitive bird species have a potential to nest on-site, including Cooper's hawk, Southern California rufous-crowned sparrow, and white-tailed kite. Although no raptor nests were observed on-site, and hawks maintain rather large nesting territories (possibly limiting the number of possible nests in the entire area), Cooper's hawk is still considered to have a moderate potential to nest on-site. Other bird species, including migratory birds, have a higher potential to nest in the vegetation or structures on-site. Construction activities associated with the Project, including vegetation removal, building demolition, and noise and vibration have a potential to result in direct (i.e., death or physical harm) and indirect (i.e., nest abandonment) adverse impacts to nesting birds; these impacts would be considered significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure I-3, involving either initiation of construction activities before the nesting season, or pre-construction surveys during the nesting season, would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. In addition, although construction would temporarily reduce available nesting habitat for birds in the area, compliance with the City's protected tree requirements, the implementation of the tree regulations under the proposed County Specific Plan, and Mitigation Measure I-5 would result in the replacement and/or protection of nesting habitat in the form of trees and oak woodland habitat either on-site or in the vicinity.

The non-native grassland and woodland habitats on-site are used as foraging habitat for raptors; however, given the relatively low use of the site as observed during raptor surveys, the equal or higher usage of the golf course to the north, and the lack of any current nesting activities on-site, the on-site foraging habitat does not appear to be of high value critical to the maintenance of local raptor populations. With implementation of Mitigation Measure I-5, which provides for replacement of oak woodland habitat, impacts to raptor foraging under the Project would be reduced to less than significant.

Several special-status bat species (pallid bat, western mastiff bat, spotted bat, western red bat, and western yellow bat) have potential to forage and roost on-site in larger trees during winter or fall and spring migration periods. If roosting sensitive bat species were impacted by the Project, the impact may be considered significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure I-6, involving pre-construction surveys and avoidance of roosting individuals if found, would reduce potential impacts on roosting sensitive bat species associated with the Project to less than significant levels.

b. Locally Designated Species, Habitats or Communities

(1) County Protected Trees

Under the Project, 571 protected oaks would be present within the proposed County area. All oaks that shift from County to City jurisdiction would be protected under the City protected tree regulations and impacts would be less than significant. In addition, there are total of 113 oaks ranging from four to seven inches in trunk diameter that may grow to become protected size within the current County area during the lifetime of the Project. Under the Project, all of the oaks that shift from County to City jurisdiction would still be protected, and impacts would be less than significant.

Under the Project, approximately 252 County-protected oak trees in the proposed County area may be impacted (removed, damaged, encroached upon within drip line or exclusion area) by development activities.

The removal of or damage to County-protected oak trees would be considered a significant impact as it would result in the loss of trees designated as locally sensitive under the

County's protected tree ordinance. However, implementation of the Oak Tree Removal Regulations in the proposed County Specific Plan as part of the Project requiring the planting of replacement trees or the payment of an in-lieu fee, would result in a less than significant impact to protected oaks under the Project.

The remaining protected oaks that would not be removed may be adversely impacted as a result of Project construction activities, such as from the inadvertent removal of limbs or encroachment into the root zone; such impacts may be considered significant, but with the implementation of Mitigation Measure I-4, which includes tree protection and enhancement measures from pre- to post-construction, this potential impact would be reduced to less than significant.

(2) City Protected Trees

Under the Project, which includes shifts in County and City jurisdictional boundaries, 250 protected trees would be present within the proposed City jurisdictional area (165 Coast live oaks, 30 California sycamores, and 12 Southern California black walnuts). Due to differences in tree sizes subject to the County and City ordinances, some of the Coast live oaks would be considered protected under the Los Angeles Municipal Code, whereas they are not considered protected within the County's jurisdiction. This would also mean that the additional sycamores would be protected; however, potential Project impacts to the black walnuts would be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation Measure I-1.

Under the Project, 140 City-protected trees in the proposed City area may be impacted (removed, damaged, encroached upon within drip line or exclusion area) by development activities. The removal of, or damage to, City-protected trees would be considered a significant impact as it would result in the loss of trees designated as locally sensitive under the City's protected tree ordinance. However, implementation of the City protected tree regulations would result in a less than significant impact to protected trees under the Project.

Any remaining protected trees that would not be removed may be adversely impacted as a result of Project construction activities, such as from the inadvertent removal of limbs or encroachment into the root zone; such impacts may be considered significant, but with the implementation of Mitigation Measure I-4, which includes tree protection and enhancement measures from pre- to post-construction, this potential impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.

c. Sensitive Plant Communities

Under the Project, which also includes shifts in County and City jurisdictional boundaries, impacts to oak woodlands in County jurisdiction following annexation would be addressed by Mitigation Measure I-5 pursuant to Section 21083.4 of the Public Resources Code, and impacts to oak woodlands within City jurisdiction following annexation would be addressed by Project Design Feature I-1.

The avoidance of and/or compensation for oak woodland impacts within the current jurisdiction of the County shall be partially accomplished through the implementation of Mitigation Measure I-4, which includes protecting avoided oaks during construction, and the implementation of the proposed County Specific Plan Oak Tree Removal regulations which includes oak tree replacement and/or payment of an in-lieu fee for protection of oaks. However, the installation of replacement oak trees can mitigate no more than half of the impacts to oak

woodland habitat in the County area from direct removal or damage during development of the Project Site. Therefore, this replacement would count toward only half of the oak woodland habitat mitigation, and impacts to oak woodland habitat would still be significant. This impact would be reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of Mitigation Measure I-5. This mitigation measure presents options for impacted oak woodland habitat compensation, including conserving oak woodlands in perpetuity, replacing or restoring oak woodland habitat (which can only count toward half of the mitigation requirement), and contributing funds to an oak woodland fund. Thus, under the Project, impacts to oak woodland would be reduced to less than significant.

d. Wildlife Movement/Migration Corridors

The Project Site does not act as a true wildlife corridor, movement pathway, or linkage between larger habitat areas for terrestrial wildlife. Thus, although the Project would result in a loss of some of the relatively natural woodland, scrub and grassland habitats on-site, this would not result in a significant impact to wildlife migration or movement corridors.

e. Wetland Habitat

The Project Site does not contain wetland habitat; however, one potentially jurisdictional water feature (drainage) is present along the eastern Project Site boundary adjacent to Barham Boulevard and may be impacted by future development activities on-site. This impact is considered potentially significant under the Project; however, implementation of Mitigation Measure I-7 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

f. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

Impacts under the No Annexation scenario would be generally the same as for the Project for nearly all issues as the physical impacts of the Project would not change. The exception would be for those impacts which would vary based on specific County and City regulations that pertain to special status plants, protected trees, and oak woodlands. The appropriate jurisdiction's policies and procedures would be applicable to the areas within the existing City/County boundaries. While there are some differences between the policies and procedures of the respective jurisdictions, adherence to the policies and procedures of the applicable jurisdiction and project design features and mitigation measures would mitigate any potential impacts. As such, impacts associated with the No Annexation scenario would be less than significant.

g. Cumulative Impacts

The Project Site is not considered a major wildlife movement corridor or habitat linkage, but may provide for occasional or accidental movement of insects, bats, and birds. With implementation of project design features and mitigation measures discussed below, the Project would not have a significant impact on sensitive biological resources. If any of the related projects impact resources, similar to those found on the Project Site, these projects would likely be required to implement mitigation measures similar to those for the Project, which would reduce these impacts to less than significant. In addition, although the Project would result in some loss of available nesting habitat, it would not result in a cumulatively significant impact when considered with the proposed mitigation. Therefore, the Project is not anticipated to result in significant cumulative impacts to biological resources.

2. Project Design Features

- I-1:** The Project Applicant or its successor shall mitigate consistent with Mitigation Measure I-5 below for all impacted oak woodlands that are located within the current County jurisdiction, regardless of the proposed annexation of some of this habitat into the City under the originally proposed project.
- I-3:** Three sensitive reptile species (silvery legless lizard, coastal western whiptail, and San Bernardino ringneck snake) have low potential to occur on-site and, if present, are likely to exist in small numbers due to the fragmented and/or disturbed habitat conditions and the Project Site's prolonged isolation, a situation that might lead to their eventual extirpation. The Project includes the following project design feature to avoid or minimize potential impacts to sensitive reptile species:
- Prior to construction activities in the areas of oak woodland or scrub habitat in the Back Lot Area, field surveys would be conducted in oak woodland and scrub habitat in the Back Lot Area during the peak activity season and time of day for each species (ranging from February to May for silvery legless lizard, April to August for coastal western whiptail, and late spring through summer for San Bernardino ringneck snake) to determine the presence or absence of the aforementioned three special status reptiles on the Project Site, and their approximate population size and distribution if present. Surveys would be conducted by a qualified biologist according to standard methods of surveying for reptiles. A report would be submitted to the City Planning Department, County Department of Regional Planning, and CDFG documenting the survey methods and results, including number and location of individuals observed, if any, and estimated population sizes.
 - Based on the field survey results, a plan would be prepared by a qualified biologist to trap special status reptile individuals present on-site prior to and during ground-disturbing construction activities and release them to nearby suitable protected habitat. This may include preserved habitat areas onsite or public lands in the vicinity if approved through a Memorandum of Understanding with the landholding agency (i.e. the City for Griffith Park, or the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area). This plan would be submitted to and be approved by the City Planning Department and/or County Department of Regional Planning and CDFG prior to implementation and prior to vegetation removal or ground disturbance. A follow-up report documenting trapping and relocation methods and results would also be submitted to the City Planning Department and County Department of Regional Planning and CDFG following construction.
 - If special status reptiles are relocated to preserved habitat on-site, this area would be protected during Project construction using silt fencing or other fencing as approved by a qualified biologist. The protective fencing would be installed prior to any ground disturbance or vegetation removal, and would be maintained during all phases of Project construction occurring within or adjacent to suitable habitat for the species; fence maintenance would be regularly monitored by a qualified biologist. No construction-related activities would be allowed in the protected habitat, including storage of materials or equipment, or trespass by

construction crew members. This preserved on-site habitat would also be protected in perpetuity from the adjacent development by appropriate permanent fencing as recommended and approved in the relocation plan described above.

- If special status reptiles are present on-site based on the field survey results, a qualified biologist would be present during vegetation removal and grading activities conducted in the oak woodland and scrub habitat in the Back Lot Area to monitor activities and relocate any special status reptiles in accordance with the above plan in order to avoid impacts to any individuals remaining on-site following pre-construction trapping and relocation activities.

3. Mitigation Measures

I-1: In order to avoid and compensate for impacts to Southern California black walnut trees within the County portion of the Project Site, the following measures shall be implemented:

- a) Southern California black walnut trees that are avoided shall be protected during site development activities in compliance with protective measures described for avoided trees under Mitigation Measure I-4.
- b) Southern California black walnut trees impacted within the County portion of the Project Site shall be replaced at a minimum 2:1 ratio. Impact includes cutting, relocating, inflicting damage, or encroaching into the root zone or filling the drip line area. Replacement shall generally follow the Oak Tree Removal Regulations of the proposed County Specific Plan, but shall relate specifically to Southern California black walnut trees, including the following:

1. The Project Applicant or its successor shall provide and plant two replacement trees for each single Southern California black walnut tree impacted. The replacement trees shall meet the following minimum requirements:
 - i. shall consist of a range of plant sizes, at a minimum of one gallon in size, in order to approximate a natural habitat condition and the range of sizes of the individuals impacted;
 - ii. shall consist exclusively of indigenous trees and certified as being grown from a seed source collected from an indigenous habitat within valley regions of Los Angeles County;
 - iii. if planted off-site, the replacement walnut trees shall be planted at a location approved by the County Forester, in consultation with the Supervisor's Office; and

2. Additional Requirements.

- i. The Project Applicant or its successor shall monitor the replacement trees for a minimum of 5 years, to evaluate the growth, health and condition of the replacement trees
- ii. The soil for new tree plantings shall be appropriately inoculated with beneficial mycorrhizal fungi.
- iii. The Project Applicant or its successor shall design landscapes and irrigation systems which are adjacent to the replacement trees in a manner that is compatible for the survival of the replacement trees.
- iv. Trees which are determined to be healthy and structurally sound shall be considered as candidates for relocation, to the extent feasible.

I-2: Avoidance of Special Status Plants. To avoid impacts to special-status plants that may not have been detected during focused surveys in June 2006, prior to vegetation clearing for construction in the Back Lot Area, focused surveys for the special-status plants identified below shall be conducted in the Back Lot Area during the blooming period for the species. If any species identified below are detected, then prior to vegetation clearing for construction the plants shall be censused and a special-status plant relocation plan shall be developed and implemented to provide for translocation of the plants. The plan shall be prepared by a biologist and shall include the following components: (1) identify an area of appropriate habitat on-site; (2) depending on the species detected, determine if translocation will take the form of seed collection and deposition, or transplanting the plants and surrounding soil as appropriate; (3) develop protocols for irrigation and maintenance of the translocated plants where appropriate; (4) set forth performance criteria (e.g., establishment of quantitative goals, expressed in percent cover or number of individuals, comparing the restored and impacted population) and remedial measures for the translocation effort; and (5) establish a five-year monitoring procedures/protocols for the translocated plants.

The following species will be targeted for focused pre-construction surveys:

- Catalina mariposa lily (*Calochortus catalinae*)
- Club-haired mariposa lily (*Calochortus clavatus* var. *clavatus*)
- Plummer's mariposa lily (*Calochortus plummerae*)
- Many-stemmed dudleya (*Dudleya multicaulis*)
- Robinson's pepper grass (*Lepidium virginicum* var. *robinsonii*)
- Coulter's matilija poppy (*Romneya coulteri*)

I-3: To avoid impacting nesting birds, including migratory birds and raptors, one of the following shall be implemented:

- Conduct vegetation removal and building demolition associated with construction from September 1st through January 31st, when birds are not nesting. Initiate grading activities prior to the breeding season (which is generally February 1st through August 31st) and keep disturbance activities constant throughout the breeding season to prevent birds from establishing nests in surrounding habitat (in order to avoid possible nest abandonment); if there is a lapse in activities of more than five days, pre-construction surveys shall be necessary as described in the bullet below.

- OR -

- Conduct pre-construction surveys for nesting birds if vegetation removal, building demolition or grading is initiated during the nesting season. A qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct a weekly pre-construction bird survey no more than 30 days prior to initiation of grading to provide confirmation on the presence or absence of active nests in the vicinity (at least 300 to 500 feet around the individual construction site, as access allows). The last survey should be conducted no more than three days prior to the initiation of clearance/construction work. If active nests are encountered, clearing and construction in the vicinity of the nest shall be deferred until the young birds have fledged and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. A minimum exclusion buffer of 300 feet (500 feet for raptor nests) or as determined by a qualified biologist, shall be maintained during construction depending on the species and location. The perimeter of the nest-setback zone shall be fenced or adequately demarcated with staked flagging at 20-foot intervals, and construction personnel and activities restricted from the area. Construction personnel should be instructed on the sensitivity of the area. A survey report by the qualified biologist documenting and verifying compliance with the mitigation and with applicable state and federal regulations protecting birds shall be submitted to the City of Los Angeles, Department of Building and Safety, or County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, as applicable, in charge of Mitigation Monitoring, depending on within which jurisdiction the construction activity is occurring. The qualified biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when construction activities would occur near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts on these nests would occur.

I-4: In order to prevent damage to any protected trees that would be avoided within the City or County area during Project construction, the following measures shall be implemented for any such trees within 20 feet of an active construction area:

Pre-Construction

- **Fencing:** Chain link fencing, not less than 4 feet high with tree - protection signs, shall be erected around all undisturbed trees (or tree groups). The protective fence shall be installed at the protected zone boundary of each tree (or tree group), which is defined as five (5) feet beyond the tree canopy dripline. The intent of protection fencing is to prevent root damage and/or compaction by grading equipment. A Registered Consulting Arborist may be required on-site if grading

activities occur within the tree protected zone. The fencing shall be secured to 6-foot, heavy gauge t-bar line posts, pounded in the ground a minimum of 18-inches and spaced a minimum of 8-feet on-center. Fencing shall be attached to t-bar posts with minimum 14-gage wire fastened to the top, middle and bottom of each post. Tree protection signs shall be attached to every fourth post. The contractor shall maintain the fence to keep it upright, taut and aligned at all times. Fencing shall be removed only after all construction activities are complete.

- **Pre-Construction Meeting:** A pre-construction meeting shall be held between all contractors (including grading, tree removal/pruning, builders, etc.) and a Registered Consulting Arborist. The meeting shall focus on instructing the contractors on tree protection practices and to answer any questions. All equipment operators and spotters, assistants, or those directing operators from the ground shall provide written acknowledgement of their receiving tree protection training. This training shall include information on the location and marking of protected trees, the necessity of preventing damage, and the discussion of work practices that shall accomplish such.

During Construction

- **Equipment Operation and Storage:** Contractors shall avoid using heavy equipment operation around the undisturbed, protected trees. Operating heavy machinery around the root zones of trees would increase soil compaction, which decreases soil aeration and subsequently reduces water penetration into the soil. All heavy equipment and vehicles shall, at minimum, stay out of the fenced protected tree zone, unless where specifically approved in writing and under the supervision of a Registered Consulting Arborist.
- **Materials Storage and Disposal:** Contractors shall not store or discard any supply or material, including paint, lumber, concrete overflow, etc. within the protected zone, and shall remove all foreign debris within the protected zone. However, the contractors shall leave the duff, mulch, chips, and leaves around the retained trees for water retention and nutrient supply. In addition, contractors shall avoid draining or leakage of equipment fluids near retained trees. Fluids such as gasoline, diesel, oils, hydraulics, brake and transmission fluids, paint, paint thinners, and glycol (anti-freeze) shall be disposed of properly. The contractors shall ensure that equipment be parked at least 50 feet from the protected zone to avoid the possibility of leakage of equipment fluids into the soil. The effect of toxic equipment fluids on the retained trees could result in tree decline and/or mortality.
- **Grade Changes:** Contractors shall ensure that grade changes, including adding fill, shall not be permitted within the protected zone without special written authorization and under supervision by a Registered Consulting Arborist. Lowering the grade within the protected zone would necessitate cutting main support and feeder roots, thus jeopardizing the health and structural integrity of the tree(s). Adding soil, even temporarily, on top of

the existing grade would compact the soil further, and decrease both water and air availability to the tree roots. Contractors shall ensure that grade changes made outside of the protected tree zone shall not create conditions that allow water to pond at the base of the tree. Water trapped at the base of a tree could lead to root rot and other detrimental tree impacts.

- **Moving Construction Materials:** Contractors shall ensure that care be exercised when moving construction equipment or supplies near the protected trees, especially overhead. Contractors shall ensure that damage to the tree(s) be avoided when transporting or moving construction materials and working around the tree (even outside of the fenced protected zone). Contractors shall flag above ground tree parts that could be damaged (e.g., low limbs, scaffold branches, trunks) with high visibility flagging, such as florescent red or orange. If contact with the tree crown is unavoidable, conflicting branch(es) may be pruned by an ISA Certified Tree Worker under the supervision of a Registered Consulting Arborist and shall adhere to ISA standards.
- **Trenching:** Except where specifically approved in writing beforehand, all trenching shall be outside of the fenced protected zone. Roots primarily extend in a horizontal direction forming a support base to the tree similar to the base of a wineglass. Where trenching is necessary in areas that contain roots from retained trees, contractors shall use trenching techniques that include the use of either a root pruner (Dosko root pruner or equivalent) or an Air-Spade to limit root impacts. A Registered Consulting Arborist shall ensure that all pruning cuts shall be clean and sharp, to minimize ripping, tearing, and fracturing of the root system. Root damage caused by backhoes, earthmovers, dozers, or graders is severe and may ultimately result in tree mortality. Use of both root pruning and Air-Spade equipment shall be accompanied only by hand tools to remove soil from trench locations. The trench shall be made no deeper than necessary.
- **Irrigation:** Irrigation of native oaks retained on-site shall seek to mimic natural rainfall patterns in Southern California. Supplemental irrigation for trees adjacent to construction activity may be necessary during winter or spring months. Summer and fall irrigation may be necessary based on variable climatic and site conditions, but should be conducted judiciously to avoid over-watering. One irrigation cycle should thoroughly soak the root zones of the trees to a depth of 3 feet. The soil should be allowed to dry out between watering to avoid keeping a consistently wet soil. The contractors shall be responsible for irrigating (deep watering) the trees. Soil moisture shall be checked with a soil probe before irrigating. Irrigation is best accomplished by installing a temporary above ground micro-spray system that would distribute water slowly (to avoid runoff) and evenly throughout the fenced protection zone. Over watering of native oak trees may promote the growth of tree-damaging agents, such as Oak Root Fungus, so proper soil moisture monitoring is critical to prolonged tree health. For any trees that have been substantially root pruned (30% or more of their root zone), irrigation shall be required for

the first twelve months. The first irrigation shall occur within 48 hours of root pruning. The tree(s) should be deep watered every two weeks during the summer and once a month during the winter (adjusted accordingly with rainfall).

- **Canopy Pruning:** The contractor shall not prune trees until all construction is completed, unless standard pruning would reduce conflict between canopy and equipment. This would help protect the tree canopies from damage. All pruning shall be conducted by an ISA Certified Tree Worker under the supervision of a Registered Consulting Arborist and shall adhere to ISA pruning standards.
- **Canopy Washing:** During construction, the contractors shall wash the foliage of trees adjacent to construction activity with a strong water stream every two weeks in early hours before 10:00 a.m. to control mite and insect populations.
- **Inspection:** A Registered Consulting Arborist shall inspect the preserved trees adjacent to grading and construction activity on a monthly basis for the duration of the Project construction. A report summarizing site conditions, observations, tree health, and recommendations for minimizing tree damage shall be submitted by the Registered Consulting Arborist or Registered Professional Forester following each inspection.

Post-construction

- **Mulch:** The contractors shall ensure that the natural duff layer under all trees shall be maintained. This would stabilize soil temperatures in root zones, conserve soil moisture, and reduce erosion. The contractors shall ensure that the mulch be kept clear of the trunk base to avoid creating conditions favorable to the establishment and growth of decay causing fungal pathogens. Should it be necessary to add organic mulch beneath retained oak trees, packaged or commercial oak leaf mulch shall not be used as it may contain Oak Root Fungus. Also, the use of Redwood chips shall be avoided as certain inhibitive chemicals may be present in the wood. Other wood chips and crushed walnut shells can be used, but the best mulch that provides a source of nutrients for the tree is its own leaf litter. Any added organic mulch added by the contractors shall be applied to a maximum depth of 4- inches where possible.
- **Pruning:** Regular pruning of the trees is not required. An ISA Certified Tree Worker under the supervision of a Registered Consulting Arborist shall only prune trees to maintain clearance and remove broken, dead or diseased branches. No more than 15% of the canopy shall be removed at any one time. All pruning shall conform to ISA standards.
- **Watering:** The trees should not require irrigation other than the twelve months following substantial root pruning, if applicable. However, soil probing shall be necessary to accurately monitor moisture levels. Especially in years with low winter rainfall supplemental irrigation for the

trees that sustained root pruning and any newly planted trees may be necessary.

- **Watering Adjacent Plant Material:** All plants near the trees shall require moderate to low levels of water. The contractor shall water surrounding plants infrequently with deep soaks and allow them to dry out in-between, rather than frequent light irrigation. The soil shall not be allowed to become saturated or stay continually wet, nor should drainage allow ponding of water beneath the canopy of the oak trees. Irrigation spray shall not hit the trunk of any tree. The contractors shall maintain a 30-inch dry-zone around all tree trunks. An above ground micro-spray irrigation system shall be used in lieu of typical underground pop-up sprays.
- **Chemical Applications:** If the trees are maintained in a healthy state, regular spraying for insect or disease control would not be necessary. If a problem does develop, a Registered Consulting Arborist shall be consulted as the trees may require the application of insecticides to prevent the intrusion of bark-boring beetles and other invading pests. All chemical spraying shall be performed by a licensed applicator under the direction of a licensed pest control advisor.
- **Monitoring:** A Registered Consulting Arborist shall inspect the trees preserved on-site for a period of seven (7) years following the completion of construction activity. Monitoring visits shall be completed quarterly, totaling twenty-eight (28) visits. Following each monitoring visit, a report summarizing site conditions, observations, tree health, and recommendations for promoting tree health shall be submitted. Additionally, any tree mortality shall be noted and any tree dying during the seven year monitoring period shall be replaced according to regulations of the City's Department of Public Works or provisions of the County Specific Plan, as applicable.

I-5: Mitigation for impacts to oak woodland habitat shall be accomplished through one or a combination of the options presented below.

1. **Oak Woodland Conservation Easements** – Protect existing oak woodlands on or off the Project Site in perpetuity at a 2:1 acreage ratio through a conservation easement approved by the County and the Department of Fish and Game. Priority should be given to oak habitat that is (1) of equal or greater ecological value as the habitat to be removed, and (2) is contiguous with or adjacent to larger areas of existing woodlands under conservation easements, public lands, or open space lands. Approval should be contingent on demonstrating that such lands meet these criteria to the maximum extent feasible and available. Mitigation for individual developments shall be clustered into the fewest areas possible, to avoid habitat fragmentation.
2. **Plant Replacement Trees** - Plant and maintain replacement trees on or off the Project Site at a 2:1 tree ratio, with the intention of recreating the acreage of oak woodlands impacted. The goal is to restore declining

woodlands or re-establish them where they once grew. The selection of off-site planting should follow the same criteria as noted in option 1 above (equivalent habitat replacement, contiguous with other protected woodland habitat, consolidation of mitigation to avoid fragmentation). Restoration should result in species composition and density similar to the Project Site and appropriate to the restoration site. This type of mitigation shall not fulfill more than one-half of the mitigation requirements for the Project. The replacement of oak woodland habitat, if pursued as a mitigation option, should be coordinated with the replacement of oak trees during implementation of the proposed County Specific Plan Oak Tree Removal regulations. An option is to propose planting a range of sizes including seedlings, 1 gallon, 5 gallon, 15 gallon, 24-inch box, 36-inch box, 48-inch box, and 60-inch box trees (depending on the planting area and the ability to irrigate). The goal is to stress sustainability and replicate natural oak woodlands by creating a diversity of size and age classes. The mitigation oaks shall be maintained for a period of no less than seven (7) years from the date of planting, and replaced if mortality should occur during that seven year period.

3. Oak Woodlands Conservation Funding – This final mitigation alternative involves contributing funds to the California Wildlife Conservation Board's Oak Woodlands Conservation Fund or, a segregated trust fund maintained or selected by the County. The contribution amount would equal an in lieu fee of \$2,700 for each removed Oak Tree. This fee shall be adjusted by the County Forester consistent with the Consumer Price Index for the Los Angeles-Long Beach metropolitan statistical area on the annual anniversary of the adoption of the proposed County Specific Plan. The contribution should specify that funds should be prioritized for use in acquiring or restoring oak woodland habitat within Los Angeles County.

The in lieu fee (\$2,700) is the calculated average value of all trees that may be impacted by the Project and the No Annexation scenario. The value of each impacted tree was calculated using the Trunk Formula Method presented in the "Guide for Plant Appraisal," published by the International Society of Arboriculture (Council of Tree and Landscape Appraisers, 2000).

Compliance with the proposed County Specific Plan oak tree regulations would also satisfy the Oak Woodland mitigation requirements, except that on-site or off-site tree replacement may only satisfy up to half of the mitigation to oak woodland habitat.

- I-6: Prior to removal of trees within oak woodland habitat of eight inch diameter at breast height or greater, as well as native or non-native palm trees greater than ten feet in height, which may provide roosting habitat for special-status bat species, conduct pre-construction surveys for bats in the immediate vicinity of the affected trees using sonic bat detectors (e.g. Anabat). The surveys shall be conducted at dusk and after nightfall by a biologist. If special-status bats are detected, and based upon the experience of the biologist conducting the surveys, the detected bats are likely roosting in the trees to be removed, then exclusion devices (e.g., netting, canvas, or similar materials) shall be employed once bats

have emerged from identified roosts to block access to tree cavities or other roost entry points. If tree removal is to occur during the maternity season (March 1 to September 30), and if during this period the biologist detects maternity roosts, then removal of the trees shall be delayed for the remainder of the maternity season until the young are sufficiently mature to leave the maternity roost as determined by the biologist.

Mitigation Measure I-7 adopted by the City is not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction.

4. Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects on Biota, as identified in the EIR, to less than significant levels.

In addition, where changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency (the City) and not the agency making the finding (the County), such changes have been adopted by such other agency.

5. Rationale for Findings

No adverse impacts associated with Biota would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of Mitigation Measures I-1 to I-7.

6. Reference

For a complete discussion of environmental impacts to Biota, please see (1) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection 3.i., Biota, in Section II, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR; (2) Section IV.I of the Draft EIR; (3) the Biota studies conducted by Glenn Lukos Associates and Dudek, in Appendices K to the Draft EIR; and (4) Appendices FEIR-25 and FEIR-26 to the Final EIR.

F. Cultural Resources (Historic)

1. Description of Effects

a. Environmental Impacts

Film production at the Project Site dates back to the early 1900's and continues through today. Studio production facilities include sound stages and outdoor sets as well as production support facilities that occur in a number of different types and sizes of buildings. Given the nature of entertainment production, it is common for these facilities to be moved around in response to the production needs at any given point in time. While individual buildings do not appear to exhibit historic attributes unto themselves, some of the buildings along with the outdoor sets collectively have historic value. This collection of resources form the potential Universal Studios Historic District which is historically significant for its association with the development of the motion picture industry in the United States. The potential Universal Studios Historic District does not appear eligible for the National Register due to a lack of physical integrity, but does appear to meet criteria for listing on the California Register. The potential Universal Studios Historic District is located in the northern portion of the Project Site and

contains sixty buildings in total. Of these, forty are considered contributors to the potential district. Of the forty contributing buildings, under the Project's conceptual plan, three are proposed to be demolished and/or altered. The demolition of three of the contributing buildings the Jack Webb building, the William Goetz building, and contributing stage building, represents a substantial loss of representative building types and would thus reduce the integrity of the potential district. As such, the Project would have a significant impact with respect to the potential district without mitigation. However, the implementation of project design features and mitigation measures, which include provisions to ensure that the historic integrity of the potential Universal Studios Historic District is maintained via the Universal Studios Historic District Historic Preservation Plan, would reduce the impacts associated with the Project, to a less than significant level.

The Universal Studios Back Lot Site is a contributing site to the potential Universal Studios Historic District. While two sets dating from the period of significance are to be demolished, the Universal Studios Back Lot Site would continue to retain its historic use and primary character-defining features. Therefore, the Universal Studios Back Lot Site would continue to be considered a historic site contributing to the potential Universal Studios Historic District. With regard to the conversion, rehabilitation or alteration of the remaining contributing resources, should such activities be undertaken in the future, a significant impact could occur; however, implementation of the Universal Studios Historic District Preservation Plan pursuant to the County Specific Plan would reduce impacts to these resources to a less than significant level.

b. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The proposed annexation/detachment of land areas between the City of Los Angeles and County of Los Angeles would not alter the potential for encountering historical resources on the Project Site. Further, the area within the potential historic district is located within the County regardless of the proposed annexation/detachment actions. As such, potential impacts would remain the same as those identified above (i.e., less than significant with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures), if the proposed annexation/detachment actions are not implemented.

c. Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts to historic resources takes into consideration whether the impacts of the Project and the related projects, when taken as a whole, substantially diminish the number of historic resources within the same or similar context or property type. Two historic resources have been identified in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site. The first, Campo de Cahuenga, is located directly west of the Project Site at the Universal City Metro Red Line Station, near the northwest corner of Lankershim Boulevard and Campo de Cahuenga Way. The second resource, the Barham Boulevard Crossing, is located south of the Project Site where Barham Boulevard crosses the Hollywood Freeway.

Campo de Cahuenga is significant in the context of the Mexican-American War in 1847, and the construction of the existing park and building in 1949-50. The Barham Boulevard Crossing is significant in the context of the early planning of the Los Angeles freeway system and as a representative example of reinforced concrete construction of the 1940s. Neither of these contexts is associated with the history of the film industry or the significance of the potential Universal Studios Historic District, so the Project would have no impact on the historic significance of Campo de Cahuenga or the Barham Boulevard Crossing. All new development

under the Project would be contained within the Project Site and would not materially affect either resource. Therefore, the impacts to historic resources on the Project Site would not affect the historic resources in the immediate vicinity within the same or similar context or property type. As a result, the cumulative impacts are less than significant.

2. Project Design Features

J.1-1: As part of the Project, the alteration of contributing buildings, structures and sites within the potential Universal Studios Historic District shall comply with the Universal Studios Historic District Preservation Plan (see Attachment G to the MMRP). The Plan provides appropriate guidance for the alteration of contributing buildings, structures, and sites within the potential Universal Studios Historic District and establishes criteria for new construction to ensure that the historic integrity of the district is maintained. The Plan should serve as the framework for future repair, maintenance, and rehabilitation, and guide architects and designers in designing compatible new construction in the areas identified as potential sites for new buildings within the district. The Plan also includes guidelines for the documentation of historic resources.

3. Mitigation Measures

J.1-1: Retain and/or relocate the 1946 Film Vault (#6237) to avoid its demolition.

J.1-2: Retain and/or relocate the Jack Webb (#2250) and William Goetz (#2252) buildings to avoid their demolition.

J.1-3: Maintain the Universal Studios Back Lot Area identified on Attachment G to the MMRP as an area of open space primarily used for outdoor filming using large-scale, semi-permanent sets. Retain important character-defining features including: (1) the location in the northeastern portion of the Studio Area, adjacent to the motion picture production facilities; (2) the circulation pattern of streets, roads and trails; and (3) the large scale sets recreating different streetscapes and locations and arranged along key segments of the circulation system.

4. Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects on Cultural Resources (Historic), as identified in the EIR, to less than significant levels.

5. Rationale for Findings

No adverse impacts associated with Cultural Resources (Historic) would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of Mitigation Measures J.1.1 to J.1-3.

6. Reference

For a complete discussion of environmental impacts of Cultural Resources (Historic), please see (1) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection 3.j(1), Historic Resources, in Section II, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR; (2) Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR; (3) Appendix L-1 to the Draft EIR; and (4) Appendix FEIR-27 to the Final EIR.

G. Cultural Resources (Archaeological)

1. Description of Effects

a. Construction Impacts

There is an extensive history of human habitation in the San Fernando Valley and the important Gabrielino/Tongva village of Kawenga is believed to have been in the vicinity of the Project Site. Furthermore, the Project Site is located in an area that would have provided the basic necessities for a prehistoric population. Therefore, development of the Project, including associated grading, excavations, and the development of proposed structures and other improvements could disturb existing, but as of yet undiscovered, archaeological resources. Present and past surveys of the Project Site have not identified prehistoric archaeological sites or isolated cultural resources except for a single isolated flake not considered significant. Large portions of the Project Site have been disturbed by the post-1914 development of the property. However, some areas with sensitivity for prehistoric buried sites are located along the northern margin of the Project Site in portions of the historical-period floodplain area of the Los Angeles River Flood Control Channel near the northern edge of the Project Site. In addition, a single historical period site was identified. The remains of three early-twentieth-century residences were found in the southeast corner of the Project Site near the intersection of Barham Boulevard and Buddy Holly Drive (hereafter referred to as SR-1). Additionally, the closed on-site landfill that contains trash from the early days of on-site activity may contain refuse dating from the 1920s and may have a high sensitivity for historical-period sites. Thus, there is the possibility of the existence of archaeological material on the Project Site. If development activities disturb, damage, or degrade a unique archaeological resource or an archaeological historic resource, or setting of the resource, the Project could have a significant impact on such resources. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, however potential impacts on on-site resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Additionally, pursuant to Government Code Section 65352.3, California Native American Tribes identified by the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) were contacted regarding the potential effect of the Project to Native American resources. Two responses were received, both of which requested that a Native American Monitor be present during all periods of on-site archaeological monitoring. This request has been incorporated as a mitigation measure. To further satisfy notification requirements, NAHC representatives were also sent letters on June 5, 2012, by County and City staff, and an official notice for the City's August 14, 2012, public hearing was emailed to Mr. John Tommy Rosas.

b. Operational Impacts

Operational aspects of the Project would not cause ground disturbances with the potential to encroach or disturb unknown archaeological resources; therefore, no operational impacts to archaeological resources would occur.

c. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The proposed annexation/detachment of land areas between the City of Los Angeles and County of Los Angeles would not alter the potential for encountering archaeological resources on the Project Site as the potential significance level of any artifact would be independent of jurisdictional boundaries. Therefore, the responsible agencies and those groups or agencies involved in consultation and establishing a mitigation protocol would not change. As

such, potential impacts would remain the same (i.e., less than significant with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures), if the proposed annexation/detachment was not implemented.

d. Cumulative Impacts

The Project in combination with cumulative development could contribute to the progressive loss of and access to archaeological resources. The extent of the cultural resources (if any) that occur at the related project sites is generally unknown, especially given that the proposed Metro Universal project (Related Project No. 65.) has been withdrawn from consideration. The analysis of impacts to cultural resources concluded that through the implementation of the mitigation measures, recommended below, the Project related impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not contribute to any potential cumulative impacts, and cumulative impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant.

2. Project Design Features

No Design Features are identified in the Environmental Impact Report for this environmental issue.

3. Mitigation Measures

J.2-1: During construction, an archaeologist and Native American monitor shall be retained by the Project Applicant or its successor to monitor any earth-moving activities, including grading, in areas designated as high, moderate or low sensitivity for the presence of buried prehistoric archaeological sites (see Attachment H to the MMRP).

J.2-3: If potentially significant archaeological resources are encountered during Project development, site preparation/ construction activities in the area of potential impact shall be halted until the archaeological consultant and/or Native American monitor, as appropriate, have evaluated the resources and, if necessary, developed a plan to mitigate associated impacts. The construction manager at the Project Site shall be notified, and shall notify the responsible lead agency of the discovery. The archaeologist and/or the Native American monitor, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the City or County, as applicable, shall determine the area of potential impact and the timing when construction activities can resume.

- a) Discovered cultural resources shall be stored in a protected environment to prevent vandalism, damage, or theft until such time as they are examined by an archaeologist and/or Native American monitor, as appropriate.
- b) The identification and handling of archaeological resources at the site shall be conducted by a qualified archaeologist and overseen by local Native American monitor.
- c) All the Project-related notes, records, photographs, and artifacts, both prehistoric and historical period, shall be curated at a repository in

accordance with 36 Code of Federal Regulations 79. Any items of cultural patrimony, however, shall be returned to an appropriate Native American community, which shall be responsible for the disposition of these materials.

J.2-4: If human remains are encountered during construction, work in the affected area and the immediate vicinity shall be halted immediately. The construction manager at the Project Site shall be notified, and shall notify the archaeologist and Native American monitor, if they are not on-site at the time, as well as the responsible lead agency of the discovery, who in turn shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission and the County Coroner pursuant to procedures and requirements set forth in California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. Disposition of the human remains and any associated grave goods shall also be in accordance with this regulation and Public Resources Code 5097.91 and 5097.98, as amended. The archaeologist and the Native American monitor, with the concurrence of the City or County, as applicable, shall determine the area of potential impact and the timing when construction activities can resume.

J.2-5: All construction-phase employees shall undergo a cultural resources orientation and awareness training prior to commencing work activities on the Project Site. Such training shall include familiarization with the stop-work restrictions, noticing, and handling procedures, and ultimate disposition of cultural resources as described below. The construction manager shall provide the responsible lead agency with a verification list of the employees completing the orientation.

J.2-7: An archaeologist shall be retained by the Project Applicant or its successor to monitor any earthmoving activities, including grading, in areas designated as high sensitivity for the presence of buried historical period archaeological sites (see Attachment I to this MMRP).

Mitigation Measures J.2-2 and J.2-6 adopted by the City are not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction.

4. Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects on Cultural Resources (Archaeological), as identified in the EIR, to less than significant levels.

In addition, where changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency (the City) and not the agency making the finding (the County), such changes have been adopted by such other agency.

5. Rationale for Findings

No adverse impacts associated with Cultural Resources (Archaeological) would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of Mitigation Measures J.2-1-J.2-7.

6. Reference

For a complete discussion of environmental impacts of Cultural Resources (Archaeological), please see (1) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection 3.j(2), Archaeological Resources, in Section II, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR; (2) Section IV.J.2 of the Draft EIR; and (3) Appendix L-2 to the Draft EIR.

H. Cultural Resources (Paleontological)

1. Description of Effects

a. Construction Impacts

Development could affect as-yet unrecorded fossil sites and remains during the construction period for the Project through surface disruption or excavation. Direct impacts would result mostly from earth-moving activities, particularly grading for roadways and building pads, and excavation for basement structures and pipelines in previously undisturbed strata. Direct impacts also would result from any earth-moving activity that buried previously undisturbed strata, making the strata and their paleontological resources unavailable for future scientific investigation. Although earthmoving activities would be comparatively short term, the possible accompanying loss of some fossil remains, unrecorded fossil sites, associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data, and the fossil-bearing strata would be considered a significant environmental impact. Such resources, to the extent present at the Project Site, would be found within the portions of the Project Site that are underlain by the Upper Topanga Formation and, the Holocene younger alluvium, at depths greater than 12 feet below current grade. However, recommended mitigation measures identified would reduce any such potential impact on the paleontological resources of the Project Site to a less than significant level.

b. Operational Impacts

Operational aspects of the Project would not require any earth-moving activity that would disturb previously undisturbed strata and, therefore, would not result in the permanent loss of, or loss of access to, a paleontological resource of regional or statewide significance. Therefore, no operational impact on paleontological resources would occur.

c. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The proposed annexation/detachment of areas between the County of Los Angeles and City of Los Angeles would not alter the potential for fossil remains being encountered at the Project Site because this potential is independent of jurisdictional boundaries. As such, potential impacts would remain the same and implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level under the No Annexation scenario as well.

d. Cumulative Impacts

Development of the Project Site, in combination with the other projects in the region that are underlain by the Upper Topanga Formation could lead to the progressive loss of fossil-bearing strata in this rock unit. The cumulative impact of the Project together with all other regional developments would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of statutory requirements, and by implementing site-specific mitigation measures required by responsible agencies entrusted with protecting paleontological resources. Such measures have

been identified in this Draft EIR, and similar mitigation measures have been implemented for past projects in the surrounding area. With implementation of the listed mitigation measures, important fossil remains would be recovered for future study. Thus, there would be no cumulative impact on the paleontological resources of the younger alluvium because fossil-bearing strata occur only in the subsurface and would not be available for prospecting without development. Therefore, cumulative impacts on paleontological resources would be less than significant.

2. Project Design Features

No Design Features are identified in the Environmental Impact Report for this environmental issue.

3. Mitigation Measures

J.3-1: The services of a qualified paleontologist approved by the City or County of Los Angeles, as applicable, and the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum Vertebrate Paleontology Department shall be retained prior to earth-moving activities associated with construction in a particular development area or with a particular development phase. Prior to these earth-moving activities, the paleontologist shall develop a site-specific mitigation plan to be implemented in support of the activities in the particular development area or during a particular development phase. The plan shall specify the level and types of mitigation efforts as set forth below, based on the types and depths of any earth-moving activity and the rock unit in which the activity would be conducted.

J.3-2: Earth-moving activities shall be monitored by the paleontologist or a monitor only in those areas of the Project Site where these activities would disturb previously undisturbed strata. Monitoring shall be conducted on a full-time basis in areas underlain by the Upper Topanga Formation and at depths greater than 10 feet below current grade in areas underlain by younger alluvium. If no fossil remains are found once 50 percent of earth-moving activities have been completed in an area underlain by one or the other rock unit, monitoring can be reduced or suspended in the remainder of that area following approval from the City or County of Los Angeles, as applicable. Monitoring shall consist of visually inspecting debris piles and freshly exposed strata for larger fossil remains, and periodically dry test screening sediment, rock, and debris for smaller fossil remains. As soon as practicable, the monitor shall recover all vertebrate fossil specimens, a representative sample of invertebrate or plant fossils, or any fossiliferous rock sample that can be recovered easily. If recovery of a large or unusually productive fossil occurrence is warranted, earth-moving activities shall be diverted temporarily around the fossil site and a recovery crew shall be mobilized as necessary to remove the occurrence as quickly as possible. If the paleontologist or monitor is not on site when a fossil occurrence is uncovered by these activities, the activities shall be diverted temporarily around the fossil site and the monitor called to the site to evaluate and, if warranted, remove the occurrence. If the fossil site is determined by the paleontologist or monitor to be too unproductive or the fossil remains not worthy of recovery, no further action shall be taken to preserve the fossil site or remains, and earth-moving activities shall be allowed to proceed through the site immediately. The location and

proper geologic context of any fossil occurrence shall be documented, as appropriate.

As part of the monitoring effort, rock or sediment samples of the Upper Topanga Formation and younger alluvium shall be collected from each construction site and processed to allow for the recovery of smaller fossil remains. The total weight of all processed samples from either rock unit at each construction site shall not exceed 6,000 pounds (12,000 pounds total). The results of processing 250-pound test samples shall be used by the paleontologist or monitor in determining how much of the remainder of the total collected shall be processed. More of the samples or more of each sample shall be processed if the recovered remains are sufficiently common (at least 4-5 identifiable specimens per test sample), generally identifiable to genus or species level, and represent a taxonomically diverse faunal assemblage. With the development of each successive construction site, the paleontologist or monitor may specify that less than 6,000 pounds shall be processed, based on the amount of excavation and other earth-moving activities that would occur in areas underlain by either rock unit, and on the results of processing samples from the same rock unit at previous construction sites.

Unless potentially fossilized remains are discovered at or near the surface, no paleontological monitoring of earth-moving activities in the younger alluvium shall be conducted at depths less than 10 feet below current grade, and no sample shall be collected or processed.

J.3-3: Before the mitigation program begins, the paleontologist or monitor shall coordinate with the appropriate construction contractor personnel to provide information regarding City or County of Los Angeles requirements, as applicable, for the protection of paleontological resources. Contractor personnel shall be briefed on procedures to be followed in the event that fossil remains and a previously unrecorded fossil site are encountered by earth-moving activities, particularly when the monitor is not on site. The briefing shall be presented to new contractor personnel as necessary. Names and telephone numbers of the monitor and other appropriate mitigation program personnel shall be provided to appropriate contractor personnel. The Project's construction superintendent shall be instructed by the paleontologist or monitor regarding the identification of conditions whereby potential paleontological resources could occur. The construction superintendent shall be sufficiently informed that he/she will be able to recognize when fossil remains have been uncovered and require that grading be temporarily diverted around the fossil site until the monitor has evaluated and, if warranted, recovered the remains. Similarly, and if necessary, the monitor shall be empowered to temporarily divert grading around an exposed fossil specimen to facilitate evaluation and, if warranted, recovery.

J.3-4: The paleontologist shall reach a formal agreement with a recognized museum repository, such as the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum, before the mitigation program begins, regarding final disposition and permanent storage and maintenance of any fossil remains that might be recovered as a result of the mitigation program, the archiving of associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data, and the level of treatment (preparation, identification, curation, and cataloging) of the remains that would

be required before the entire mitigation program fossil collection would be accepted by the repository for storage. The fossil collection shall be donated to a public, nonprofit institution, such as the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum, with a research interest in the collection. The costs to be charged by the repository for curating and permanently storing the collection should be specified in the agreement.

- J.3-5:** All fossil specimens recovered at the Project Site as a result of the mitigation program, including those recovered as the result of processing fossiliferous rock samples, shall be prepared, identified, curated, and catalogued in accordance with designated museum repository requirements. Rock samples from the Upper Topanga Formation and the younger alluvium shall be submitted to commercial laboratories for microfossil, pollen, or radiometric dating analysis.
- J.3-6:** The paleontologist or monitor shall maintain daily monitoring logs that record the particular tasks accomplished, locations where earth-moving activities and monitoring were conducted, rock unit(s) encountered, any fossil specimen recovered, and associated specimen data and geologic and geographic site data.
- J.3-7:** A final technical report of results and findings shall be prepared by the paleontologist in accordance with any City or County of Los Angeles requirements, as applicable. Copies of the final report and any supporting documentation, including the paleontologist's or monitor's field notes and fossil site maps shall be archived at the designated museum repository. The final report shall be prepared upon completion of grading activities for the first Project requiring monitoring by a paleontologist. Subsequent Project reports shall be issued as addenda to the first final report. Projects whose grading activities are completed within a one-year time period may be addressed collectively in one report or addenda.

4. Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects on Cultural Resources (Paleontological), as identified in the EIR, to less than significant levels.

5. Rationale for Findings

No adverse impacts associated with Cultural Resources (Paleontological) would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of Mitigation Measure J.3-1 to J.3-7.

6. Reference

For a complete discussion of environmental impacts of Cultural Resources (Paleontological), please see (1) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection 3.j(3), Paleontological Resources, in Section II, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR; (2) Section IV.J of the Draft EIR; and (3) Appendix L-2 to the Draft EIR.

I. Public Services (Fire Protection)

1. Description of Effects

a. Construction Impacts

Construction activities associated with development of the Project would increase the potential for accidental on-site fires from such sources as mechanical equipment and flammable construction materials. Construction contractors and work crews would implement the following measures to minimize these hazards during construction of the Project: maintenance of mechanical equipment in good operating condition; careful storage of flammable materials in appropriate containers; and the immediate and complete cleanup of spills of flammable materials when they occur.

Construction activities also have the potential to affect fire protection services, such as emergency vehicle response times, by adding construction traffic to the street network and potentially requiring partial lane closures during street improvements and utility installations. These impacts would be considered to be less than significant as construction impacts are temporary in nature and do not cause lasting effects; partial lane closures, if determined to be necessary, would not greatly affect emergency vehicles, as using sirens to clear a path of travel or driving in the lanes of opposing traffic would be available options; and, flaggers would be used to facilitate traffic flow until construction is complete. Additionally, existing Los Angeles County Fire Department (County Fire Department) Fire Station 51, which includes an engine company and a paramedic squad, is located on-site, and would be available throughout the duration of Project construction as well as following the completion of construction.

In addition to emergency fire service, the County Fire Department has determined that an additional fire inspector position is required for each Department to review future development within County portion of the Project Site, respectively. In order to reduce potential impacts, Mitigation Measure K.1-4 address the need for added County personnel to assist with fire inspection duties. Therefore, construction-related impacts related to fire protection services would be less than significant with mitigation.

b. Operational Impacts

The County Fire Department has indicated that the need for fire service and additional equipment is based upon the nature of the use proposed rather than strictly the amount of development proposed. At build-out, the County Fire Department would require expanded County fire fighting facilities, which may be a new fire station or remodeling of the existing Fire Station 51 to accommodate additional equipment and staffing. To address changes in on-site conditions occurring during the course of the Project's implementation, the County Fire Department would require that the Applicant and the County Fire Department meet annually to review the new construction that is anticipated for the upcoming year and assess Facility Improvement needs. With implementation of Mitigation Measure K.1-5 (requiring facility improvements) and Mitigation Measure K.1-6 (establishing an annual process to discuss upcoming development(s)), potential impacts related to fire service would be reduced to a less than significant level.

With respect to response times to the City portions of the Project Site, signal pre-emption controls, would reduce potential impacts to emergency access during heavily congested travel periods in and around the Project Site. Furthermore, under the automatic aid agreements currently in place, County Fire Department and Burbank Fire Department can respond with additional units to the Project Site, as needed. Further, to ensure adequate fire

service for City portions of the Project Site, pursuant to Mitigation Measure K.1-2, the Applicant would (1) provide funding for the acquisition of a Fire Department rescue ambulance to be housed at Fire Station 86 and (2) offer to dedicate to the City of Los Angeles approximately 1-acre of land in the southeastern portion of the Project Site for use by the City for construction of a new fire station. As such, potential impacts related to City of Los Angeles Fire Department response distance and emergency access under the Project would be less than significant.

Any additional water lines and hydrants that may be required to serve the new buildings and/or to provide the required fire flows would be constructed as necessary. Any water main and other infrastructure upgrades potentially required for the fire flow system would not be expected to create a significant impact to the physical environment and would be installed in accordance with all statutory and City requirements which would preclude significant impacts. In addition, hydrants and water lines would also be installed per Fire Code requirements for the Project. As such, with respect to fire flows, fire protection services would be adequate with respect to City of Los Angeles Fire Department and the associated impact would be less than significant.

c. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The development program under the No Annexation scenario would differ only slightly from the Project in that the City Fire Department would service relatively larger portions of the Entertainment and Business Areas. Under the No Annexation scenario, the overall quantity of new construction (i.e., total square footage) would be the same. Such impacts, as is the case with the Project, would be less than significant, since the Project in either case would comply with existing City Fire Department and County Fire Department requirements, emergency response times would not be significantly impacted by construction, and emergency vehicle access to adjoining and nearby properties would be maintained at all times. Implementation of the identified mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

d. Cumulative Impacts

With regards to the County Fire Department, cumulative impacts are not expected to occur since the service area for Fire Station No. 51, located in the central portion of the Project Site, is not contiguous with other County Fire Department service areas, and the on-site demand for fire protection services would be fully accounted for by the Project's project design features and mitigation measures. As such, the cumulative impacts with regard to County Fire Department fire protection services would be less than significant.

In the City portion of the Project, impacts would be fully mitigated by the Project's proposed project design features and mitigation measures. In addition, developers of individual future projects, as well as the Project, would provide for all statutory and Fire Department-required improvements to facilitate the provision of fire services. Through this process, the ability of the City Fire Department to provide adequate facilities to accommodate future growth and maintain acceptable levels of service would be assured. On this basis, it is anticipated that cumulative impacts to City Fire Department fire protection services would be less than significant.

2. Project Design Features

K.1-6: In conjunction with the building permit process in the County, the Project Applicant or its successor shall consult with the County Fire Department and

incorporate fire prevention and suppression features appropriate to the design of the Project.

- K.1-7:** Project development in the County shall comply with all applicable County code and ordinance requirements for construction, access, water mains, fire flows and fire hydrants.
- K.1-8:** The Project shall continue to provide fire flows up to 8,000 gallons per minute at 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure for up to a four-hour duration in the County. Final fire flows will be based on the square footage of the buildings, the types of construction used, and the type of fire sprinkler system within the structure.
- K.1-9:** Future buildings in the County shall be designed with sprinklers in accordance with the County of Los Angeles Building and Fire Codes. An automatic fire sprinkler system shall be provided for all buildings with four stories or greater above Los Angeles County Fire Department vehicular access (e.g. street level)
- K.1-10:** All new permanent outdoor facades that fall within the scope of the current edition of Los Angeles County, Fire Department Regulation #29 shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with that Regulation.
- K.1-11:** Prior to the removal of Park Lake (see Attachment A to the MMRP), a drafting reservoir and drafting appliances shall be provided and maintained with the ability to draft 1.5 million gallons of water designed to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County, Fire Department.

Project Design Features K.1-1, K.1-2, K.1-3, K.1-4, and K.1-5 adopted by the City are not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction.

3. Mitigation Measures

- K.1-4:** Upon the issuance of the first building permit for new construction in the County portion of the Project Site, the Project Applicant or its successor shall enter into an agreement with the County to reimburse the County for the cost of staffing Fire Station 51 with a permanent fire inspector to serve the needs of implementation of the Project during construction activities and ongoing expanded operations.
- K.1-5:** Expanded County fire fighting facilities shall be provided to serve the Project. The expanded facilities may be a new fire station or remodeling of the existing Fire Station 51 to accommodate additional equipment and staffing (Facility Improvements). The decision to remodel the existing station or construct a second additional station is solely the County Fire Department's based upon its determination of service needs. The new fire station, if this option is selected, shall be a "four-man" station built to County Fire Department's specifications that could accommodate a new "tiller-quint", or similar equipment approved by the County Fire Department, with a minimum of four firefighter positions. The Project Applicant or its successor shall construct or cause to be constructed and furnish the Facility Improvements at no cost to the County as well as providing the quint and ancillary equipment for the quint, or similar equipment at no cost to the

County. The County Fire Department shall be responsible for staffing costs. The Facility Improvements shall be constructed / conveyed to the County Fire Department before building permits are issued for: (a) the first new building that is 75-feet or greater in height; (b) the first new building that is 70,000 square-feet in total net new floor area; or (c) the last of multiple buildings less than 75 feet in height that cumulatively exceed 100,000 square feet of new net floor area in the same vicinity. The Project Applicant or its successor and the County Fire Department shall work together to appropriately locate the station.

K.1-6: The Project Applicant or its successor shall engage in an annual review through the Project build-out with the County Fire Department to determine fire service needs of the Project Site.

K.1-7: Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the Project Applicant or its successor shall contact the local water purveyor, if the fire hydrant is public, or a private sprinkler contractor, if the fire hydrant is private, to have the closest existing fire hydrant(s) to the location under review verified and tested to the satisfaction of the County Fire Department by conducting a fire flow availability test.

K.1-8: When the Applicant provides to County Fire Station 51 the tiller-quint pursuant to Mitigation Measure K.1-5 and the City Fire Department obtains the rescue ambulance pursuant to Mitigation Measure K.1-2, the City Fire Department and County Fire Department shall agree upon use of their respective equipment on an automatic response basis pursuant to a mutually acceptable automatic aid agreement.

Mitigation Measures K.1-1, K.1-2, and K.1-3 adopted by the City are not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction.

4. Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects on Public Services (Fire and Sheriff/Police), as identified in the EIR, to less than significant levels.

In addition, where changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency (the City) and not the agency making the finding (the County), such changes have been adopted by such other agency.

5. Rationale for Findings

No adverse impacts associated with Public Services (Fire) would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of Mitigation Measures K.1-1 to K.1-8.

6. Reference

For a complete discussion of environmental impacts of Public Services (Fire), please see (1) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection 3.k(1), in Section II, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR; (2) and Section IV.K of the Draft EIR.

J. Public Services (Police/Sheriff)

1. Description of Effects

a. Construction Impacts

Construction activities associated with Project development could result in impacts to the City of Los Angeles Police Department (City Police Department) and the County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (County Sheriff's Department) due to crimes involving the construction sites and with regard to emergency vehicle access. The City Police Department has indicated that during construction, emergency responders may need to consider alternative routes when responding to calls in this area, particularly during peak traffic periods. This condition may cause a delay in the response time for emergency responders. To reduce potential construction-related impacts to City Police Department and County Sheriff's Department services, access to the Project Site and area roadways would be maintained during construction. In the event that construction activities do require lane closures, emergency access would remain unimpeded through the use of flaggers, and other controls. Although there is the potential that at some locations, at certain times, traffic congestion may increase due to construction on off-site roadways, significant environmental impacts are not expected to occur at these locations based on the Applicant's implementation of a construction traffic management plan and various security measures, included as project design features. The implementation of these features would reduce the increase in demand for City Police Department and County Sheriff's Department services, and construction impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

b. Operational Impacts

Implementation of the Project would result in increased demand for City Police Department and County Sheriff's Department services. The County Sheriff's Department has indicated that the Project would result in the need for additional lieutenants, sergeants, deputies, and support staff, with some of the additional deputies being needed to patrol the County portions of the Project Site.

Although the Project's traffic analysis shows that traffic at most of the intersections analyzed would operate at similar, and in some cases better conditions than future conditions without the Project, the Project could result in a minor increase in response time in the area. Any increase in traffic would not greatly affect emergency vehicles since the drivers of emergency vehicles normally have a variety of options for avoiding traffic. This impact is not considered significant since emergency response times would not be substantially affected and the availability of alternative routes given the street pattern in the area surrounding the Project Site.

The Project would include design features to reduce the increase in impacts to City Police Department and County Sheriff's Department services. These design features would include recommendations included in the City Police Department's Design Out Crime Guidelines and specific County Sheriff's Department recommendations, which may include an on-site security force, illuminating parking lots with artificial lighting, use of closed-circuit television monitoring and recording of on-site areas, maintaining security fencing along the Project Site's eastern boundary to restrict public access, and way-finding lighting. Further, emergency access to the Project Site would be provided by the existing and proposed on-site street systems. Implementation of the Project would result in an increase in the number of on-site security personnel to maintain adequate security levels. In addition, given that there is no

evidence of a relationship between on-site crime incidents and crime within the adjacent residential neighborhoods, it is concluded that on-site growth would not increase off-site crime. The proposed County Specific Plan would provide an adequate approach for minimizing security issues related to the sale of alcoholic beverages. Since it cannot be guaranteed that the Project's revenue contributions would be applied to police and sheriff services in the Project area, it is conservatively concluded that the Project's demands would result in a reduction in the service ratio, and thus, impacts could potentially be significant. Mitigation measures have been included to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

c. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

Under the No Annexation scenario, potential traffic impacts to City Police Department and County Sheriff's Department services would be similar to those under the Project, and would be less than significant with the addition of officers. Similar to the Project, development under the No Annexation scenario would generate revenues to the County and City which could be applied to the provision of police/sheriff's facilities and/or related staffing. The sufficiency of such funds, and a decision to allocate such funds accordingly, cannot be guaranteed; therefore, it is conservatively concluded that the demands under the No Annexation scenario would result in a reduction in the service ratio, and thus, impacts prior to mitigation could potentially be significant. The same mitigation measures that apply to the Project would also apply to the No Annexation scenario. This would limit the increase in demand for City Police Department and County Sheriff's Department services and reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

d. Cumulative Impacts

The increase in demand from the identified cumulative off-site growth could result in a reduction in the service ratio, and thus, impacts from cumulative off-site growth prior to mitigation could potentially be significant. However, mitigation measures have been included to address the Project's increase in demand on police and sheriff services. Thus, with the implementation of these mitigation measures, the Project's cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

2. Project Design Features

K.2-1: During Project construction, the Project Applicant or its successor shall implement security measures at Project construction sites that are accessible to the general public. Security measures could include, but are not limited to, fencing, security lighting, and providing security personnel to patrol construction sites.

K.2-3: The Project Applicant or its successor shall design on-site streets, street lighting, and street signage in accordance with the emergency access requirements of the applicable jurisdiction (i.e., City of Los Angeles or County of Los Angeles). The Project Applicant or its successor shall submit to the applicable jurisdiction (i.e., City or County) for review the design plans for on-site street widths, street lighting, and street signage.

Project Design Feature K.2-2 adopted by the City is not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction.

3. Mitigation Measures

K.2-2: The Project Applicant or its successor shall provide a new up to 16,000 square foot facility within the County portion of the Project Site, for the shared use of the County Sheriff's Department, contract security, and corporate security for the Project Site. Construction of the facility shall meet the operational needs of the County Sheriff's Department and comply with applicable California Code of Regulations Title 15 requirements and County standards. The facility shall include holding cells, office space, locker room, and several access points. The Project Applicant or its successor shall improve the facility at its cost. The facility shall be available once certificates of occupancy have been issued for a cumulative total of 765,000 square feet of net new Project development within County portions of the Project Site or 2022, whichever comes first, and once constructed shall replace the existing on-site County Sheriff's Department facility.

K.2-3: Extra private security personnel shall be deployed at important entertainment events (i.e., visits to the Project Site by state, national, or international dignitaries and red carpet events), in order to reduce the need for sworn officer response.

4. Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects on Public Services (Police/Sheriff), as identified in the EIR, to less than significant levels.

5. Rationale for Findings

No adverse impacts associated with Public Services (Police/Sheriff) would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of Mitigation Measures K.2-2 to K.2-3.

6. Reference

For a complete discussion of environmental impacts of Public Services (Police/Sheriff), please see (1) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection 3.k(2), in Section II, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR; and (2) Section IV.K of the Draft EIR.

K. Utilities (Water)

1. Description of Effects

a. Construction Impacts

Construction impacts would be limited to trenching for water lines and removing one existing on-site man-made water feature, all of which would be temporary in nature. Vehicle and pedestrian access would be impacted during the connection of the proposed water mains to the existing Los Angeles Department of Water and Power mains located along Barham Boulevard and Buddy Holly Drive, and potential construction of a new water main along Barham Boulevard. The installation of these connection lines and upgrades would require up to two traffic lane closures for approximately one week at the Barham and Buddy Holly Drive locations. Depending on the length of the new water main that may be

required in Barham Boulevard, there could be additional traffic lane closures along Barham Boulevard from the intersection with Buddy Holly Drive to the intersection with Lake Hollywood Drive. The Project's construction impacts relative to vehicular and pedestrian access associated with the installation of the proposed new connection lines would be considered a less than significant impact.

During the construction of the Project, additional water would be required during grading. Adequate facilities for the provision of this water exist and there would continue to be an adequate supply of water for construction purposes. Therefore, potential construction-related impacts would be less than significant.

b. Operational Impacts

The Project would increase the Project Site's water consumption over existing conditions. The Project would have a net increase in average water consumption of 657,315 gallons per day and a net increase in peak water consumption of 1,209,961 gallons per day. With project design features, adequate water supplies would be available to serve the Project Site. For instance, in order to facilitate Los Angeles Department of Water and Power's long-term supply of potable water available to serve the Project, the Applicant would enter into an agreement with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power to augment the water supply available to the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. Thus, the Project would result in a less than significant impact to water supplies.

Notwithstanding, the net increase in water demand would exceed the capacity of the water conveyance infrastructure. As such, improvements to the internal water distribution system would be required. Due to the Project's elimination of the residential, neighborhood retail and community-serving commercial uses, the Project would not include an underground recycled water storage tank to serve the Back Lot Area. However, improvements to the on-site recycled water system for the remainder of the Project would occur. These improvements would reduce impacts to the conveyance infrastructure to a less than significant level.

Development under the Project would incorporate project design features that include water conservation features. Impacts with regard to water resources under the Project would be less than significant.

c. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The proposed detachment/annexation of land between the County and City would not alter the projected increases in demand for water nor the means by which water is delivered to the Project Site. As total water demand under the No Annexation scenario is the same as that of the Project, impacts with regard to water demand would be less than significant under the No Annexation scenario, as is the case with the Project. The water supply service lines would be designed and constructed pursuant to the requirements of the applicable jurisdiction; therefore impacts would be the same with or without the proposed annexation/detachment. With the incorporation of the proposed project design features, impacts under the No Annexation scenario would be less than significant.

d. Cumulative Impacts

The City's Urban Water Management Plan (2005) anticipates that sufficient supplies would be available to meet the cumulative demand at 2030 through a combination of existing

and planned locally-developed supplies, conservation and purchasing water from the Metropolitan Water District. The 2005 Urban Water Management Plan also includes water shortage contingency plans in the event anticipated supplies are not available. Through these processes (i.e., implementation of the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan and compliance with California Water Code requirements for water supply assessment), sufficient water supplies would be available to meet the forecasted demand. As the Project would enter into an agreement with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power to augment the water supply available to Los Angeles Department of Water and Power and development would have a less than significant impact with regard to water supply, the Project's water supply impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative water supply impacts are also concluded to be less than significant.

With regard to conveyance infrastructure, it is anticipated that all projects would comply with City requirements regarding distribution infrastructure to serve the project demand of the related projects. As such, cumulative impacts with regard to conveyance infrastructure are less than significant.

2. Project Design Features

- L.2-1:** Any additional water lines and hydrants that may be needed to provide additional fire flows to new buildings shall be constructed as necessary. The new water lines shall be designed and installed in accordance with applicable City and County standards and would be sized to accommodate both fire flow demand and peak day domestic demand.
- L.2-2:** All water lines that are constructed that deliver both domestic and fire water shall be constructed with the necessary materials and appropriate size to deliver the highest instantaneous demand on the individual water line.
- L.2-3:** The following water conservation features shall be incorporated into the proposed outdoor and indoor areas of the Project:

Outdoor

- Use recycled water for landscape irrigation.
- Installation of the infrastructure to deliver and use recycled water.
- Expanded use of high efficiency irrigation systems, including weather-based irrigation controllers with rain shutoff technology or smart irrigation controllers for any area that is either landscaped or designated for future landscaping.
- Use native/drought tolerant plant materials (for at least 25 percent of new landscaping) and use of water efficient landscaping such as proper hydro-zoning, turf minimization, and landscaping contouring (to minimize precipitation runoff) for new landscaping in areas other than production activities, entertainment attractions, sets/facades, the theme park and visitor entries to the theme park and Universal CityWalk). Other than the exempted areas described above, areas of the Project Site within the

County's jurisdiction would also comply with the County's landscaping design regulations, as applicable.

- Provide education on water conservation for employees.

Indoor

- Install high efficiency toilets that use 1.28 gallons per flush or less.
- Install high efficiency urinals that use 0.5 gallons per flush or less.
- Install restroom faucets that use 1.5 gallons per minute or less.
- Install pre-rinse spray valves that use 1.6 gallons per minute or less for commercial kitchens.
- Install self-closing faucets for public restrooms.
- Install high efficiency clothes washers with a water savings factor of 7.5 or less.
- Install cooling tower conductivity controllers or cooling tower pH conductivity controllers, as applicable.

Project Design Features L.2-4 and L.2-5 adopted by the City are not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction.

3. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure L.2-1 adopted by the City is not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction.

4. Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects on Utilities (Water), as identified in the EIR, to less than significant levels.

In addition, where changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency (the City) and not the agency making the finding (the County), such changes have been adopted by such other agency.

5. Rationale for Findings

No adverse impacts associated with Utilities (Water) would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of the identified project design features and mitigation measure.

6. Reference

For a complete discussion of environmental impacts of Utilities (Water), see (1) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection 3.l(2), in Section II, Corrections and

Additions, of the Final EIR; (2) Section IV.L.2.1, Utilities (Water), in the Draft EIR; (3) Appendices N-1 and N-2 to the Draft EIR; (4) Appendix FEIR-28 to the Final EIR; and (5) NBC Universal Evolution Plan, Plan for Municipal Services for Proposed Annexation to the City of Los Angeles, October 2012.

L. Environmental Safety

1. Description of Effects

a. Hazardous Materials Use, Storage, and Management

Compliance with project design features as well as existing regulations and plans at the Project Site during construction would reduce the risk for hazardous materials releases and, subsequently, the exposure of people and the environment to hazardous materials through the use, handling, and storage of hazardous materials. Therefore, a less than significant impact is anticipated.

During operations, the Project has the potential to increase the acquisition, use, handling and storage of hazardous materials on-site. With continued implementation of hazardous materials management in accordance with all applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulations, operation of the Project would be consistent with the County and City General Plan Safety Elements. Through continued compliance with applicable laws, as well as implementation of the identified project design features, impacts associated with the use, storage, and management of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

b. Hazardous Waste

Compliance with the project design features as well as existing regulations and plans at the Project Site during construction of the Project would prevent exposure of people to substantial risk resulting from the release of a hazardous material, or from exposure to a health hazard, in excess of regulatory standards due to increased use, handling and storage of hazardous materials, and the potential to encounter contaminated soil. In addition, with implementation of mitigation specific to the potential discovery of contaminated soil during construction excavation and grading activities, potential hazardous materials impacts during construction would be minimized further. Therefore, no significant impact is anticipated.

Due to the implementation of existing hazardous waste reduction efforts on-site, and that operational hazardous waste is conveyed to licensed treatment, disposal and resource recovery facilities, it is not anticipated that operation of the Project would result in a notable increase in demand for hazardous waste landfill capacity. With compliance with applicable regulations related to the handling, storage and disposal of hazardous waste, no significant impact is anticipated related to these potential releases of the materials.

c. Asbestos, Lead-Based Paint, and Polychlorinated Biphenyls

As the handling and disposal of asbestos, asbestos containing material, lead-based paint, and polychlorinated biphenyls would be in accordance with the project design features as well as all applicable laws and regulations, construction of the Project would not expose people to substantial risk resulting from the release or explosion of a hazardous material, or from exposure to a health hazard, in excess of regulatory standards. Therefore, no significant impact

associated with asbestos, asbestos containing material, lead-based paint, or polychlorinated biphenyls is anticipated from construction of the Project.

Operation of new proposed development at the Project Site is not anticipated to expose persons to friable asbestos or lead-based paint. With existing laws and regulations, as well as implementation of the identified project design features, operation of the Project would not expose people to substantial risk resulting from the release or explosion of a hazardous material, or from exposure to a health hazard, in excess of regulatory standards. Therefore, no significant impact associated with asbestos, asbestos-containing materials, and lead-based paint is anticipated from operation of the Project. Furthermore, due to project design features, the operation of the Project would not result in significant exposure to polychlorinated biphenyls.

d. Closed Landfill

Construction of the Project in the area of the closed landfill would be undertaken in accordance with the project design features as well as all applicable laws and regulations. However, construction still has the potential to expose people and the environment to potentially hazardous conditions (including explosive and toxic concentrations of landfill gas and leachate from the landfill), if encountered. With implementation of the identified mitigation, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Operation of the Project in the area of the closed landfill would be undertaken in accordance with the identified project design features as well as all applicable laws and regulations. Therefore, operation of the Project would not expose people to substantial risk resulting from the release or explosion of a hazardous material, or from exposure to a health hazard, in excess of regulatory standards. Therefore, no significant impacts associated with the closed landfill are anticipated from operation of the Project.

e. Underground Storage Tanks

If existing known and unknown underground storage tanks or impacted soils are encountered during Project-related grading, the project design features as well as existing comprehensive on-site policies and programs specifically related to environmental safety would continue to be implemented. Therefore, a less than significant impact is anticipated.

All new underground storage tanks at the Project Site would be installed in accordance with the identified project design features as well as in accordance with federal, state, and local laws. Implementation of the identified project design features and continued compliance with applicable laws would minimize impacts to human health and the environment associated with underground storage tanks and no significant impacts are anticipated.

f. Aboveground Storage Tanks

New aboveground storage tanks installed on the Project Site by the Applicant, tenants or third-party vendors must conform to applicable regulatory requirements. Implementation of the identified project design features as well as compliance with these laws would minimize impacts to human health and the environment associated with aboveground storage tanks by ensuring that new tanks include secondary containment, as required. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

g. Radio Frequency

The Project involves the construction and operation of several satellite-uplink antenna systems and possibly a variety of wireless communication antennas, including cellular systems. As potential radio frequency radiation is a result of energy from the operation of an antenna that transmits energy, the construction of the Project in itself would not result in a radio frequency safety hazard. Therefore, no significant impact associated with radio frequency is anticipated from the construction of the Project.

With regulatory compliance and implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the potential radio frequency hazard would not result in a substantial risk resulting from the release or explosion of a hazardous material, or from exposure to a health hazard, in excess of regulatory standards. Therefore, no significant human exposure to radio frequency energy or radiation is anticipated.

h. Emergency Response

Construction of the Project could temporarily interfere with local and on-site emergency response. Implementation of construction traffic management plans and access standards would reduce the potential for the impacts on emergency response during construction and operations. Therefore, construction and operation of the Project is not anticipated to significantly impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, any adopted or on-site emergency response or evacuation plans or a local, State, or Federal agency's emergency evacuation plan. As a result, a less than significant impact is anticipated.

i. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

If the proposed annexation/detachment does not occur, the appropriate lead agency's policies and procedures would be applicable to the current areas within the City/County boundaries. While there are some differences between the policies and procedures of the respective jurisdictions, adherence to the policies and procedures of the applicable jurisdiction would mitigate any potential impacts. As such, impacts associated with the No Annexation scenario would be less than significant.

j. Cumulative Impacts

Development of the Project in combination with the related projects has the potential to increase the risk for an accidental release of hazardous materials. Each of the related projects would require evaluation for potential threats to public safety, including those associated with the use, storage, and/or disposal of hazardous materials, asbestos containing material, lead-based paint, polychlorinated biphenyls, and radio frequency would be required to comply with all applicable local, State, and federal laws, rules and regulations. Because environmental safety issues are largely site-specific, this evaluation would occur on a case-by-case basis for each individual project affected, in conjunction with development proposals on these properties. Therefore, with compliance with all applicable local, State, and federal laws, rules and regulations, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

2. Project Design Features

- M-1:** Prior to the issuance of any demolition permit or building permit for remodeling of existing buildings, the Project Applicant or its successor shall provide evidence to the City of Los Angeles, Department of Building and Safety or County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, as applicable, that the demolition contract

provides for a qualified asbestos abatement contractor/specialist to remove or otherwise abate or manage asbestos during demolition or renovation activities in accordance with all applicable federal, state and local regulations.

- M-2:** Prior to the issuance of any demolition permit or building permit for remodeling of existing buildings, the Project Applicant or its successor shall provide evidence to the City of Los Angeles, Department of Building and Safety, or County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, as applicable, that the demolition contract provides for a qualified lead-based paint abatement contractor/specialist to remove or otherwise abate or manage lead-based paint during demolition or renovation activities in accordance with all applicable federal, state and local regulations.
- M-3:** The Project Applicant or its successor shall implement a soil management plan, or other applicable plan, approved by the Department of Toxic Substances Control, pursuant to Department of Toxic Substances Control's Voluntary Cleanup Program, or other applicable state or local regulatory agency providing oversight, to address contamination in soil in the Back Lot Area. The approved soil management plan or other applicable plan shall include procedures for soil sampling and remedial options that may include removal (excavation), treatment (*in-situ* or *ex-situ*), or other measures, as appropriate.
- M-4:** The Project Applicant or its successor shall submit to the County Fire Department, City Fire Department, and Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, and City Department of Building and Safety, as applicable, an updated emergency response and/or evacuation plan, as appropriate, to include operation of the Project. The emergency response plan shall include but not be limited to the following: mapping of evacuation routes for vehicles and pedestrians, and the location of the nearest hospital and fire departments.

3. Mitigation Measures

- M-1:** If soil contamination is suspected to be present, prior to excavation and grading, the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 1166 shall be implemented, as appropriate. If soil contamination is not suspected, but is observed (i.e., by sight, smell, visual, etc.) by a qualified professional during excavation and grading activities, excavation and grading within such an area shall be temporarily halted and redirected around the area until the appropriate evaluation and follow-up measures are implemented, as contained in Southern California Air Quality Management District's Rule 1166, so as to render the area suitable for grading activities to resume. The contaminated soil discovered shall be evaluated and excavated/disposed of, treated in-situ (in-place), or otherwise managed in accordance with all applicable regulatory requirements.
- M-2:** As required by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Construction Worker Safety Plan shall be developed by each contractor working within the footprint of the landfill. The Construction Worker Safety Plan shall comply with Occupational Safety and Health Administration Safety and Health Standards 29 Code of Federal Regulations 1910.120, the California Code of Regulations, Title 8, General Industry Safety orders, and U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The Plan shall include requirements associated with potential

exposure to landfill gases. In addition, construction personnel shall wear protective equipment and clothing and other safety equipment, as appropriate, in accordance with the Construction Worker Safety Plan and/or Project Site-specific safety plans, as applicable.

- M-3:** Construction of all new development within 1,000 feet of the landfill shall be designed and constructed to prevent gas migration into the buildings in accordance with the recommendations of a licensed civil engineer. The recommendations shall be subject to the review and approval of the Los Angeles County, Department of Public Works.
- M-5:** During operation, monitoring of methane safety systems shall occur in accordance with County or City requirements, as applicable.
- M-6:** The Project Applicant or its successor shall locate and operate satellite-uplink antennas with an absolute minimum of 1 foot of separation between the eye level and all waveguide connections, waveguide components, and flexible waveguide. Exposure within 1 to 3 feet from waveguide shall be limited to less than one minute.
- M-7:** The Project Applicant or its successor shall develop and use a simple lockout, tagout procedure prior to the maintenance activities of satellite-uplink antennas (i.e., reflector antennas) to ensure that the high-power amplifiers cannot be energized while anyone is working on an antenna.
- M-8:** If a 2.4-meter-diameter antenna is installed so that the bottom lip of the antenna is less than 7 feet above ground, the Project Applicant or its successor shall install a barrier, such as a chain and stanchion barrier to be added in front of the antenna, to prevent access to the area directly in front of the antenna. As appropriate, the width of the restricted access area shall be 10 feet wide, to ensure that no access to the area is possible by leaning over the chain. The distance in front of the antenna shall be determined based on the minimum elevation angle and height of the bottom lip of the antenna above the ground. The bottom lip of the antenna shall be a minimum of 7 feet above ground level at the chain. In addition, a warning/notice sign shall be hung on each side of the enclosure.
- M-9:** The Project Applicant or its successor shall restrict access to the beam of the 2.4-meter-diameter antenna(s) only to workers trained in radio frequency safety.
- M-10:** Prior to operation of new antennas on the Project Site, the Applicant's or its successor's existing Radio Frequency Radiation Safety and Health Program shall be updated and additional training given to maintenance personnel, as appropriate.

Mitigation Measure M-4 adopted by the City is not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction.

4. Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that avoid or substantially lessen potential significant environmental effects on Environmental Safety, as identified in the EIR, to less than significant levels.

In addition, where changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency (the City) and not the agency making the finding (the County), such changes have been adopted by such other agency.

5. Rationale for Findings

No adverse impacts associated with Environmental Safety would occur as a result of the development of the Project with incorporation of Mitigation Measures M-1 to M-10.

6. Reference

For a complete discussion of environmental impacts of Environmental Safety, please see (1) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection 3.m., Environmental Safety, in Section II, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR; (2) Section IV.M of the Draft EIR; (3) Appendix M-1 to the Draft EIR; and (4) Appendix FEIR-29 to the Final EIR.

VIII. SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WHICH REMAIN SIGNIFICANT AFTER MITIGATION MEASURES

The Project would result in the following impacts, which are found to be significant and unavoidable:

A. Traffic/Access—Traffic/Circulation (Operational: Intersections, Freeway Segments, Neighborhood Intrusion, Site Access, Supplemental Caltrans Analysis: Weaving)

1. Description of Effects

The Project is expected to generate a net total of 23,601 daily trips on a typical weekday, including approximately 2,241 morning peak-hour trips and 2,197 afternoon peak-hour trips before considering Transportation Demand Management/transit credits. With the incorporation of Transportation Demand Management trip reductions, the Project Site is expected to generate a net increase of 19,139 daily trips on a typical weekday, including approximately 1,760 morning peak-hour trips and 1,698 afternoon peak-hour trips. The Project's Transportation Demand Management program thus reduces the Project's trip generation by 4,462 daily trips, including approximately 481 morning peak-hour trips and 499 afternoon peak-hour trips. The Study Area for the traffic analysis encompasses a geographic area of approximately 50 square miles, and is generally bounded by Burbank Boulevard in North Hollywood and Burbank on the north, Santa Monica Boulevard in West Hollywood and Hollywood on the south, Buena Vista Street and Forest Lawn Drive on the east, and Sepulveda Boulevard in Sherman Oaks on the west.

a. Intersection Levels of Service

Intersection impacts are evaluated based on an intersection's level of service. An intersection's Level of Service is rated from A to F, with Level of Service A reflecting conditions where there is very little traffic and Level of Service F reflecting congested conditions. Due to

the highly urbanized nature of the Project area, many intersections currently operate at Level of Service E or Level of Service F.

Of the 148 unsignalized intersections during the morning peak hour in 2030, before taking into account the Project's Transportation Demand Management program and other mitigation measures, the Project is forecasted to result in significant impacts at 6 intersections operating at Level of Service C or Level of Service D; 7 intersections operating at Level of Service E; and 31 intersections operating at Level of Service F. During the afternoon peak hour in 2030, the Project is expected to result in significant impacts at 10 intersections operating at Level of Service C or Level of Service D, 11 intersections operating at Level of Service E, and 22 intersections operating at Level of Service F. Intersections impacted in the morning peak hour are not necessarily the same intersections impacted in the afternoon peak hour and vice-versa. Thus, a total of 60 of the 148 signalized study intersections analyzed would be significantly impacted in the morning and/or afternoon peak hour before Transportation Demand Management trip reduction and mitigation. The Project would not result in significant traffic impacts at 88 of the 148 signalized study intersections during either peak hour.

With the implementation of Transportation Demand Management trip reduction and mitigation, the Project would result in remaining significant intersection impacts at the following intersections:

Intersection #22	US 101 Northbound On-Ramp/Campo de Cahuenga (afternoon peak hour)
Intersection #30	Cahuenga Boulevard/Moorpark Street (morning and afternoon peak hours)
Intersection #35	Lankershim Boulevard/Main Street (afternoon peak hour)
Intersection #36	Lankershim Boulevard/Campo de Cahuenga/Universal Hollywood Drive (morning peak hour)

However, with the Metro Universal project (Related Project No. 65) no longer proposed, it is anticipated that implementation of the Project would only result in one remaining significant intersection impact, at Intersection # 30 – Cahuenga Boulevard/Moorpark Street (afternoon peak hour).

With respect to unsignalized intersections, based on the *City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide* threshold for unsignalized intersections, taking into account the Transportation Demand Management trip reductions and mitigation, impacts at one (1) of these unsignalized intersections would be significant. Project impacts at only the Lankershim Boulevard & Jimi Hendrix Drive (Intersection 73) unsignalized intersection would be significant after implementation of Transportation Demand Management trip reductions and mitigation.

b. Freeway Segments

The evaluation of the impact of a project on the regional transportation system (freeways, designated streets, and transit facilities) is guided by procedures outlined in the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan. A total of 16 freeway segments were analyzed.

The Project would result in significant impacts to the following six freeway segments before Transportation Demand Management trip reductions and mitigation:

Segment 1: US 101 south of Alvarado Street – morning peak hour (northbound) and afternoon peak hour (southbound)

Segment 2: US 101 south of Vermont Avenue – morning peak hour (northbound and southbound) and afternoon peak hour (southbound)

Segment 3: US 101 south of Santa Monica Boulevard – morning peak hour (northbound) and afternoon peak hour (southbound)

Segment 4: US 101 south of Barham Boulevard – morning peak hour (northbound) and afternoon peak hour (southbound)

Segment 5: US 101 north of Campo de Cahuenga Way – afternoon peak hour (northbound)

Segment 10: SR 170 north of Magnolia Boulevard – afternoon peak hour (northbound)

Even with implementation of the identified mitigation measures, significant impacts would remain at these same six freeway segments.

c. Neighborhood Intrusion

Neighborhood intrusion impacts occur when traffic congestion occurs along major roadways, and parallel alternative routes are available to motorists that involves travel through local neighborhoods. Based on the Project's traffic analysis, nine neighborhoods were identified that may be subject to neighborhood traffic intrusion impacts. After Transportation Demand Management trip reductions and subregional and regional highway improvements, three neighborhoods have the potential to experience neighborhood intrusion impacts. With implementation of the proposed mitigation, the Project's potential significant neighborhood impact could remain significant and no other feasible mitigation was identified.

d. Site Access

Under the Future with Project conditions, before Transportation Demand Management trip reductions and mitigation, all but one of the intersections that directly access the Project Site would operate at Level of Service E or F during the peak hours. Therefore, the Project's impacts, before mitigation, related to site access would be significant. After Transportation Demand Management trip reductions and implementation of mitigation measures, the Project would still have a significant access impact at one access location: Intersection #36: Lankershim Boulevard and Campo de Cahuenga Way/Universal Hollywood Drive (morning peak hour). Due to physical constraints, no improvements could be identified that would mitigate the impact at this location to less than significant.

e. Supplemental Caltrans Analysis: Weaving

Caltrans requested that the traffic impact analysis include an evaluation of the Project's potential effects on weaving/merging operations along those freeway segments to which the Project would add the most traffic. Based on this analysis, before Transportation Demand

Management trip reductions and mitigation, Project impacts would be significant at six of the locations where weaving/merging operations were analyzed. With the implementation of the identified mitigation measures, weaving impacts would be reduced, but not to a less than significant level.

f. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The proposed annexation/detachment of land areas between the County and City would not alter the potential for traffic/circulation impacts nor the significance level of any impact. Annexation has no bearing on which jurisdictional intersection or recommended improvement to various intersections could occur with the Project. The jurisdictions responsible for implementation of the mitigation measures would also be unaffected. As such, potential impacts would remain the same if the proposed annexation/detachment actions are not implemented.

g. Cumulative Impacts

(1) Intersection Levels of Service

Cumulative conditions would result in significant impacts at several intersections and the Project would contribute to these impacts. Thus, the Project's contribution to impacts that would occur in the future cumulative conditions would be considerable, and cumulative impacts would be significant at these intersections. While the Project's mitigation measures would reduce several of the significant impacts to a less than significant level, some of the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. These same conclusions apply based on the use of the other jurisdictions' methodology/ significance thresholds.

(2) Freeway Segments

The Project's contribution to cumulative traffic would result in significant cumulative Level of Service impacts at six Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan freeway segments, before Transportation Demand Management trip reductions and mitigation. With implementation of proposed mitigation measures, the Project's significant impacts to these Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan freeway segments would be reduced but would remain significant and unavoidable.

(3) Neighborhood Intrusion

Implementation of the Project in conjunction with the 256 related projects would increase the amount of traffic in the Project area. Cumulative impacts related to neighborhood intrusion would be significant and unavoidable. With implementation of the Project's proposed mitigation, potential neighborhood intrusion impact could remain significant and no other feasible mitigation was identified. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to neighborhood intrusion could be significant and unavoidable.

(4) Site Access

The Project would result in significant impacts related to site access. With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, Project impacts related to access would remain significant and no other feasible mitigation was identified. Therefore, cumulative project access impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

(5) Supplemental Caltrans Analysis: Weaving

With regard to weaving, the Project's contribution to this type of cumulative traffic condition would result in significant impacts at six study freeway segments. Therefore, the Project could result in significant cumulative impacts at the analyzed freeway segments.

2. Project Design Features

B-1: The Project Applicant or its successor shall prepare and implement a Transportation Demand Management program to reduce traffic impacts of the Project encouraging Project employees and patrons to reduce vehicular traffic on the street and freeway system during the most congested time periods of the day. The Transportation Demand Management program shall include implementation of several Transportation Demand Management strategies, which may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Flexible work schedules and telecommuting programs;
- Alternative work schedules;
- Bicycle and pedestrian-friendly environment (i.e., established and clear pedestrian networks, intersections, and built environments);
- Bicycle amenities;
- Rideshare/carpool/vanpool promotion and support;
- Mixed-use development;
- Education and information on alternative transportation modes;
- Transportation Information Center;
- Guaranteed Ride Home Program;
- Join an existing or form a new Transportation Management Association;
- On-site flex cars;
- Discounted employee and tenant transit passes; and
- Financial mechanisms and/or programs to provide for the implementation of the Transportation Demand Management program.

B-3: Buddy Holly Drive between Barham Boulevard and the US 101 northbound off-ramp shall be widened from its current configuration of two westbound lanes to three westbound lanes. The roadway shall continue to accommodate only westbound traffic on this section.

B-4: Buddy Holly Drive between the US 101 northbound off-ramp to Donald O'Connor Drive shall be widened to accommodate between four and five lanes. At the approach to Donald O'Connor Drive, a dedicated right-turn lane shall be

provided, and a dedicated left-turn lane onto the northbound US-101 Freeway shall be provided.

B-5: The final segment of Buddy Holly Drive between Donald O'Connor Drive and Universal Studios Boulevard/Universal Center Drive may be widened to accommodate four westbound travel lanes and two eastbound travel lanes. If this segment of Buddy Holly Drive is widened, the US 101 northbound on-ramp at Universal Studios Boulevard/Buddy Holly Drive shall be relocated maintaining the existing 12-foot travel lane, an 8-foot left shoulder, and a 6-foot right shoulder. Entrance to the on-ramp shall be reconfigured from the existing northbound right-turn lane off of Universal Studios Boulevard to a right-turn off the new westbound lanes on Buddy Holly Drive between Donald O'Connor Drive and Universal Studios Boulevard/Universal Center Drive. If operated under two-way flow, the westbound approach on Buddy Holly Drive would include two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and two free-flow right-turn lanes. Also, Universal Studios Boulevard would be restriped to provide a northbound right-turn lane, and the eastbound approach would be restriped to provide one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane. This configuration would not be needed if Buddy Holly remains a one-way eastbound street.

B-7: The new development calls for the realignment and widening of Universal Hollywood Drive, which extends between the Universal Tram stop east of Lankershim Boulevard and Universal Studios Boulevard, providing access to parking structures within Universal Studios Hollywood and the entrance to CityWalk near Universal CityWalk, to improve overall circulation both on-site and off-site.

Project Design Features B-6, B-8, B-9, B-10, B-11, and B-12 adopted by the City are not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction. For more information, see Attachment B to the County's MMRP.

3. Mitigation Measures

B-6: The Project Applicant or its successor shall implement the following Lankershim Boulevard Corridor improvements:

- a. [DELETED DUE TO SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVE 10];
- b. [DELETED DUE TO SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVE 10];
- c. Restripe James Stewart Avenue at its intersection with Lankershim Boulevard to provide one left-turn, one shared through/left-turn, and dual right-turn lanes in the westbound direction;
- d. [SEE BELOW];
- e. Widen Main Street at its intersection with Lankershim Boulevard to improve ingress/egress to/from the Project Site;
- f. [DELETED DUE TO SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVE 10];

- g. [SEE BELOW];
- h. [SEE BELOW];
- i. [SEE BELOW];
- j. Widen Universal Hollywood Drive at its intersection with Lankershim Boulevard to provide a separate westbound left-turn lane and additional signal equipment for protected left-turn phasing on the east-west approach;
- k. [SEE BELOW];
- l. [SEE BELOW];
- m. [DELETED DUE TO THE SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVE 10].

B-43: All construction workers shall be prohibited from parking on neighborhood streets offsite. To the extent that parking would not be available on-site, parking shall be provided by The Project Applicant or its successor at offsite locations. A construction worker shuttle service shall be provided if an offsite parking lot is not within reasonable walking distance of the Project Site.

B-44: The Project Applicant or its successor shall prepare construction traffic management plans, including but not limited to street closure information, detour plans, haul routes, and staging plans, satisfactory to the affected jurisdictions. The construction traffic management plans shall be based on the nature and timing of the specific construction and other projects in the vicinity of the Project Site, and shall include the following elements as appropriate:

- 1. Provisions to configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference;
- 2. Provisions for temporary traffic control during all phases of construction activities to improve traffic flow on public roadways (e.g., flag person);
- 3. Scheduling construction activities to reduce the effect on traffic flow on public roadways;
- 4. Rerouting construction trucks to reduce travel on congested streets;
- 5. Consolidating construction truck deliveries;
- 6. Provision of dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on- and off-site;
- 7. Construction-related vehicles shall not park on any residential street;
- 8. Provision of safety precautions for pedestrians and bicyclists through such measures as alternate routing, and protection barriers;

9. All contractors shall be required to participate in a common carpool registry during all periods of contract performance monitored and maintained by the contractor;
10. Schedule construction-related deliveries, other than concrete and earthwork-related deliveries to reduce travel during peak travel periods;
11. Construction vehicle travel through neighboring jurisdictions other than the City of Los Angeles shall be conducted in accordance with the standard rules and regulations established by the respective jurisdictions where such jurisdictions would be subject to construction impacts. These include allowable operating times for construction activities, truck haul routes, clearance requirements, etc.;
12. Prior to the issuance of any permit for the Project, required permits for the truck haul routes, if applicable, shall be obtained from the City of Los Angeles;
13. Obtain a Caltrans transportation permit for use of oversized transport vehicles on Caltrans facilities; and
14. Submit a traffic management plan to Caltrans for approval to avoid potential access restrictions to and from Caltrans facilities.
15. In order to facilitate coordination with funeral processions, the Applicant shall provide the Forest Lawn Memorial-Park Association 72-hour notice of major improvements to Forest Lawn Drive.
16. During construction, lane closures on Forest Lawn Drive shall be limited in terms of scope and duration to the extent feasible. A minimum of one lane of through traffic shall be maintained on Forest Lawn Drive in each direction at all times.

Mitigation Measures B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, B-5, B-6.d, g, h, i, k, and l, B-7, B-8, B-9, B-10, B-12, B-13, B-15, B-16, B-18, B-19, B-20, B-22, B-23, B-26, B-27, B-28, B-29, B-30, B-31, B-33, B-34, B-35, B-36, B-37, B-38, B-39, B-40, B-41, B-45, B-46, and B-47 adopted by the City are not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction. For more information see Attachment B to the MMRP.

4. Findings

Specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the EIR.

5. Rationale for Findings

While implementation of the identified mitigation measures, including those previously adopted by the City, would reduce impacts, the Project's impacts on specific intersections and freeway segments, neighborhood intrusion, site access, and weaving (under the supplemental Caltrans analysis) would still remain significant and unavoidable. If any of the traffic mitigation measures within the City or County of Los Angeles or any other jurisdiction are determined to be

infeasible or necessary permits/approvals to implement the mitigation measures cannot be obtained, then a significant impact (or impacts) may remain. Furthermore, if implementation of any measure is delayed, a significant impact would occur until the implementation of the measure.

6. Reference

For a complete analysis of impacts related to the Project's Traffic/Access—Traffic/Circulation impacts, please see (1) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection 3.b(1) of Section II Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR; (2) Section IV.B.1, Traffic/Access – Traffic/Circulation, of the Draft EIR; (3) Appendices E-1 and E-2 to the Draft EIR; and (4) Appendices FEIR-14 and FEIR-15 to the Final EIR.

B. Noise (Construction & Demolition)

1. Description of Effects

Increased on-site noise levels would occur during demolition, site preparation activities, and the subsequent construction of proposed development of on-site structures. Construction would require the use of a number of pieces of heavy equipment such as bulldozers, backhoes, cranes, loaders, and concrete mixers. In addition, both heavy- and light-duty trucks would be required to deliver construction materials to and export construction debris from the site.

There is the potential for significant short-term noise impacts resulting from construction activities within the Project Site during daytime and nighttime hours. The analysis of potential construction noise impacts focused on the potential impacts of construction within the Studio, Business, and Entertainment Areas, the Back Lot Area, and all of these areas simultaneously. It is important to note that, to be conservative, the noise-reducing impact of project design features was not included in the construction analysis; accordingly, the construction noise analysis overstates potential noise levels related to construction activities.

The analysis of the Project construction concluded that un-mitigated construction noise may exceed the thresholds of significance at all of the receptor locations during the nighttime hours and almost all of the daytime hours. Mitigation measures are proposed to reduce construction noise impacts on area receptors. These mitigation measures would reduce the impacts onto the receptors, but depending on the receptor and ambient noise levels at the time of construction, daytime construction impacts may remain significant. During nighttime construction, impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels, except for those atypical conditions when exterior nighttime construction pursuant to the stated exceptions would occur.

2. Project Design Features

C-1: The Project shall not utilize pile driving machinery as part of its construction equipment mix.

Project Design Features C-2 and C-3 adopted by the City are not applicable to the portion of the Project in the County's jurisdiction.

3. Mitigation Measures

C-1: When Project construction staging occurs within 500 feet of an occupied residential structure that is located outside of the combined boundaries of the County Specific Plan and the City jurisdiction or along the frontage of Forest Lawn Memorial-Park, Hollywood Hills, the contractor shall:

- Locate stationary construction equipment away from the occupied residential structure or install temporary acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources; and
- Shut off construction equipment that is not in use.

C-2: Project construction or grading activity shall be permitted during the following times:

- Monday through Friday (non-legal Holidays) between 7:00 A.M. and 7:00 P.M.;
- Saturdays between 8:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M., except that no hauling shall occur along Forest Lawn Drive during this time.

Exceptions

Notwithstanding the above permitted times, the following construction activities may occur between 7:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. Monday through Friday (non-legal holidays), between 6:00 P.M. and 8:00 A.M. on Saturdays, and on Sundays and legal Holidays:

- Construction activities conducted within an enclosed structure that either: (1) do not result in an audible sound outside of the combined boundaries of the proposed County Specific Plan and the City jurisdiction; or (2) are located more than 400 feet from an occupied residential structure that is located outside of the combined boundaries of the proposed County Specific Plan and the City jurisdiction.
- Those construction activities which must occur during otherwise prohibited hours due to restrictions imposed by a public agency.
- Roofing activities in the Studio, Entertainment, and Business Areas which cannot be conducted during daytime hours due to weather conditions, provided at least 72 hour advance written notice is submitted to the County Department of Public Works or City Building and Safety Department, as appropriate to jurisdiction.
- Emergency repairs, such as repairs to damaged utility infrastructure.
- Project construction activities which cannot be interrupted (e.g., continuous concrete pours and other activities which affect health and safety as approved by the County Department of Public Works or City Building and Safety Department, as appropriate to jurisdiction).

4. Findings

Specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the EIR.

5. Rationale for Findings

This conclusion is conservative since the project design features would have a substantial effect in reducing construction noise. As a result, the construction noise analysis overestimates potential noise levels related to construction activity. Further, the mitigation measures recommended above would reduce the daytime noise levels associated with grading and construction activities attributable to the Project to some extent. However, depending on the receptor and ambient noise levels at the time of construction these activities could continue to substantially increase the daytime noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive uses above the established threshold. This would be considered a significant and unavoidable short-term impact when grading and construction activities associated with the Project occur near noise sensitive uses.

6. Reference

For a complete discussion of environmental impacts of Noise (Construction and Demolition), please see (1) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection 3.c, in Section II, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR; (2) Section IV.C of the Draft EIR; (3) Appendix C-1 to the Draft EIR; and (4) Appendix FEIR-16 to the Final EIR.

C. Air Quality (Construction: Regional Construction and Localized Construction; Operational: Regional Operations, Localized Operations, Concurrent Construction and Operations)

1. Description of Effects

a. Construction Impacts

Project construction has the potential to create air quality impacts through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and through vehicle trips generated from construction workers traveling to and from the Project Site. In addition, fugitive dust emissions would result from demolition and construction activities. Mobile source emissions, primarily nitrogen oxides, would result from the use of construction equipment such as dozers, loaders, and cranes. During the finishing phase, paving operations and the application of architectural coatings (i.e., paints) and other building materials would release volatile organic compounds. Construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of activity, the specific type of operation and, for dust, the prevailing weather conditions.

For the Project, air quality impacts for construction emissions were modeled using a conservative construction zone approach for new development areas. The construction zone approach uses conservative air quality modeling based on where construction and new Project developments are planned. Project development is represented by ten different construction zones located around the Project Site. The combined impact of construction in multiple construction zones was evaluated to identify the maximum potential impacts due to Project construction. As a conservative assumption, this analysis assumed that maximum construction activity will occur in all construction zones at the same time, even though this is unlikely to occur in practice.

(1) Regional Construction

To evaluate the short-term air quality impacts, the maximum emission rate during the entire construction period for each construction zone was identified and it was assumed that the maximum emission rate from each construction zone would occur at the same time. Since these maximum emission rates occur for relatively short periods of time during the construction schedule for each construction zone, this is a conservative approximation. The maximum offsite construction emissions were estimated for the construction activities for each land use type (i.e., Studio, Studio Office, Office, Entertainment, Entertainment Retail, Hotel, Amphitheater, and parking structures). Based on the anticipated construction schedule for each construction zone, the maximum offsite daily emissions were estimated by totaling the potential emissions for the various combinations of construction activities.

Based upon the emission estimates for the individual construction zones, the maximum total daily construction emissions (i.e., onsite plus offsite) were estimated. The maximum total daily mass emissions and the average total daily mass emissions show that the maximum construction emissions may exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds for CO, NO_x, VOC, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. The maximum construction emissions for SO_x would be less than the significance threshold. The average construction emissions are much lower, and only the NO_x and VOC average daily emissions may exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds. Implementation of proposed mitigation measures would work to reduce construction emissions. However, maximum site-wide regional construction impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} under peak construction conditions.

(2) Localized Construction

The maximum ambient air quality impacts for construction criteria pollutant emissions results indicate that hypothetical worst-case air quality impacts could exceed SCAQMD air quality significance thresholds for 1-hour and annual NO₂, and 24-hour PM₁₀. Results also show that estimated CO, sulfate, 24-hour PM_{2.5}, and annual PM₁₀ impacts are below SCAQMD thresholds. This analysis incorporates project design features (e.g., fugitive dust control and diesel particulate filters on selected construction equipment). The primary construction activities contributing to the maximum estimated impacts are earth moving and fuel combustion (e.g., construction vehicles). The reported short-term impacts (1-hour, 8-hour, 24-hour averages) are in part due to the assumed simultaneous occurrence of maximum construction conditions in all construction zones. It is possible that the simultaneous construction emissions from all construction zones may not occur and thus the actual impacts would be lower than that reported. Furthermore, the reported impacts represent the maximum impact from the worst case scenario of the maximum daily construction emissions from each construction zone occurring at the same time. Thus, the impacts during construction of the construction zones are expected to be less than that reported since the maximum values are for the conservative representation of the worst case construction occurring in each construction zone at the same time.

This analysis incorporates other conservative assumptions that likely overstate actual impacts. For short-term averaging times (e.g., 1-hour, 8-hour, 24-hour), the analysis uses maximum emission rates and evaluates them over all relevant meteorological conditions in the SCAQMD meteorological data set to determine the maximum air quality impact that might occur in any hour, which is the value reported. Because this analysis assumes that both maximum emissions and worst-hour meteorological conditions occur exactly at the same time (a

combination which may not even occur), there is a low probability that the reported maximum impacts will actually occur.

b. Operational Impacts

(1) Regional Operations

After build-out, operational emissions generated by both stationary and mobile sources would result from normal day-to-day activities at the Project Site. Emission estimates represent the potential increase (or decrease) in emissions due to the Project based on the demolition of sources as well as the creation of new sources as compared to baseline conditions. The estimated emissions are based on SCAQMD emission factors for new land use developments (e.g., Hotel) and increases in current emissions based on the square footage increase for the various land use types (e.g., Studio, Studio Office, Office, Entertainment, Entertainment Retail, Amphitheater). Project daily operations would generate maximum emissions of carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides that exceed the Southern California Air Quality Management District significance threshold resulting in a significant impact. Maximum emissions of sulfur oxides, volatile organic compounds, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} would be less than significant as they would not exceed the Southern California Air Quality Management District's significance thresholds.

(2) Localized Operations

The daily mass emissions of criteria pollutants associated with on-site Project operations were used to model maximum ambient air quality impacts. The operational emissions may result in maximum ambient air concentrations that exceed the Southern California Air Quality Management District air quality significance threshold for annual nitrogen dioxide, resulting in a significant impact. The estimated annual NO₂ concentration is primarily due to the background concentrations assumed for NO₂, which are based on the most recent measured NO₂ concentrations. The impacts due to the Project contribute to less than 5% of forecasted annual NO₂ level. The 2007 AQMP projects that NO_x emissions in the South Coast Air Basin will decrease substantially by 2030.¹ Results also show that estimated 1-hour NO₂, 24-hour PM₁₀, and annual PM₁₀, 24-hour PM_{2.5}, CO, and sulfate impacts would be below SCAQMD thresholds and below the 1-hour NO₂ Federal standard (188 ug/m³).

Relative to localized off-site impacts, carbon monoxide concentration levels were forecasted for those intersections that changed from Level of Service C to D as a result of the Project and for all intersections rated D or worse where the Project increases the volume-to-capacity ratio by two percent or more. Future carbon monoxide concentrations near these intersections would not exceed the national and State ambient air quality standards for carbon monoxide. Since a significant impact would not occur at the intersections operating at the highest Vehicle-to-Capacity ratio, no significant impacts would occur at any other analyzed roadway intersection as a result of Project-generated traffic volumes. Thus, the Project would not cause any new or exacerbate any existing carbon monoxide hotspots, and, as a result, impacts related to localized mobile-source carbon monoxide emissions would be less than significant.

Furthermore, the evaluation of existing conditions with the Project also did not show any exceedances of the SCAQMD significance thresholds for CO. Based on the conservative

¹ SCAQMD, 2007. Final 2007 Air Quality Management Plan.

screening procedures described above, four intersections met the SCAQMD criteria for further evaluation. There are no intersections that would exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds for CO.

(3) Concurrent Construction and Operation (Mid-Project Impacts)

The development of the Project through 2030 may lead to a situation where emissions from both construction and operation occur simultaneously. A hypothetical mid-Project scenario was identified based on the potential construction schedules. This scenario is conservative because it was developed to maximize the potential air quality impacts based on the likely construction schedules and operations.

The onsite operational emissions were adjusted to represent the incremental increase in emissions due to partial Project completion. The offsite emissions are based on emission estimates due to increased vehicle trips due to the new partial Project operations, and the offsite construction emissions are the maximum that may occur. The mid-Project Scenario emissions may exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds for CO, NO_x, and VOC. The mid-Project Scenario emissions would be below SCAQMD significance thresholds for PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}, and SO_x. With respect to onsite emissions, maximum impacts may exceed SCAQMD thresholds for 24-hour PM₁₀, and 1-hour and annual NO₂. Note that the new Federal 1-hour NO₂ standard is 188 ug/m³ and the Federal annual NO₂ standard is 100 ug/m³. The estimated impacts are greater than the Federal 1-hour NO₂ standard and less than the Federal annual NO₂ standard. Results show that the maximum impacts for CO and sulfates are below SCAQMD thresholds.

The chronic and noncancer risk impacts were also evaluated for the mid-Project scenario. The results show that the mid-Project scenario would not result in any chronic and acute noncancer impacts.

c. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

Both the County and the City of Los Angeles are located in the South Coast Air Basin and as such both jurisdictions rely on the South Coast Air Quality Management District for guidance regarding air quality issues and significance thresholds. Therefore, the location of jurisdictional boundaries has no effect on the assessment of impacts whether under the Project or the No Annexation scenario. As such, impacts associated with the No Annexation scenario would be the same as those identified above with regard to the Project.

d. Cumulative Impacts

According to the Southern California Air Quality Management District, individual construction projects that exceed the Southern California Air Quality Management District recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts would cause a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the South Coast Air Basin is in non-attainment. Construction-related daily emissions at the Project Site would exceed the Southern California Air Quality Management District significance threshold for all criteria pollutants except SO_x. Consequently, the Project would have a cumulative impact due to construction-related regional carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, and nitrogen oxides, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions. In terms of localized air quality impacts, construction of the Project would have a cumulative impact due to nitrogen dioxide (1-hour and annual) and PM₁₀ (24-hour) emissions. Other construction projects in the vicinity of the Project Site could also

contribute emissions that would cumulatively increase these concentrations. With respect to sulfur oxides, construction of the Project during all phases of construction at the Project Site would not exceed the Southern California Air Quality Management District significance threshold. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with sulfur oxides construction emissions would be less than significant.

According to the Southern California Air Quality Management District, individual projects that exceed the Southern California Air Quality Management District recommended daily thresholds for project-specific operation impacts would cause a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the Basin is in non-attainment. Operational emissions of the Project would exceed the Southern California Air Quality Management District thresholds for carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides. Consequently, the total emissions of these criteria pollutants would be cumulatively considerable.

Relative to localized offsite impacts, cumulative development is not expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of carbon monoxide. As discussed previously, the future 1-hour and 8-hour carbon monoxide concentrations at the study intersections in 2030 are based on the projected future traffic volumes from the study intersections contained in the traffic study for the Project, which takes into account emissions from the Project, future ambient growth, and cumulative growth in the Project area. As discussed above, future 1-hour and 8-hour carbon monoxide concentrations near the selected study intersections would not exceed their respective national or State ambient air quality standards. Therefore, carbon monoxide hotspots would not occur near these intersections in the future, and this cumulative impact would be less than significant.

2. Project Design Features

H-1: The Project Applicant or its successor shall implement fugitive dust control measures during Project construction in accordance with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403. The Project Applicant or its successor shall include in construction contracts the fugitive dust control measures in accordance with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, with construction controls being at least as effective as the following:

- Watering active construction areas at least twice daily to minimize fugitive dust emissions;
- Maintaining soil stabilization of inactive construction areas with exposed soil via water, non-toxic soil stabilizers, or replaced vegetation;
- Suspending earthmoving operations or requiring additional watering to meet Rule 403 criteria if wind gusts exceed 25 mph;
- Covering all haul trucks or maintaining at least six inches of freeboard;
- Minimizing track-out emissions; and
- Limiting vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour or less in staging areas and on-site haul roads.

H-2: Project Site haul roads during vertical construction shall be paved temporary or permanent paving.

H-3: Diesel-emitting construction equipment greater than 200 horsepower shall use diesel particulate filters having 85 percent removal efficiency based on California Air Resources Board verified technologies.

H-6: New on-site facility NO_x emissions shall be minimized through the use of emission control measures (e.g., use of best available control technology for new combustion sources such as boilers and water heaters) as required by South Coast Air Quality Management District Regulation XIII, New Source Review.

3. Mitigation Measures

H-1: The Project Applicant or its successor shall include in construction contracts the following control measures:

- Keep all construction equipment in proper tune and maintained in accordance with manufacturer's specifications.
- All contractors shall operate in compliance with the California Air Resource Board in-use off-road diesel engine rule.²
- Limit truck and equipment idling time to five minutes or less.
- Require the use of 2010 and newer diesel haul trucks (e.g., material delivery trucks and soil import/export), to the extent available.
- Rely on the electricity infrastructure surrounding the construction sites rather than electrical generators powered by internal combustion engines to the extent feasible.
- Use coatings and solvents with a VOC content lower than that required under AQMD Rule 1113, to the extent available.
- Appoint a construction relations officer to act as a community liaison concerning on-site construction activity including resolution of issues related to PM₁₀ generation.
- Require the use of pre-painted construction materials, to the extent available.

H-2: Construct or build with materials that do not require painting, to the extent available.

H-3: During Project construction, all internal combustion engines/construction equipment used on the Project Site for purposes of the Project construction shall be designed or retrofitted to meet EPA-Certified Tier 2 emissions standards, or higher, according to the following:

- January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2014: All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet Tier 3 off-road emissions standards, to the extent available. In addition, construction

² CARB, 2007. Regulation for In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicles. Article 4.8, Section 2449. Websites www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2007/ordiesel07/ordiesel07.htm, www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/ordiesel/ordiesel.htm.

equipment shall be outfitted with BACT devices certified by CARB to the extent available for such construction equipment. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations to the extent available for such equipment.

- Post-January 1, 2015: All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet the Tier 4 emission standards, to the extent available. In addition, construction equipment shall be outfitted with BACT devices certified by CARB to the extent available for such construction equipment. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations to the extent available for such equipment.
- For each applicable unit of construction equipment, a copy of the certified tier specification, BACT documentation, and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit, to the extent such are available for such construction equipment, shall be maintained and made available upon request by the lead agency.

H-4: The Project Applicant or its successor shall minimize delivery truck idling times to a maximum of five (5) minutes, per the California Air Resources Board's Airborne Toxic Control Measure.

H-5: The Project Applicant or its successor shall route delivery trucks via the most efficient route on the Project Site.

4. Findings

Specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the EIR.

5. Rationale for Findings

Implementation of the mitigation measures listed above would work to reduce Project construction emissions. However, maximum site-wide regional construction impacts would remain significant and unavoidable for carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Construction emissions would result in maximum ambient air concentrations, across all construction scenarios, that would exceed Southern California Air Quality Management District thresholds, thereby resulting in significant impacts, for nitrogen dioxide (1-hour and annual) and to PM₁₀ (24-hour and annual). Even with implementation of the mitigation measures listed above, impacts associated with these concentration levels could be significant and unavoidable. In addition, estimated construction emissions for the construction scenarios described above would cause maximum ambient concentrations to exceed the new federal 1-hour nitrogen dioxide standard, also resulting in a significant impact. Localized concentrations of all other criteria pollutants would be less than significant.

The Project would generate mass daily regional emissions of carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides that exceed the Southern California Air Quality Management District thresholds of significance. Even with implementation of the mitigation measures listed above, impacts associated with these criteria pollutants could be significant and unavoidable. Mass daily

emissions of all other criteria pollutants would be less than significant. Operational emissions would result in maximum ambient air concentrations that would exceed the Southern California Air Quality Management District thresholds for nitrogen dioxide (annual). Even with implementation of the mitigation measures listed above, impacts associated with this pollutant could be significant and unavoidable. Localized concentrations of all other criteria pollutants would be less than significant.

During the period of time when Project construction and operations are occurring concurrently, mass daily emissions of carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, and nitrogen oxides would exceed the Southern California Air Quality Management District thresholds of significance. Even with implementation of the mitigation measures listed above, impacts associated with these criteria pollutants would be significant and unavoidable. Mass daily sulfur oxide emissions during concurrent construction and operations would be less than significant. During the period of time when Project construction and operations are occurring concurrently, emissions would result in maximum ambient air concentrations that exceed Southern California Air Quality Management District air quality significance thresholds for PM₁₀ (24-hour and annual) and PM_{2.5} (24-hour) as well as the threshold for nitrogen dioxide (1-hour and annual) concentrations. In addition, estimated construction emissions would cause maximum ambient concentrations to exceed the new federal 1-hour nitrogen dioxide standard, also resulting in a significant impact. Even with implementation of the mitigation measures listed above, impacts associated with these concentration levels would be significant and unavoidable.

6. Reference

For a complete discussion of environmental impacts of Air Quality, please see (1) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection H, of Section II, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR; (2) Section IV.H of the Draft EIR; (3) Appendix H-1 of the EIR; and (4) Appendix FEIR-24 to the Final EIR.

D. Solid Waste (Operational: Landfill Capacity)

1. Description of Effects

a. Landfill Capacity

The Project would increase solid waste generation over existing conditions. Operation of the Project would generate an average of approximately 22.5 tons of solid waste daily. Existing onsite programs to recycle waste would continue into the future, and would be expanded to result in a diversion rate of 65 percent. Applying this same practice to the Project would result in 7.9 tons of solid waste that would need to be landfilled on a daily basis.

The Puente Hills and Chiquita Canyon Landfills would accept operational solid waste generated under the Project. Based on existing information, the closure dates for these two landfills occurs before 2030, the time horizon for buildout, therefore it is conservatively concluded that the Project would result in a significant impact due to the uncertainty regarding future landfill capacity.

b. Impacts Under No Annexation Scenario

The amount of solid waste generated would be the same under the No Annexation Scenario. Therefore, as is the case with the Project, due to the uncertainty in future availability and capacity of regional landfills, it is conservatively concluded that development under the No Annexation scenario would also result in a potentially significant impact with respect to landfill capacity.

c. Cumulative Impacts

Implementation of the Project in combination with the identified related projects and forecasted growth would further increase regional demands on landfill capacities. Based on forecasted growth within the County and City of Los Angeles, the City of Los Angeles would generate an additional 2,248.59 tons of solid waste per day based on forecasted growth between 2007 and 2030. Assuming the 56 percent diversion rate achieved by the City of Los Angeles in 2005, approximately 989.38 tons of solid waste would need to be landfilled on a daily basis. In comparison, all other areas within the County of Los Angeles (excluding the City of Los Angeles) would generate 5,149.26 tons of solid waste per day. Assuming the 50 percent diversion required by Assembly Bill 939, all other areas within Los Angeles County would generate 2,574.63 tons of solid waste per day that would need to be landfilled.

As discussed above, the Project would generate approximately 22.5 tons of solid waste per day, of which 65 percent would be recycled. Therefore, the actual amount of additional waste that would be landfilled is forecasted to be approximately 7.9 tons per day, with 1.9 tons per day resulting from the City portion of the Project Site and 6.0 tons per day resulting from the county portion of the Project Site. When waste from the City portion of the Project Site is added to the forecasted growth in the City's solid waste stream, the cumulative total that would need to be landfilled is 991.3 tons per day. As such, the City portion of the Project would contribute only a small fraction (0.2 percent) of the cumulative 2030 City solid waste stream that would need to be landfilled. Similarly, when solid waste generated from the County portion of the Project is added to the forecasted growth in the County solid waste stream that would need to be landfilled, the 2030 County solid waste stream that would need to be landfilled totals 2,580.6 tons per day. As such, the County portion of the Project would also contribute only a small fraction (0.2 percent) of the cumulative 2030 County solid waste stream that would need to be landfilled. Thus, the total amount of solid waste from forecasted growth that would need to be landfilled in Los Angeles County, including solid waste from the Project, would be 3,571.9 tons per day, of which the Project would contribute 7.9 tons per day, or approximately 0.2 percent. However, given the uncertainty of landfill capacity through 2030, cumulative impacts with respect to landfill capacity are concluded to be significant.

2. Project Design Features

L.3-5: During occupancy and operations, the Project shall have a solid waste diversion target of 65 percent of the non-hazardous waste (not including production activities and temporary uses).

3. Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are identified for this environmental issue.

4. Findings

Specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible additional mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the EIR.

5. Rationale for Findings

Because of the uncertainty regarding future landfill capacity to 2030, under the Project it is conservatively concluded that this would result in a significant impact.

6. Reference

For a complete discussion of environmental impacts of Solid Waste (Operational: Landfill Capacity), please see (1) Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative, subsection L.3., of Section II, Corrections and Additions, of the EIR; (2) Section IV.L.3 of the Draft EIR; and (3) NBC Universal Evolution Plan, Plan for Municipal Services for Proposed Annexation to the City of Los Angeles, October 2012.

IX. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

A. Summary of Findings

Based upon the following analysis, the County finds, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15096(g)(2), that no alternative (other than Alternative 10 that was adopted by the Lead Agency as the Project and is now being adopted by the County as a Responsible Agency) or feasible mitigation measure within its powers would substantially lessen or avoid any significant effect the Project would have on the environment.

B. Project Objectives

An important consideration in the analysis of alternatives to the originally proposed project is the degree to which such alternatives would achieve the objectives of the originally proposed project. To facilitate this comparison, the objectives of the originally proposed project contained in Section 1.B, Introduction/Summary of the Draft EIR and Section 5 of the Final EIR's discussion of Alternative 10 were compared to the alternatives.

The overall purpose of the originally proposed project is to provide a clear set of comprehensive guidelines under which future development of the Project Site would occur. The overall goal for future development is to provide new facilities to accommodate the growth of existing on-site businesses and to encourage the creation of new business and entertainment opportunities integrated with existing facilities.

The specific objectives of the originally proposed project are as follows:

- Provide Comprehensive Guidelines for Growth
- Expand Entertainment Industry and Complementary Uses of the Project Site
- Maintain and Enhance the Site's Role in the Entertainment Industry
- Create a Fully Integrated Site
- Continue the Tradition of Outdoor Uses

- Establish Jurisdictional Boundaries that Reflect Existing and Planned On-Site Land Use Patterns
- Fulfill Adopted Land Use and Transportation Policies
- Maximize Opportunities for the Local and Regional Economy
- Provide Certainty for Future Development
- Enhance the Identity of the Site as an Entertainment and Media-Oriented Commercial District
- Recognize Relationships with Neighbors
- Maximize the Efficient Use of the Project Site to Meet Regional Housing Needs.

In addition, the EIR contained additional objectives that specifically pertained to the originally proposed project's residential component:

- Locate residential development in proximity to a regional employment and entertainment center, within a site that is well serviced by existing and proposed infrastructure and services.
- Provide a physical design that incorporates a variety of housing product types (e.g., townhomes, mid-rise, and high-rise buildings), as well as efficient and aesthetically attractive streets in with convenient connections to adjoining mass transit, arterials, and freeways, while minimizing traffic impacts on existing residential neighborhoods.
- Create a pedestrian-friendly, mixed use community combining new housing with on-site neighborhood retail and community serving commercial uses, community service facilities, active and passive open space and other on-site amenities.

C. Project Alternatives

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), an EIR should identify any alternatives that were considered for analysis but rejected as infeasible and briefly explain the reasons for rejection. According to the CEQA Guidelines, among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration is the alternative's failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, the alternative's infeasibility, or the alternative's inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. Alternatives that have been considered and rejected are discussed below.

1. Alternative 1: No Project – Status Quo (No Additional Square Footage)

a. Description of Alternative

The Status Quo Alternative assumes that the originally proposed project would not be implemented and that on-site activities would be limited to the maintenance and replacement of existing land uses, with no increase in on-site floor area. Replacement buildings under this Alternative would be of the same type and floor area as what is being demolished, with the replacement buildings limited to the location of the building that is being demolished or

renovated. As such, replacement buildings would not increase the total amount of developed square footage within either the City or County jurisdictional areas. For example, a demolished building located in the City would not be replaced with the same use and floor area at another location within the City portions of the Project Site or anywhere within the County portion of the Project Site. In addition, under this Alternative, no changes in existing jurisdictional boundaries would occur (i.e., no annexation or detachment).

b. Impact Summary of Alternative 1

Alternative 1 would eliminate some of the significant impacts that would occur with the originally proposed project, including: operational air quality, traffic/circulation, noise, and solid waste. However, significant construction air quality impacts would occur under Alternative 1, as is the case with the originally proposed project. In addition, Alternative 1 could result in potentially significant impacts with regard to artificial light, glare, and historic resources that do not occur under the originally proposed project. Alternative 1 would result in the avoidance of most of the adverse, less than significant impacts anticipated to occur with the development of the originally proposed project, including among other things: land use – physical, operational noise, geology/soils, biota, visual qualities, public services, and utilities. On the other hand, Alternative 1 would eliminate net beneficial effects that would otherwise occur with implementation of the originally proposed project, including: advancing key regional, City, and County land use policies, creating new employment and housing opportunities, improving jobs/housing balance, and increasing parklands in the area.

c. Finding

Overall, the Status Quo Alternative would reduce adverse environmental impacts when compared with the development of the originally proposed project. Therefore, this Alternative would be an environmentally superior alternative to the Project. However, Alternative 1 would not address any of the project objectives. It is found pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make infeasible the No Project Alternative described in the EIR.

d. Rationale for Finding

Alternative 1 would not meet any of the project objectives. Specifically, Alternative 1 would not expand the existing on-site motion picture, television production and entertainment facilities or enhance the Project Site's role in the entertainment industry by meeting the growing and changing needs of the industry. In addition, Alternative 1 would not meet the project objectives to: create a fully integrated site (i.e., expanding existing uses while creating new entertainment facilities and residential uses); establish jurisdictional boundaries that reflect existing Project Site land use patterns; and fulfill adopted County and City land use and transportation policies (i.e., Transportation Demand Management program and transit connectivity) by locating the originally proposed project's growth at a regional transportation hub and in proximity to a jobs rich area.

Further, Alternative 1 would not provide a mixed-use community that fulfills adopted land use and transportation policies that ultimately decrease dependency on the automobile with resultant traffic, air quality and noise benefits, nor creates greater efficiencies in the utilization of infrastructure. This alternative would also not generate housing and recreational opportunities that would contribute to the existing supply in the Project area. Lastly, Alternative

1 would not provide certainty for future development on all portions of the Project Site, and the Project's beneficial effects to the local and regional economy would be lost.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 1, please see Section V of the Draft EIR.

2. Alternative 2: No Project – Reduced Existing Land Use Plans: Proposed Development Program

a. Description of Alternative

The purpose of this Alternative is to compare the originally proposed project to the incremental growth of the Project Site pursuant to the existing land use regulations that guide on-site development (i.e., respective County and City General Plans, zoning, and location specific land use approvals, e.g., existing Conditional Use Permits). As such, this alternative assumes that the Project's proposed General Plan amendments or zone changes are not required. In addition, neither the proposed City nor County Specific Plans would be implemented under Alternative 2. This alternative assumes that the Project Site would continue to function as it does today, with on-going demolition, construction, and relocation of structures with additional square footage limited to the quantities proposed under the Project that are also allowed under existing land use regulations. It is conservatively assumed that additional new development under Alternative 2 would only occur within the County portion of the Project Site, and that only replacement structures would occur in the City (i.e., no new additional development). In defining this alternative it is also important to note that the Project Site's existing zoning would allow most of the uses proposed for the County portion of the Project Site, except for hotel and child care uses.

Under these parameters, Alternative 2 would include a total of 939,402 square feet of net new studio, office, studio office, entertainment, and entertainment retail uses. This level of development was calculated based on the proportional acreage within each development area multiplied by the land use program under the originally proposed project within the corresponding development area. For example, if 75 percent of the Studio Area is located within the County and 100,000 square feet of studio uses are proposed in the Studio Area under the originally proposed project, then this alternative would assume that 75,000 square feet of studio uses would occur within the County portion of the Studio Area.

Under this alternative, the originally proposed project's residential program would not occur, nor would the associated 180,000 square feet of commercial/community-serving development proposed within the Mixed-Use Residential Area. As such, existing uses located in the Mixed-Use Residential Area would be retained. In addition, no hotel development would occur under this alternative and the existing child care center would not be relocated or expanded. Thus, Alternative 2 would be developed pursuant to the existing County zoning code and not the development standards set forth in the proposed County Specific Plan. In addition, under this Alternative, no changes in existing jurisdictional boundaries would occur (i.e., no annexation or detachment).

b. Impact Summary of Alternative 2

Alternative 2, while reducing the amount of on-site development, would reduce but not eliminate any of the originally proposed project's significant and adverse impacts. This alternative would continue to generate significant impacts to traffic, construction air quality, construction noise, and solid waste disposal. Furthermore, Alternative 2 would eliminate net beneficial effects that would otherwise occur with implementation of the originally proposed project, including: advancing key land use policies; the provision of housing; improving jobs/housing balance; and improving the parks ratio in the area. However, Alternative 2 would reduce the originally proposed project's significant operational air quality impact and less than significant impacts on noise from operations, improving public services (other than parks), biotic resources, aesthetics and views, and utilities among other issues.

c. Finding

Overall, Alternative 2 would not introduce additional significant environmental impacts, except by not implementing certain improvements associated with the development of the originally proposed project. Also, Alternative 2 would meet only some of the project objectives. It is found pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make Alternative 2 described in the EIR infeasible.

d. Rationale for Finding

Alternative 2 would meet only some of the project objectives. Specifically, objectives that would not be met include those that pertain to the originally proposed project's residential component such as locating residential development in proximity to an employment center, providing efficient and aesthetically attractive streets in the residential community, and creating a pedestrian friendly mixed use community. In addition, Alternative 2 would not meet the project objective to provide for a physical design that would include a range of housing types as no residential development would occur. Furthermore, this Alternative would not provide a mixed-use community that fulfills adopted land use and transportation policies that ultimately decrease dependency on the automobile with resultant traffic, air quality and noise benefits, nor create greater efficiencies in the utilization of infrastructure. Development under Alternative 2 would also not provide certainty for future development of the Project Site as the proposed Specific Plans would not be implemented.

Conversely, the objectives for the continuation of the Project Site's role in the entertainment industry and the enhancement of the Project Site as a media-oriented commercial district would be met under this Alternative. This is due to the continued growth and complementary use of the Project Site as a regional entertainment center that would help promote the regional economy by providing office, studio, and entertainment uses that are consolidated on a single property. However, the lack of hotel development under Alternative 2 would result in realizing these objectives to a lesser degree than under the originally proposed project.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 2, please see Section V of the Draft EIR.

3. Alternative 3: No Project – Reduced Existing Land Use Plans: 2:1 FAR Limited Development Program

a. Description of Alternative

The purpose of this Alternative is to compare the proposed project to the incremental growth of the Project Site pursuant to the existing land use regulations that guide on-site development (i.e., respective County and City General Plans, zoning, and location-specific land use approvals, e.g., Conditional Use Permits). As such, Alternative 3 assumes that no General Plan amendments or zone changes are required to implement the alternative. In addition, neither the proposed City nor County Specific Plans would be implemented. This alternative assumes that the Project Site would continue to function as it does today, with ongoing demolition, construction, and relocation of structures. The growth that is assumed to occur under this alternative would only occur within the County portions of the Project Site as limited development potential exists within the City portions of the Project Site.

Thus, additional new development assumed to occur under this alternative would only occur within the County portion of the Project Site, and only replacement structures would occur in the City. In defining this alternative it is also important to note that the Project Site's existing zoning would allow most of the uses proposed for the County portion of the Project Site.

Most of the County portion of the Project Site is zoned M-1½, which allows for a floor area ratio of 13:1. Under Alternative 3, the analyzed development program is equivalent to a 2:1 floor area ratio applied to the existing County portion of the Project Site that is not otherwise governed by a Conditional Use Permit. Land uses developed under this Alternative would be limited to those uses permitted by the existing land use plans that guide on-site development. As such, it would allow a broad range of industrial and commercial uses, including most of the uses proposed for the originally proposed project except for residential, hotel and child care uses. Under these parameters, this alternative would include studio, office, studio office, entertainment, and entertainment retail uses. As such, under this alternative the originally proposed project's residential program would not occur, nor would the associated 180,000 square feet of commercial development proposed within the Mixed-Use Residential Area. In addition, no hotel or child care center development would occur under this alternative. Furthermore, development under Alternative 3 would occur in a manner consistent with building heights and other related County development standards (i.e., this alternative would be developed pursuant to existing County zoning codes and not the development standards set forth in the proposed Specific Plans).

As this alternative is defined by a floor area ratio level across the County portions of the Project Site, the calculation of the amount of development analyzed under this Alternative needs to consider both the maximum amount of development that could occur within the County under a 2:1 floor area ratio and existing development within the County. Under existing jurisdictional boundaries, a total of 296 acres are located within the County of Los Angeles. Of this total, 71.7 acres are under the jurisdiction of County Conditional Use Permit 90-074 which places various limitations on activities within the Conditional Use Permit area. For the purposes of this alternative, it is assumed that development would not occur within this portion of the Project Site. With a floor area ratio of 2:1, the remaining 224.3 acres within the County portion of the Project Site (i.e., 296 acres minus 71.7 acres) translates to a total of 19.5 million square feet of development. Existing and interim project development totals 4.1 million square feet. As such, the incremental development (over existing and interim project conditions) analyzed under this Alternative is 15.4 million square feet. While this represents a seven to eightfold increase

in development over the originally proposed project, it still represents only a small fraction of the Project Site's development potential under existing County zoning. As stated above, the County's M-1½ zoning allows a floor area ratio of 13:1. Applying this floor area ratio to all 224.3 acres in the County yields a development potential of over 127 million square feet, or nearly eight times more development than is assumed under this alternative.

The amount of incremental development by land use category under this alternative is calculated mainly based on the proportion that each land use category represents of the Project's proposed development program. Based on these parameters, the development program that is analyzed under this alternative is: (1) studio – 3,349,700 square feet; (2) studio office -- 4,701,600 square feet; (3) office -- 5,389,200 square feet; (4) entertainment -- 1,583,700 square feet; and (5) entertainment retail -- 426,400 square feet. In addition, under Alternative 3, the amphitheater would be demolished and replaced with a new 60,000 square foot venue.

b. Impact Summary of Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would substantially increase the overall density of development on the Project Site and would ultimately increase the intensity of the Project's significant impacts. Alternative 3 would generate significant impacts with regard to traffic, air quality, construction noise, and solid waste disposal at an increased level when compared to the originally proposed project. Specifically, this alternative would nearly triple the daily trips to and from the Project Site, which would result in 15 to 20 times greater number of intersections being significantly impacted in and around the area of the Project Site when compared to the originally proposed project. Also, significant visual character and view impacts would occur within the Hollywood Manor area near the eastern border of the Project Site due to the overall increase in mass and height of structures that do not occur under the originally proposed project. In addition, structures that could be located along Lankershim Boulevard may result in significant natural light impacts at the Campo de Cahuenga, Weddington Park (South), and City View Lofts. In comparison, natural light impacts with mitigation are less than significant under the originally proposed project.

In addition, Alternative 3 would eliminate net beneficial effects that would otherwise occur with implementation of the originally proposed project, including: advancing key land use policies, the provision of housing, and improving jobs/housing balance and parklands in the area. Specifically, there would be no increase in total housing capacity, while total indirect population and employment would increase from expanded development. Thus, this Alternative would exacerbate the imbalance in the jobs/housing ratio in the local and sub-regional areas. Alternative 3 would also increase the Project's adverse, but less than significant impacts on electricity and natural gas consumption, water consumption, and wastewater generation, among other things.

However, Alternative 3 would reduce the originally proposed project's less than significant impacts on surface water quality, drainage, and biotic resources, among other issues.

c. Finding

Overall, Alternative 3 would produce a greater number of significant impacts than the originally proposed project, while also increasing the severity of the originally proposed project's significant impacts. Also, Alternative 3 would meet only some of the project objectives. It is found pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal,

social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make Alternative 3 described in the EIR infeasible.

d. Rationale for Finding

Alternative 3 would meet only some of the project objectives. Specifically, objectives that would not be met include those that pertain to the originally proposed project's residential component such as locating residential development in proximity to an employment center, providing efficient and aesthetically attractive streets in the residential community, and creating a pedestrian friendly mixed use community. Furthermore, this alternative would not provide a mixed-use community that fulfills adopted land use and transportation policies that ultimately decrease dependency on the automobile with resultant traffic, air quality, and noise benefits, nor create greater efficiencies in the utilization of infrastructure. Development under Alternative 3 would also not provide certainty for future development of the Project Site as the proposed Specific Plans would not be implemented. The lack of housing along with the much greater amount of commercial activity would exacerbate jobs/housing imbalance.

Conversely, the objectives for the continuation of the Project Site's role in the entertainment industry and the enhancement of the Project Site as a media-oriented commercial district would be met under this Alternative. This is due to the continued growth and complementary use of the Project Site as a regional entertainment center that would help promote the regional economy by providing office, studio, and entertainment uses that are consolidated on a single property. However, the lack of hotel development under Alternative 3 would result in realizing these objectives to a somewhat lesser degree than under the originally proposed project.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 3, please see Section V of the Draft EIR.

4. Alternative 4: Reduced Intensity

a. Description of Alternative

The Reduced Intensity Alternative includes all the proposed types of land uses that are part of the originally proposed project, but reduces the quantity of net new development that would occur at the Project Site by 25 percent across all land use categories. This overall reduction in land use intensity would result in a total of approximately 1,491,063 net new square-feet of floor area, including 375 hotel rooms and hotel-related facilities as well as 2,203 residential units. Development under Alternative 4 would occur in accordance with all of the provisions set forth in the proposed County and City Specific Plans, including, but not limited to, all proposed development standards, as well as proposed streetscape and circulation plans. In terms of floor area by land use category, net new development under Alternative 4 would consist of 230,962 square feet of studio uses; 327,994 square feet of studio office uses; 371,554 square feet of office uses, 109,241 square feet of entertainment uses, 29,412 square feet of entertainment retail uses, and 337,500 square feet of hotel uses, including up to 375 hotel rooms. Similar to the originally proposed project, the amphitheater would be demolished under this alternative and replaced with a new, smaller entertainment venue. The proposed

Mixed-Use Residential Area portion of the Project Site would see neighborhood retail and community-serving commercial uses reduced to approximately 135,000 square feet with a smaller residential land use program totaling 2,203 units. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would be developed across the entire 391-acre Project Site, like the originally proposed project, but at a reduced level. In addition, under Alternative 4, the Project's proposed changes in existing jurisdictional boundaries would occur (i.e., annexation/detachment).

b. Impact Summary of Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would reduce the originally proposed project's density of development within the Project Site by 25 percent across all of the Project's land use categories. As many of the originally proposed project's potential environmental impacts are directly related to the amount of development that occurs, Alternative 4 would lessen these types of impacts, including most of those for which the originally proposed project would result in significant impacts. Even though most of the originally proposed project's significant impacts would be reduced under Alternative 4, they would not be sufficiently reduced to less than significant levels. As such, Alternative 4, as is the case with the originally proposed project, would result in significant impacts with regard to traffic, air quality, construction noise, and solid waste disposal. While impacts for a number of issues would be reduced under Alternative 4, the reduced levels of development under this alternative also serve to reduce the beneficial impacts of the originally proposed project, particularly with regard to advancing key land use policies and the provision of new employment and housing in an existing urbanized area in proximity to multiple transit lines and major employment centers.

c. Finding

In summary, Alternative 4 would not introduce additional significant environmental impacts, and in many cases would lessen the originally proposed project's overall impacts, including beneficial impacts. Alternative 4 would meet all of the project objectives, but to a lesser degree than what occurs under the originally proposed project due to the overall decrease in the amount of development. It is found pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make Alternative 4 described in the EIR infeasible.

d. Rationale for Finding

The objectives for continuing the Project Site's role in the entertainment industry and the enhancement of the Project Site as a media-oriented commercial district would be met under Alternative 4, but to a lesser degree given the reduced amount of studio and studio-related uses. In addition, Alternative 4 would not promote the regional economy to as great an extent as the originally proposed project by providing lower levels of office, studio, and entertainment uses. With regard to the proposed residential development, as Alternative 4 would provide less housing than the originally proposed project, it would not meet the Project objective to maximize the overall amount of housing units on the Project Site to help meet regional housing needs consistent with the County and City General Plans and SCAG's Regional Housing Needs Assessment.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 3, please see Section V of the Draft EIR.

5. Alternative 5: Mixed-Use Residential High-Rise

a. Description of Alternative

The Mixed-Use Residential High-Rise Alternative includes the same amount of development and proposed uses as set forth for the originally proposed project, but all of the residential structures in the Mixed-Use Residential Area would be high-rise structures of approximately 25 stories in height. Based on future grade levels, buildings under Alternative 5 would reach heights of between 800 feet above mean sea level in the northern portion of the Mixed-Use Residential Area to approximately 1,050 feet above mean sea level in the southwestern portion of the Mixed-Use Residential Area. Commercial and community serving uses within the Mixed-Use Residential Area would be developed in 1- or 2-story buildings. Under this alternative, the same amount of commercial and residential development as the Project (i.e., 2.01 million square feet of commercial development, which includes 500 hotel rooms and related hotel facilities, and 2,937 residential units) would occur. New development under Alternative 5 would be the same as the originally proposed project within the Studio, Entertainment, and Business Areas, but the Mixed-Use Residential Area would be developed with different building locations and open space configurations compared to the originally proposed project.

Under Alternative 5, the development profile within the Mixed-Use Residential Area would change from a mix of residential building heights to the development of only high-rise buildings. The roughly 15-20 high-rise buildings that would be constructed under Alternative 5 would be spread across those portions of the Mixed-Use Residential Area that allow height exceptions. It is assumed that the 180,000 square feet of proposed retail and community uses would be developed throughout the balance of the Mixed-Use Residential Area. Based on these assumptions development under Alternative 5 would occur across all of the Mixed-Use Residential Area's Mixed-Use Universal City District and occupy the same 391-acre area as the originally proposed project. As fewer buildings would be built under this alternative, the separation between buildings, on average, would increase.

As with the originally proposed project, changes in existing jurisdictional boundaries would also occur under this alternative (i.e., annexation or detachment). All proposed streetscape and circulation plans would be implemented as proposed under the Project, with some modifications to development standards in the originally proposed project (i.e., building heights within certain portions of the Mixed-Use Residential Area would be adjusted to allow 25-story structures).

b. Impact Summary of Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would create greater effects than the originally proposed project in terms of significant impacts. Specifically, Alternative 5 would generate significant impacts with regard to visual character, which do not occur under the originally proposed project. In addition, due to the same amounts and types of uses, development under Alternative 5 would not lessen any of the originally proposed project's significant adverse impacts. Thus, Alternative 5 would continue to generate significant impacts to traffic, air quality, construction noise, and solid waste disposal. Conversely, as with the originally proposed project, beneficial effects would occur with implementation of this alternative with regard to advancing key land use plans and policies,

parks and recreation, and housing. By providing housing and employment opportunities under this alternative, the imbalance in the jobs/housing ratio in the local and sub-regional areas would be improved.

c. Finding

Alternative 5 would meet all of the project objectives. But, as described above, significant visual character impacts could occur for those geographic areas near the eastern border of the Project Site due to the overall increase in mass and height of structures. Thus, Alternative 5 would have greater impacts than the originally proposed project. It is found pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make Alternative 5 described in the EIR infeasible.

d. Rationale for Finding

Alternative 5 would provide a mixed-use community that fulfills adopted land use and transportation policies that ultimately decrease dependency on the automobile with resultant traffic, air quality and noise benefits, and creates greater efficiencies in the utilization of infrastructure. As Alternative 5 would be developed pursuant to the proposed County and City Specific Plans, development under Alternative 5 would also provide certainty for future development of the Project Site. Objectives that would be met under Alternative 5 that pertain to the originally proposed project's residential component include: locating residential development in proximity to an employment center, providing efficient and aesthetically attractive streets in the residential community, and creating a pedestrian friendly mixed-use community. However, Alternative 5 would not meet the project objective to provide for a physical design that would include a range of housing types as all of the residential structures in the Mixed-Use Residential Area would be high-rise structures.

In addition, the project objectives with regards to the continuation of the Project Site's role in the entertainment industry and the enhancement of the Project Site as a media-oriented commercial district would also continue to be met under this alternative.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 5, please see Section V of the Draft EIR.

6. Alternative 6: Mixed-Use Residential Mid-Rise

a. Description of Alternative

The Mixed-Use Residential Mid-Rise Alternative includes the same amount of development and proposed uses as set forth for the originally proposed project, but all of the residential structures in the Mixed-Use Residential Area would be mid-rise structures of approximately 5-6 stories in height (i.e., less than 75 feet in height). Commercial and community serving uses within the Mixed-Use Residential Area would be developed in 1- or 2-story buildings or integrated into the ground floor of the mid-rise buildings. Under this alternative, the same amount of commercial and residential development as the originally proposed project (i.e., 2.01 million square feet of commercial development, including 500 hotel rooms and related hotel

facilities, and 2,937 residential units) would occur. New development under Alternative 6 would be the same as the originally proposed project within the Studio, Entertainment, and Business Areas, but the Mixed-Use Residential Area would be developed with different building locations and configurations compared to the originally proposed project.

Under Alternative 6, the development profile within the Mixed-Use Residential Area would change from a mix of residential building heights to the development of only mid-rise buildings. As such, development under Alternative 6 would occur across all of the Mixed- Use Residential Area's Mixed-Use Universal City District and occupy the same 391-acre area as the originally proposed project, but would result in more buildings and less spacing between buildings.

As with the originally proposed project, it is assumed that changes in existing jurisdictional boundaries would also occur under this alternative (i.e., annexation/detachment). All proposed streetscape and circulation plans would be implemented as proposed under the Project.

b. Impact Summary of Alternative 6

Alternative 6 would create similar effects as the originally proposed project within all of the identified environmental issue areas in terms of significant impacts. Also, due to the same amount and types of uses, development under Alternative 6 would not lessen any of the originally proposed project's significant adverse impacts. This alternative would continue to generate significant impacts to traffic, air quality, construction noise, and solid waste disposal. Conversely, as with the Project beneficial effects would occur with implementation of this alternative with regard to advancing key land use plans and policies, parks and recreation, and housing. By providing housing and employment opportunities, which both occur under this alternative, the imbalance in the jobs/housing ratio in the local and sub-regional areas would be improved.

c. Finding

Overall, Alternative 6 would create similar effects as the originally proposed project. Alternative 6 would meet all but one of the project objectives. However, Alternative 6 would not meet the project objective to provide for a physical design that would include a range of housing types. It is found pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make Alternative 4 described in the EIR infeasible.

d. Rationale for Finding

Alternative 6 would meet all but one of the project objectives. Specifically, Alternative 6 would provide a mixed-use community that fulfills adopted land use and transportation policies that ultimately decreases dependency on the automobile with resultant traffic, air quality and noise benefits, and creates greater efficiencies in the utilization of infrastructure. As Alternative 6 would be developed pursuant to the proposed County and City Specific Plans, development under Alternative 6 would also provide certainty for future development of the Project Site. Objectives that would be met under Alternative 6 that pertain to the originally proposed project's residential component include locating residential development in proximity to an employment center, providing efficient and aesthetically attractive streets in the residential community, and

creating a pedestrian friendly mixed use community. However, Alternative 6 would not meet the project objective of maximizing the efficient use of the project site through physical design that would include a range of housing types as all of the residential structures in the Mixed-Use Residential Area would be mid-rise structures of approximately 5–6 stories in height.

In addition, the project objectives with regard to the continuation of the Project Site's role in the entertainment industry and the enhancement of the Project Site as a media-oriented commercial district would also continue to be met under this alternative.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 6, please see Section V of the Draft EIR.

7. Alternative 7: Environmental Equivalency Alternative

a. Description of Alternative

The Environmental Equivalency Alternative is a hypothetical alternative land use mix that was developed taking into consideration the equivalency program provisions of both the proposed County and City Specific Plans. As such, the hypothetical land use changes analyzed as Alternative 7 are defined as follows: (1) proposed County Specific Plan – change 75,000 square feet of office uses to 18,000 square feet of entertainment retail uses; and (2) proposed Universal City Specific Plan – change 990 residential units to 49,000 square feet of retail uses and 200 hotel rooms. All other aspects of Alternative 7 are the same as the originally proposed project. In addition, under Alternative 7, the originally proposed project's proposed changes in jurisdictional boundaries would occur (i.e., annexation and detachment) and development would occur in accordance with the provisions of both the proposed County and City Specific Plans.

b. Impact Summary of Alternative 7

Thus, the equivalency transfers that are incorporated into Alternative 7 would be in compliance with the equivalency transfer provisions of the proposed County and City Specific Plans. As a result, implementation of the equivalency transfers that are incorporated into Alternative 7 would constitute a valid set of equivalency transfers and would not result in environmental impacts that are greater than those of the originally proposed project.

c. Finding

Alternative 7 impacts would be less than or equivalent to those of the originally proposed project in all of the environmental issue categories that are analyzed in this Draft EIR.

d. Rationale for Finding

Alternative 7 is a hypothetical alternative land use mix based on the proposed County and City Specific Plans.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 7, please see Section V of the Draft EIR.

8. Alternative 8: East/West Road Without Forman Avenue Extension

a. Description of Alternative

Alternative 8 involves the construction of the East-West Road, with three travel lanes in each direction, generally located along the Project Site's northern edge and connecting Barham Boulevard and Lankershim Boulevard. The extension of Forman Avenue to Riverside Drive to the north, as shown on the County Highway Plan, is not included as part of this alternative. The proposed alignment of the East-West Road would be routed through the existing on-site studio and production facilities, thus, requiring the demolition of existing on-site land uses.

b. Impact Summary of Alternative 8

Alternative 8 impacts with regard to traffic, air quality, noise, and historic resources would be greater than those that occur under the originally proposed project, and would have similar impacts with regard to all other environmental issues analyzed in this Draft EIR. Due to the shift in the distribution of vehicle trips in the Project area, Alternative 8 would increase vehicle/capacity ratios such that significant impacts would remain at a greater number of intersections during the morning and afternoon peak hours than under the originally proposed project. Additionally, as the proposed US 101 Freeway southbound on-ramp at Universal Studios Boulevard would not be constructed under Alternative 8, a significant impact would remain at one additional freeway segment that would not occur under the originally proposed project.

The increase in the overall amount of construction associated with Alternative 8 would also increase construction air quality impacts over that of the originally proposed project and would locate construction emissions in closer proximity to off-site sensitive receptors to the north, and also to those off-site sensitive receptors at locations that are located east and west of where the East-West Road would connect to Barham and Lankershim Boulevards. As a result, health impacts related to operational localized air emissions at these receptors would be significant and greater than the less than significant impacts under the originally proposed project. Similarly, locating on-site vehicles closer to sensitive receptors would increase noise impacts at these receptors over what would occur under the originally proposed project. As the alignment of the East-West Road would require the demolition of a notably larger number of buildings deemed as contributors to the potential Universal Studios Historic District than the originally proposed project, Alternative 8 would result in a significant impact to historic resources, whereas the originally proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to historic resources with the implementation of mitigation.

c. Finding

Alternative 8 would meet all of the project objectives, with the exception of one: recognizing the Project Site's relationship with its neighbors. By placing the East-West Road within close proximity to residential neighborhoods across the Los Angeles River Flood Control Channel north of the Project Site, as well as at locations immediately to the east and west of the locations where the East-West Road connects to Barham and Lankershim Boulevards, Alternative 8 would increase noise and air quality impacts at these receptors. It is found pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make Alternative 4 described in the EIR infeasible.

d. Rationale for Finding

As the total amount of overall development and the distribution of proposed development across the Project Site under Alternative 8 would be similar to the originally proposed project, objectives that pertain to the continuation of the Project Site's role in the entertainment industry and the enhancement of the Project Site as a media-oriented commercial district would be met under this alternative. This is due to the continued growth and complementary use of the Project Site as a regional entertainment center that would help promote the regional economy by providing office, studio, and entertainment uses. In addition, this alternative would also achieve the objective of setting forth Specific Plans that would provide certainty for future development of the Project Site.

Alternative 8 would also achieve project objectives with regard to locating residential development in proximity to an employment center, providing efficient and aesthetically attractive streets in the residential community, and creating a pedestrian-friendly mixed-use community. Additionally, Alternative 8 would provide a mixed-use community that fulfills adopted land use policies that ultimately decreases dependency on the automobile with resultant traffic, air quality and noise benefits, while creating greater efficiencies in the utilization of infrastructure. Nonetheless, Alternative 8 would not meet the objective of recognizing the Project Site's relationship with its neighbors.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 3, please see Section V of the Draft EIR.

9. Alternative 9: East/West Road with Forman Avenue Extension

a. Description of Alternative

Under Alternative 9, in addition to the East-West Road, the Forman Avenue extension, as set forth in the County Highway Plan, would also be constructed. As such, under Alternative 9, the East-West Road would connect Barham Boulevard and Lankershim Boulevards, as described under Alternative 8, and the Forman Avenue extension would connect the East-West Road to Riverside Drive to the north. Under this alternative, the Forman Avenue extension would provide two travel lanes in each direction.

b. Impact Summary of Alternative 9

Alternative 9 impacts with regard to traffic, air quality, noise, and historic resources would be greater than those that occur under the originally proposed project, and would have similar impacts with regard to all other environmental issues analyzed in this Draft EIR. In addition, Alternative 9 impacts with regard to traffic, air quality, and noise would also be greater than the corresponding impacts under Alternative 8.

Due to the shift in the distribution of vehicle trips in the Project area, Alternative 9 would increase vehicle/capacity ratios such that significant impacts would remain at a greater number of intersections during the morning and afternoon peak hours than under the originally proposed project. Furthermore, as the proposed US 101 Freeway southbound onramp at Universal Studios Boulevard would not be constructed under Alternative 9, a significant impact would

remain at one additional freeway segment that does not occur under the originally proposed project.

The increase in the overall amount of construction associated with Alternative 9 would also increase construction air quality impacts over that of the originally proposed project and would locate construction emissions in closer proximity to off-site sensitive receptors. While the overall regional operational air emissions would be similar to the originally proposed project, Alternative 9 would locate on-site and off-site vehicles closer to sensitive receptors to the north, and to the east and west of where the East-West Road would connect to Barham and Lankershim Boulevards. As a result, health impacts related to operational localized air emissions at these receptors would be greater than under the originally proposed project and Alternative 8.

Similarly, locating vehicles closer to sensitive receptors would increase noise impacts at these receptors over what would occur under the originally proposed project. As the alignment of the East-West Road would require the demolition of a notably larger number of buildings deemed as contributors to the potential Universal Studios Historic District than the originally proposed project, Alternative 9, as is the case with Alternative 8, would result in a new significant impact to historic resources, whereas the originally proposed project would result in a less than significant impact to historic resources with the implementation of mitigation.

c. Finding

Alternative 9 would meet all of the project objectives, with the exception of one. Alternative 9 would not meet the objective of recognizing the Project Site's relationship with its neighbors. By placing the East-West Road and the Forman Avenue Extension within close proximity to residential neighborhoods across the Los Angeles River Flood Control Channel to the north of the Project Site, as well as at locations immediately to the east and west of the locations where the East-West Road connects to Barham and Lankershim Boulevards, Alternative 9 would increase noise and air quality impacts at these receptors. It is found pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(3), that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in Section XII of these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), make Alternative 4 described in the EIR infeasible.

d. Rationale for Finding

Project objectives that pertain to the continuation of the Project Site's role in the entertainment industry and the enhancement of the Project Site as a media-oriented commercial district would be met under this alternative as well. This is due to the continued growth and complementary use of the Project Site as a regional entertainment center that would help promote the regional economy by providing office, studio, and entertainment uses. In addition, this alternative would also achieve the objective of setting forth Specific Plans that would provide certainty for future development of the Project Site.

Alternative 9 would also achieve project objectives with regard to locating residential development in proximity to an employment center, providing efficient and aesthetically attractive streets in the residential community, and creating a pedestrian friendly mixed use community. Additionally, Alternative 9 would provide a mixed-use community that fulfills adopted land use policies that ultimately decreases dependency on the automobile with resultant traffic, air quality and noise benefits, while creating greater efficiencies in the utilization of

infrastructure. Nonetheless, Alternative 9 would not meet the objective of recognizing the Project Site's relationship with its neighbors. Due to the inclusion of the Forman Avenue Extension, these impacts would be greater under Alternative 9 than under Alternative 8.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative 9, please see Section V of the Draft EIR.

10. Alternative 10: No Residential Alternative

Alternative 10 was adopted by the Lead Agency as the Project and is now being adopted by the County as a Responsible Agency, and has been described throughout these CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations as the Project.

Alternative 10 would meet most, but not all of the project objectives due to the elimination of the proposed residential, neighborhood retail and community-serving commercial uses in the existing Back Lot Area. Specifically, objectives that would not be met include those that pertain to the originally proposed project's residential component such as locating residential development in proximity to an employment center, providing efficient and aesthetically attractive streets in the residential community, and creating a pedestrian friendly mixed use community. Furthermore, Alternative 10 would not provide a mixed-use community that fulfills adopted land use and transportation policies that ultimately decrease dependency on the automobile with resultant traffic, air quality, and noise benefits, nor create greater efficiencies in the utilization of infrastructure. However, Alternative 10 would provide similar certainty for future development of the Project Site as it is anticipated that modified Specific Plans would be adopted under Alternative 10 that would guide the development of the Project Site.

Conversely, the objectives for the continuation of the Project Site's role in the entertainment industry and the enhancement of the Project Site as a media-oriented commercial district would be met and increased under Alternative 10. This is due to the continued growth and complementary use of the Project Site as a regional entertainment center that would help promote the regional economy by providing office, studio, and entertainment uses that are consolidated on a single property. For instance, Alternative 10 would meet, to a greater extent than the originally proposed project, the objective to expand entertainment industry and complementary uses of the Project Site, the objective to maintain and enhance the Project Site's role in the entertainment industry, and the objective to continue the tradition of outdoor film and television production facilities uniquely integrated with the theme park and business uses within the Project Site.

D. Environmentally Superior Alternative

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that an analysis of alternatives to a originally proposed project shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR. In addition, Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines states that: "If the environmentally superior alternative is the 'No Project' Alternative, then the EIR shall identify the environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives."

The selection of an environmentally superior alternative is based on an evaluation of the extent to which the alternatives reduce or eliminate the significant impacts associated with the Project, and on a comparison of the remaining environmental impacts of each alternative.

Through the comparison of the environmental characteristics and potential impacts of each of the alternatives, Alternative 2, No Project – Existing Land Use Plans: Proposed Development Program, was concluded to have a lesser degree of environmental effect than any of the other project alternatives without resulting in additional significant impacts that do not occur under the originally proposed project. While Alternative 2 was selected as the environmentally superior alternative, Alternative 2 would meet only some of the objectives of the originally proposed project. Further, it should be noted that none of the alternatives analyzed would eliminate all of the originally proposed project's significant impacts and that some of the alternatives would result in significant environmental impacts that do not occur under the originally proposed project.

However, CEQA requires that when the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, another alternative needs to be selected as environmentally superior. In accordance with this directive, in the Final EIR, the No Residential Alternative (Alternative 10) was selected as the environmentally superior alternative. Although the Draft EIR selected Alternative 4, Reduced Intensity, as the environmentally superior alternative, the Final EIR included an analysis of Alternative 10, and that analysis showed that Alternative 10, not Alternative 4, would be the environmentally superior alternative.

Alternative 10 was selected as the environmentally superior alternative because it would reduce all of the originally proposed project's significant impacts without resulting in new significant impacts that do not occur under the originally proposed project. This occurs as Alternative 10 represents a significant reduction in the overall density of the originally proposed project by eliminating the entire residential portion of the originally proposed project while increasing the Studio Office and Entertainment uses of the originally proposed project.

Even though most of the originally proposed project's significant impacts would be reduced under Alternative 10, they would not be sufficiently reduced to less than significant levels. As such, Alternative 10, as is the case with the originally proposed project, would result in significant impacts with regard to traffic (operation), air quality, construction noise, and solid waste disposal. While impacts for a number of issues would be reduced under Alternative 10, the reduced levels of development under this alternative also serve to reduce some of the beneficial effects of the originally proposed project, particularly with regard to the provision of housing as well as advancing those land use policies that relate to housing. However, Alternative 10 would implement other land use policies to a greater extent than the originally proposed project. Specifically, Alternative 10 would provide a greater level of commercial growth at a regional transportation hub than the originally proposed project, and a greater expansion to the entertainment and tourism industries, which are key economic engines in Southern California. In summary, Alternative 10 would not introduce additional significant environmental impacts, and in many cases would lessen the originally proposed project's overall impacts, as well as some of its beneficial effects, while increasing other beneficial effects.

X. FINDINGS REGARDING GENERAL IMPACT CATEGORIES

A. Potential Secondary Effects

Section 15126.4(a)(1)(D) of the state CEQA Guidelines requires mitigation measures to be discussed in less detail than the significant effects of the proposed project if the mitigation measure(s) cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the proposed project. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, proposed mitigation measures that could cause potential impacts were evaluated. The following provides a discussion of the potential secondary environmental effects that could occur as a result of implementing mitigation measures.

Implementation of the Project's traffic mitigation measures and improvements/upgrades to the area's water and electrical infrastructure have the potential to result in significant impacts, after the incorporation of project design features and mitigation measures, that are beyond those identified in the above sections. Specifically, implementation of the Project's traffic mitigation measures have the potential to contribute to significant regional construction air quality impacts during periods when multiple off-site roadway improvements are under construction at the same time and/or construction of a single off-site roadway improvement occurs concurrently with average or peak levels of on-site construction. Potential significant construction noise impacts could also occur for limited durations when mechanical construction equipment would be used within 200 to 300 feet of noise sensitive uses (e.g., residences, outdoor patios/plazas) given the incremental difference between construction noise levels and ambient noise levels in the area. With the exception of the west side of Barham Boulevard, and at the Lankershim Boulevard/Main Street (Intersection No. 35) and Olive Avenue/Pass Avenue (Intersection No. 81) intersections, the proposed off-site roadway improvements would not reduce the width of the sidewalks to less than minimum City standards. However, in order to provide a conservative analysis, any reduction in sidewalk width it considered to constitute a significant impact. As such, implementation of the Project's off-site roadway improvements would result in a significant impact with regard to sidewalk widths. Lastly, the removal of 25 on-street parking spaces along the east side of Barham Boulevard between Coyote Canyon Road and Lake Hollywood Drive in the City would also constitute a significant impact.

With regard to off-site improvements to the area's water and electrical infrastructure, significant short-term construction noise and construction regional air quality impacts similar to those described above could also occur given the incremental difference between construction noise levels and ambient noise levels in the area and if the off-site water and electrical improvements occur concurrently with average or peak levels of on-site construction.

B. Growth Inducing Impacts

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of the ways in which a proposed project could induce growth. This includes ways in which a project would foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

Discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which

would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a waste water treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also discuss the characteristic of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

The Project represents infill development within an urbanized area of southern California, recognized as a regional center for the entertainment industry, housing studio production and entertainment facilities. Alternative 10 would allow development within underutilized portions of the Project Site, adding expansion of current studio and entertainment uses, commercial uses (e.g., retail, hotel), and community support services. The associated utility and public service improvements described above would be growth-accommodating rather than growth inducing. Therefore, the Project's growth inducing impacts would be less than significant.

C. Significant Irreversible Impacts

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c) indicates that:

Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

Construction of the Project would require consumption of resources that are not replenishable or which may renew slowly enough to be considered non-renewable. These resources would include certain types of lumber and other forest products, aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt (e.g., sand, gravel, and stone), metals (e.g., steel, copper, and lead), petrochemical construction materials (e.g., plastics), and water. Fossil fuels, such as gasoline and oil, would also be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment.

Operation of the Project would involve on-going consumption of nonrenewable resources such as natural gas, and crude oil. Petroleum products (diesel fuel, fuel oil, gasoline, and petrochemical synthetics) would be consumed directly and indirectly by proposed Project activities in terms of electricity generation, and as fuels used by vehicles bringing visitors and employees to the Project Site. To the extent that fossil fuels remain a principal source of energy within the economy, the Project represents a long-term commitment of these resources. Development would irreversibly increase the commitment of public services, such as providing police and fire services. Operation of the Project would also result in an increased commitment

of public maintenance services such as waste disposal and treatment, as well as an increased commitment of the infrastructure that serves the Project Site. The use of potentially hazardous materials would occur on the Project Site. Such materials would be used, handled, stored, and disposed of in accordance with applicable government regulations and standards, which would protect against a significant and irreversible environmental change resulting from an accidental release of hazardous materials.

The commitment of resources required for the type and level of proposed development would limit the availability of these resources for future generations for other uses during the operation of the Project. However, this resource consumption would be consistent with growth and anticipated change in the City of Los Angeles, the County of Los Angeles, and the Southern California region as a whole. Further, use of such resources would be of a relatively small scale in relation to the Project's fulfillment of regional and local urban design and development goals for the area. These goals are intended to promote smart growth that would reduce resource consumption by reducing vehicle trips and incorporating sustainable design features. Therefore, the use of such resources for the Project would be reduced as compared to development in other locations that would not fulfill such goals as fully. As such, the use of such resources would not be considered significant.

XI. ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBLE AGENCY CONSIDERATIONS UNDER CEQA

1. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15096(a), the County has reviewed and considered the information found in the EIR and has reached its own conclusions on whether and how to approve the Project and make these findings.
2. Pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21002.1(d) and CEQA Guidelines § 15096(f), the County, acting as a responsible agency under CEQA, has determined that the EIR complies with the mandates of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and fully discloses and analyzes the effects of those activities involved in the Project which the County is required by law to carry out or approve.
3. The County finds that the EIR provides objective information to assist the decision makers and the public at large in their consideration of the environmental consequences of the Project. The public review period provided all interested jurisdictions, agencies, private organizations, and individuals the opportunity to submit comments regarding the Draft EIR. The Final EIR was prepared after the review period and responds to comments made during the public review period.
4. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15096(f), the County finds that the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163 calling for the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR have not occurred in that:
 - a. The Project, as approved by the County, does not result in any new significant environmental effects and no substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect, as it is the same Project (Alternative 10) approved by the City and studied in the EIR.
 - b. There have been no substantial changes to the Project which would require major revisions to the EIR.

- c. There have been no substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the Project is being undertaken which would require major revisions to the EIR.
 - d. There is no new information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the EIR was certified.
 - e. The Project will not have any significant effects not discussed in the EIR.
 - f. There are no new or additional mitigation measures that would substantially reduce one or more significant effects that the Project would have on the environment.
5. The mitigation measures identified for the originally proposed project were included in the Draft and Final EIR. With the City's approval of Alternative 10 as the Project, those mitigation measures were revised and finalized in the City's MMRP. CEQA also authorizes and requires a responsible agency approving a project to adopt an MMRP for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation. The final mitigation measures included in the County's MMRP serve that function. The County's MMRP includes all of the mitigation measures also adopted by the City in connection with the approval of the Project that address the direct or indirect environmental effects of those parts of the Project that are subject to the County's jurisdiction. The County finds that the impacts of the Project have been mitigated to the extent feasible by the mitigation measures identified in the County's MMRP and those mitigation measures previously incorporated into the Project by the City through its adoption of the City's MMRP.
6. In accordance with CEQA, the County's MMRP provides the means to ensure that the mitigation measures are fully enforceable. In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code § 21081.6, the County hereby adopts the County's MMRP. Similarly, the County hereby adopts each of the mitigation measures expressly set forth in the County's MMRP as conditions of approval for the Project.
7. The custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the County's decision is based is the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning, 320 West Temple Street, 13th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90012.
8. The County finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the EIR or is in the record of proceedings in the matter.

XII. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The EIR has identified unavoidable significant impacts that would result from implementation of the originally proposed project. Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15093(b) of the CEQA Guidelines provide that when the decision of the public agency allows the occurrence of significant impacts that are identified in the EIR but are not at least substantially mitigated, the agency must state in writing the reasons to support its action based on the completed EIR and/or other information in the record. State

CEQA Guidelines require, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(b), that the decisionmaker adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations at the time of approval of a project if it finds that significant adverse environmental effects have been identified in the EIR which cannot be substantially mitigated to an insignificant level or be eliminated. These findings and the Statement of Overriding Considerations are based on substantial evidence in the record, including but not limited to the EIR, including the reference library to the EIR, and documents and materials that constitute the record of proceedings.

The following impacts are not mitigated to a less than significant level for the Project, as identified in the EIR: Traffic (during operations and under cumulative conditions), Noise (during construction and under cumulative conditions), Air Quality (during construction and operations and under cumulative conditions), Solid Waste—Landfill Capacity (during operations and under cumulative conditions), and Off-Site Mitigation Measures (during construction and operations). It is not feasible to mitigate such impacts to a less than significant level.

Accordingly, the County adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations. The County recognizes that significant and unavoidable impacts would result from implementation of the Project. Having (i) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, (ii) rejected certain alternatives to the originally proposed project (as analyzed in the EIR), as discussed above, and selected Alternative 10, the environmentally superior alternative, (iii) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts, and (iv) balanced the benefits of the Project against the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts, the County hereby finds that the benefits outweigh and override the significant unavoidable impacts for the reasons stated below.

The below stated reasons summarize the benefits, goals and objectives of the Project, and provide the detailed rationale for the benefits of the Project. These overriding considerations of economic, social, aesthetic, and environmental benefits for the Project justify adoption of the Project and certification of the completed EIR. Each of the following overriding considerations separately and independently (i) outweighs the adverse environmental impacts of the Project, and (ii) justifies adoption of the Project and certification of the completed EIR. In particular, achieving the underlying purpose for the Project would be sufficient to override the significant environmental impacts of the Project.

1. The Project will enhance the future economic vitality of the City of Los Angeles and County of Los Angeles by providing commercial growth (307,949 net new square feet of Studio uses, 647,320 net new square feet of Studio Office uses, 495,406 net new square feet of Office uses, 337,895 net new square feet of Entertainment uses, 39,216 net new square feet of Entertainment Retail uses, and two new 500-room hotels). Such commercial growth will be located across from the Metro Red Line station and in proximity to regional freeways and other transit, and will enhance the Universal City area as a high activity regional center destination, which may attract more business to the area and encourage local job creation.

2. Development and construction of the Project will generate more than 18,500 part-time and full-time jobs in the Los Angeles County economy, of which over 11,000 jobs are directly related to construction of the Project. Operation of the Project at full buildout will generate more than 11,750 jobs in the Los Angeles County economy, of which 6,368 jobs are from on-site operations. Overall, the Project will create more than 30,000 jobs during construction and operations. *(See Appendix F-30 to the Final EIR)*
3. Development and construction of the Project includes an estimated \$1.619 billion investment in construction costs, with a resulting estimated \$2.783 billion economic output to the Los Angeles County economy from that construction. *(See Appendix F-30 to the Final EIR)*
4. The Project also will be a significant economic engine in Los Angeles County. The annual economic output from operation of the Project will generate approximately \$1.9 billion in economic activity in the greater Los Angeles County area. *(See Appendix F-30 to the Final EIR)*
5. Operation of the Project also will generate approximately \$15.0 million of recurring tax revenues for the County of Los Angeles, as well as approximately \$5.7 million in one-time tax revenues. Operation of the Project also will generate approximately \$7.7 million of recurring annual tax revenues for the City of Los Angeles, as well as approximately \$1.0 million in one-time tax revenues. *(See September 17, 2012, HR&A Advisors Memorandum re: Tax Revenue Impacts of NBC Universal Evolution Plan Alternative 10)*
6. The Project would result not only in a substantial number of new jobs and new economic activity, but it would also help to anchor the entertainment and tourism sector in Los Angeles County. The variety of part-time and full-time jobs generated by the Project would provide important employment opportunities including opportunities for students, part-time and entry level workers. The Project would similarly create career paths to higher-skilled, higher-wage positions in the multi-dimensional entertainment industry. Overall, the Project would reinforce the state's and region's entertainment and tourism sector in Los Angeles County. The Project is consistent with applicable growth forecasts and regional and local economic development and employment policies.
7. The Project's development and operation of additional studio, production, post-production, and related uses will expand and enhance the Project Site's historic role in the entertainment industry, allowing the incorporation of new technologies and operations and providing for facilities on the Project Site to meet the growing and changing needs of the industry. Approximately two-thirds (66.2%) of new jobs created as a result of the Project will be associated with film, television and video related production and management activities.
8. The Project will invest more than \$100 million in transportation and transit improvements and voluntarily implement key improvements which will enhance overall transportation operations.
 - a. The Project will facilitate a reduction of traffic impacts (and associated greenhouse gas emissions) by:

- (1) Implementing a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program that encourages employees and patrons to reduce vehicular traffic on the street and freeway system during the most congested time periods of the day. Key features of the TDM program would include: (1) joining or forming a Transportation Management Association; (2) a transportation information center for employees and visitors; (3) a guaranteed ride home program for employees; (4) on-site flex cars and a flex car station on the Project Site; (5) discounted employee and tenant transit passes; (6) rideshare/carpool/vanpool support for employees; (7) pedestrian-oriented infrastructure; and (8) bike amenities including bike parking with showers for employees;
 - (2) Funding the upgrade of traffic signal controllers and installation of CCTV cameras at various intersections; and
 - (3) Providing up to \$650,000 for the implementation of the Los Angeles Department of Transportation's Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan.
- b. Freeway connections to the Project Site would be improved, including but not limited to US 101 interchange improvements at Campo de Cahuenga Way and a new US 101 southbound on-ramp from Universal Studios Boulevard.
 - c. Transportation improvements to the regional corridor would include, but not be limited to:
 - Additional lanes and beautification on Lankershim Boulevard;
 - Additional southbound lanes and beautification on Barham Boulevard;
 - Signal coordination and roadway improvements at the SR 134 ramps on Forest Lawn Drive; and
 - Realignment and widening of portions of Universal Hollywood Drive.
 - d. Dozens of intersections in both the City of Los Angeles and City of Burbank would be improved.
 - e. The Project would provide funding to the City of Burbank Department of Transportation as follows:
 - (1) Up to \$150,000 for a Timing Plan Study;
 - (2) Up to \$800,000 for Adaptive Traffic Control System software and hardware;
 - (3) Up to \$500,000 for Intelligent Transportation Systems equipment for interconnection of signal equipment between the Cities of

Burbank and Los Angeles along Barham Boulevard and Olive Avenue corridor; and

- (4) Up to \$150,000 for neighborhood transportation improvements.
 - f. The Project would pay for up to five portable or small dynamic changeable message signs as part of the Hollywood Event Management infrastructure.
 - g. Transit connections would include new shuttles from the project site to the Metro Red Line Station, Downtown Burbank Metrolink Station and Burbank Media District, and an additional Metro Rapid Bus on Ventura Boulevard into the Studio City area.
9. The Project would provide funding in the amount of \$13,500,000 for the development of a proposed regional river bikeway along the Los Angeles River between the existing bikeway at Griffith Park and Studio City ("River Bikeway Plan"), including:
- a. As provided for in the proposed development agreement by and between the County and Universal Studios LLC, funding in the amount of \$10,000,000 to the Los Angeles County Bikeway Fund to be used by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works for (i) environmental review pursuant to CEQA and NEPA, as required, of the River Bikeway Plan; (ii) regulatory approvals from governmental agencies having jurisdiction over the River Bikeway Plan, including, but not limited to, the Army Corps of Engineers; (iii) planning, design, and engineering for the River Bikeway Plan; and (iv) construction of a 12-foot wide bikeway along the Los Angeles River north of the Property between Barham Boulevard and Lankershim Boulevard, including a connection at Lankershim Boulevard allowing for the bikeway to cross under Lankershim Boulevard or at grade at Lankershim Boulevard, or other alternative connection identified during the planning and environmental review of the River Bikeway Plan;
 - b. As provided for in that certain development agreement by and between the City and Universal Studios LLC (City Ordinance No. 182437) ("City Development Agreement"), funding in the amount of \$3,000,000 to the Los Angeles County Bikeway Fund to be used by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works for construction of a regional river bikeway along the Los Angeles River north of the Project Site between Barham Boulevard and Lankershim Boulevard; and
 - c. As provided for in the City Development Agreement, funding in the amount of \$500,000 to the Los Angeles County Bikeway Fund to be used by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works for planning and design of the regional river bikeway between the existing bikeway at Griffith Park and Whitsett Avenue/Studio City.
10. The Project would establish a Community Liaison telephone hotline in connection with the Project's construction and operation.

11. The Project would require the contractor(s) for the Project to enter into a Project Labor Agreement with the Los Angeles/Orange Counties Building and Construction Trades Council to promote efficiency of demolition and construction operations during construction of the Project and provide for the orderly settlement of labor disputes and grievances without strikes or lockouts, thereby promoting the public interest in assuring the timely and economical completion of the Project.
12. Construction and implementation of the Project would institute on-site waste management and recycling programs. During new construction, a minimum of 65 percent of the non-hazardous construction and demolition debris by weight from construction of new Project buildings (not including sets/facades, production activities, and temporary uses) will be recycled and/or salvaged for reuse. During occupancy and operations, the Project will have a solid waste diversion target of 65 percent of the non-hazardous waste (not including production activities and temporary uses).
13. The Project would incorporate various energy efficient features, including: construction of new buildings that exceed Title 24 (2005) energy requirements by 15 percent or greater; and energy saving and emission reducing features such as (1) installing energy efficient heating and cooling systems, equipment, and control systems; (2) installing energy efficient appliances (e.g., Energy Star refrigerators, clothes washers, clothes dryers, dishwashers, ventilation fans, and ceiling fans); (3) installing efficient lighting and lighting control systems; (4) installing light-emitting diodes for private on-site traffic and street lighting; (5) installing light colored 'cool' roofs; and (6) providing education on energy efficiency, waste diversion, recycling services to the Project Applicant's employees through new employee orientation materials and three times annually through company website, exhibits, or meetings on energy conservation.
14. The Project would develop Trailhead Park, an approximately 0.9-acre landscaped and developed public park adjacent to the Los Angeles River Flood Control Channel in the northeastern portion of the Project Site, for which public access would be provided via Lakeside Plaza Drive. Trailhead Park would provide a connection, via Lakeside Plaza Drive, to the existing bicycle path to the east on Forest Lawn Drive.
15. Upon construction of a 12-foot wide bikeway along the Los Angeles River north of the Project Site between Barham Boulevard and Lankershim Boulevard, the Project, in consultation with the Director of City Planning, would provide for the dedication of an easement to the satisfaction of the County Director of Planning, providing for permanent public access from Barham Boulevard along Lakeside Plaza Drive to Trailhead Park and the bikeway to be developed on a portion of River Road along the Los Angeles River north of the Project Site between Barham Boulevard and Lankershim Boulevard.
16. The Project would preserve cultural resources through the implementation of the Universal Studios Potential Historic District Preservation Plan.
17. The Project would implement various measures to improve fire services including contributing to the expansion of County and City fire service capabilities in the

area. In addition, the Project will provide a new up to 16,000 square foot facility within the County of Los Angeles portion of the Project Site for the shared use of the County Sheriff's Department, contract security, and corporate security for the Project Site.

18. The Project would provide funding in the amount of \$200,000 towards landscaping in the Back Lot Area of the Project Site along the fence line with the adjacent Hollywood Manor Neighborhood. Further, the Project would remove two existing sets from the Back Lot Area of the Project Site and install landscaping to screen remaining sets in the area.
19. The Project would provide funding for all permitting fees to permit landscaping by the Toluca Estates Drive Homeowners Association in the area south of Toluca Estates Drive on County Flood Control District property.