

## **VI. Other CEQA Considerations**

---

# VI. Other CEQA Considerations

---

## 1. Significant Unavoidable Impacts

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c) requires that an EIR describe any significant impacts which cannot be avoided. Specifically, Section 15126.2(c) states:

*Describe any significant impacts, including those which can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance. Where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated without imposing an alternative design, their implications and the reasons why the project is being proposed, notwithstanding their effect, should be described.*

As evaluated in Section IV, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this Draft EIR, and summarized below, implementation of the Project would result in significant Project-level impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated with respect to: construction noise associated with on-site construction activities during daytime hours, and on-site and off-site (trucks) construction activities associated with the concrete mat pour during nighttime hours and vibration from off-site (trucks) with respect to human annoyance during construction. With regard to cumulative impacts, implementation of the Project together with the related projects would result in significant impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated with respect to: construction noise from on-site construction activities, off-site construction activities associated with off-site improvements, and off site construction activities (associated with trucks; and vibration from off-site construction activities (trucks) with respect to human annoyance.

### a. On-Site Construction Noise

#### (1) Project-Level Impacts

As discussed in Section IV.J, Noise, of this Draft EIR, construction of the Project would have the potential to result in significant noise impacts at sensitive receptor locations from on-site construction activities. Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-1, which requires installation of temporary sound barriers, would reduce the Project's construction noise levels to the extent feasible. Specifically, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-1 would reduce the noise generated by on-site construction activities at the off-site sensitive uses by a minimum of 3 dBA, 12 dBA, 3 dBA, and 3 dBA at receptor locations R1,

R4, R5, and R6, respectively. Therefore, the estimated construction-related noise levels at the uses represented by off-site sensitive receptor locations R1, R4, R5, and R6 would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-1. However, due to the slope at the North Parcel, it would not be feasible to install a temporary construction noise barrier tall enough or placed near the equipment on the slope that would be effective in providing noise reductions at receptor location R12 (Los Angeles State Historic Park). To be effective, the temporary noise barrier would need to be minimum 35 feet tall, which would not be feasible as it would require a deep foundation with extensive structural engineering components and construction activities to erect, which would result in additional noise and vibration generation and other secondary impacts. There are no other feasible mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce the temporary noise impacts from on-site construction during Phase 2 at receptor location R12. Therefore, daytime construction noise impacts associated with on-site noise sources would be significant and unavoidable. It should be noted that the estimated construction noise levels at receptor location R12, ranging from 60.4 dBA  $L_{eq}$  during paving/landscaping phase to 71.3 dBA  $L_{eq}$  during overlapping construction phases, would be similar to the existing traffic noise levels as measured along Broadway (i.e., 69.6 dBA  $L_{eq}$  as measured at receptor location R10). In addition, the North Parcel construction noise levels at the Los Angeles State Historic Park (receptor location R12) would be further reduced at the interior of the park. That is, construction noise levels would be perceived by the human ear to be lower than the significance criterion of 5 dBA  $L_{eq}$  at a distance of approximately 200 feet south of the park property line.

As discussed in Section IV.J, Noise, of this Draft EIR, the concrete mat foundation pour during Phase 1 and Phase 2 could occur during the nighttime hours, if permitted by the Executive Director of the Board of Police Commissioners. As indicated in Table IV.J 14, above, the estimated noise level due to the mat foundation pour would exceed the nighttime significance threshold (ambient plus 5 dBA) at receptor locations R1, R5, R6, and R11 during Phase 1 and at receptor location R10 during Phase 2. With implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-1, impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels at receptor locations R1, R5, and R6. However, impacts at receptor locations R10 and R11 would be significant and unavoidable.

## (2) Cumulative Impacts

As discussed in Section IV.J, Noise, of this Draft EIR, there would be potential cumulative noise impacts at the nearby sensitive uses located in proximity to the Project Site and Related Project Nos. 5, 7, 11, 17, 18, 23, 24, and 25, in the event of concurrent construction activities. Specifically, sensitive uses represented by receptor locations R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R7, R11, and R13 could be significantly impacted with noise levels that exceed 5 dBA when the Project and related projects are concurrently constructed. Similar to the Project, noise associated with cumulative construction activities would be reduced to the

degree reasonably and technically feasible through proposed mitigation measures (e.g., providing temporary noise barriers) for each individual related project. However, even with these mitigation measures, cumulative noise impacts would continue to occur, and there are no other physical mitigation measures that would be feasible. As such, cumulative on-site noise impacts from on-site construction would be significant and unavoidable.

## **b. Off-Site Construction Noise**

### **(1) Project-Level Impacts**

As discussed in Section IV.J, Noise, of this Draft EIR, during construction, the estimated noise levels from the Project-related trucks along portions of the anticipated truck routes would exceed the 5-dBA significance criteria by 1.7 to 3.8 dBA in the event of a nighttime concrete pour for the mat foundation. There are no feasible mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce this short-term impact that would occur for a few days during the mat foundation phase because conventional mitigation measures, such as providing temporary noise barrier walls to reduce the off-site construction truck traffic noise impacts, would not be practical as the barriers would obstruct the access and visibility to the properties along the anticipated haul routes. Therefore, temporary construction noise impacts associated with off-site construction traffic would be significant and unavoidable in the event of a nighttime mat pour.

### **(2) Cumulative Impacts**

As discussed above and in Section IV.J, Noise, of this Draft EIR, the Project's estimated off-site construction noise levels would exceed the significance criteria along the anticipated truck routes, including North Broadway and Spring Street during the nighttime mat foundation phase by 1.7 dBA and 3.8 dBA, respectively. While not likely, due to the short duration of this phase, any concurrent activity by related projects that would result in an additional number of trucks would incrementally increase the noise levels, therefore contributing to cumulative impacts. In particular, there are related projects located along Broadway (including Related Project Nos. 7, 11, 17, and 18), and along Spring Street (including Related Project Nos. 5, 23, 24, and 25) that could contribute to cumulative off-site construction noise impacts. In addition, during daytime hours, truck traffic associated with the related projects and the Project have the potential to result in significant impacts. Conventional mitigation measures, such as providing temporary noise barrier walls to reduce the off-site construction truck traffic noise impacts, would not be feasible as the barriers would obstruct the access and visibility to the properties along the anticipated truck routes. There are no other feasible mitigation measures to reduce the temporary significant noise impacts associated with the cumulative off-site construction trucks. As such, cumulative off-site noise impacts from off-site construction trucks would be significant and unavoidable.

The Project would require minor off-site improvements that would generally be contained in the adjacent rights-of-way to the Project Site, including along North Broadway, Bishops Road, and Solano Avenue. As analyzed in Section IV.J, Noise of this Draft EIR, the estimated Project-related off-site construction noise levels from these improvements would exceed the significance criteria at receptor locations R4, R5, R6, R7, R13, and R16, from 4.9 dBA to 8.2 dBA. The estimated off-site construction noise levels from the Project at these receptor locations would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-2. However, Related Project Nos. 5, 7, 17, 24, and 25 are located near receptor locations R4, R5, R7, and R13 and could contribute to cumulative construction noise impacts. As such, cumulative noise impacts from off-site construction would be significant and unavoidable.

### **c. Off-Site Construction Vibration (Human Annoyance)**

#### **(1) Project-Level Impacts**

As evaluated in Section IV.J, Noise, of this Draft EIR, the vibration significance criterion for human annoyance used in this Draft EIR is 72 VdB for residential and hotel uses. The estimated vibration levels generated by construction trucks traveling along the anticipated haul route were assumed to be within 24 feet of sensitive uses (i.e., motel uses) located at 1824 Broadway (between Avenue 18 and Avenue 19). As indicated in the noise calculation worksheets included in Appendix I of this Draft EIR, the temporary vibration levels could reach approximately 72.6 VdB periodically as trucks pass the sensitive receptors along Broadway at 24 feet. Therefore, the motel uses along the anticipated haul route (Broadway) would be exposed to ground-borne vibration levels up to 72.6 VdB, which would exceed the 72-VdB significance criteria from the construction trucks.

Mitigation measures considered to reduce vibration impacts from off-site construction equipment and trucks with respect to human annoyance included the installation of a wave barrier, which is typically a trench, or a thin wall made of sheet piles installed in the ground (essentially a subterranean sound barrier to reduce noise). However, wave barriers must be very deep and long to be effective and are not considered cost effective for temporary applications, such as construction. In addition, constructing a wave barrier to reduce the Project's construction-related vibration impacts would, in and of itself, generate ground-borne vibration from the excavation equipment. Furthermore, it would not be technically feasible to install a wave barrier along the public roadways for the off-site construction vibration impacts, as it is within the public right-of-way, over which the Applicant does not have control. Thus, there are no technologically feasible mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce the temporary vibration impacts from off-site construction traffic associated with human annoyance to a less-than-significant level. Since there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce the potential off-site construction vibration impacts with respect

to human annoyance, impacts as a result of off-site construction truck travel would be significant and unavoidable.

## (2) Cumulative Impacts

As discussed in Section IV.J, Noise, of this Draft EIR, there are residential and motel uses along the anticipated truck routes, which would exceed 72 VdB by 0.6 VdB as the trucks associated with the Project pass by within 24 feet of the sensitive receptors. There are related projects located along Broadway (including Related Project Nos. 7, 11, 17, and 18), and along Spring Street (including Related Project Nos. 5, 23, 24, and 25) which could utilize the same truck routes (i.e., Broadway and Spring Street). As discussed above, wave barriers would not be cost effective and would not be feasible as they would need to be located in the public right-of-way. There are no feasible mitigation measures to reduce the potential vibration human annoyance impacts. Therefore, cumulative vibration impacts from off-site construction with respect to human annoyance would be significant and unavoidable.

## 2. Reasons Why the Project is Being Proposed, Notwithstanding Significant Unavoidable Impacts

In addition to identification of a project's significant unavoidable impacts, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b) requires that an EIR describe the reasons why a project is being proposed, notwithstanding the effects of the identified significant and unavoidable impacts. The reasons why the Project has been proposed are grounded in a comprehensive list of project objectives included in Section II, Project Description, of this Draft EIR.

As discussed in Section II, Project Description, of this Draft EIR, the underlying purpose of the Project is to develop a high-quality mixed-use development that provides new multi-family housing, including affordable housing, with commercial and open space uses on an underutilized Project Site. The underlying purpose and objectives of the Project are closely tied to the goals and objectives of the City's General Plan, which supports the objectives and policies of SCAG's 2024–2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainability Communities Strategy Connect SoCal (2024–2050 RTP/SCS) and the City's General Plan.

The Project's general consistency with the 2024–2050 RTP/SCS is analyzed Section IV.I, Land Use and Planning, of this Draft EIR. As discussed therein, the Project Site is located within a SCAG-designated Priority Development Areas (PDA) including a Neighborhood Mobility Area (NMA) and Livable Corridor, as well as a High Quality Transit

Corridor (HQTC),<sup>1</sup> which indicates alignment with the goals of the 2024–2050 RTP/SCS. Additionally, the Project includes a TDM Program which incorporates TDM measures as required by the existing TDM Ordinance (LAMC 12.26 G) to display local transit information for the promotion and marketing of alternative transportation modes and choices. The Project would also include the implementation of strategies that exceed the requirements established in the TDM Ordinance, included as Project Design Feature TR-PDF-2, which comprises a reduced parking supply, pedestrian amenities, neighborhood enhancements, transit infrastructure improvements and bicycle parking which would encourage the use of transit, and reduce total VMT and single occupant vehicle (SOV) dependency. Further, the Project would support local, regional, state, and federal efforts to produce and preserve affordable housing while meeting additional housing needs, including the City’s SCAG RHNA-identified share of regional housing, by constructing 986 residential units, 200 of which would be affordable units, in transit-supportive, and walkable areas. Thus, the Project would support the 2024-2050 RTP/SCS Regional Planning Policies related to TDM, PDAs, and housing in the region.

The Project would also support the 2024–2050 RTP/SCS Regional Planning Policies regarding complete streets and safety, as the Project would be developed within an existing urbanized area served by an established network of roads and freeways that provide safe local and regional access to the area, including the Project Site. The Project would also comply with all design requirements which may affect public rights-of-way, including proper driveway alignment, sidewalk widths to the extent feasible, improved lighting elements, and landscaping design that does not hinder sight distance, mobility, or accessibility. The Project’s streetscape improvements would enhance the pedestrian experience with 110 new street trees and shrubs along all Project frontages as shown in Figures II-13 and II-14 of Section II, Project Description of this Draft EIR. The Project would also include pedestrian-only entrances separate from vehicular access points and would provide a signalized crosswalk across North Broadway at the northeastern tip of the Project Site to create a connection to the Portola Trail leading to the adjacent Elysian Park. The Project frontages would also include improved lighting, wayfinding signage, to enhance the experience for all users. In addition, the Project would provide 80 short-term and 722 long-term bicycle parking spaces. Thus, the Project would not conflict with the Regional Planning Policies related to complete streets and safety.

The Project’s general consistency with the applicable objectives of the City’s General Plan is analyzed in detail in Section IV.I, Land Use and Planning, of this Draft EIR. As indicated therein, in particular, the Project would support the policies and goals of the General Plan Framework related to distribution of land use, reduction of traffic congestion,

---

<sup>1</sup> SCAG, *High Quality Transit Corridors Interactive Map*, [https://maps.scag.ca.gov/portal/apps/experience\\_builder/experience/?data\\_id=dataSource\\_4-hqtc\\_2050pl\\_route\\_updated\\_5777%3A170&id=97f9699f14654b3b8895c74846541f75&page=home](https://maps.scag.ca.gov/portal/apps/experience_builder/experience/?data_id=dataSource_4-hqtc_2050pl_route_updated_5777%3A170&id=97f9699f14654b3b8895c74846541f75&page=home), accessed June 9, 2025.

improvement of air quality, and the creation of open space by providing a mix of uses that is consistent with existing residential and commercial uses in the Project vicinity, by promoting pedestrian activity through new streetscape improvements and pedestrian connections, by providing new development in close proximity to public transit, and by providing publicly accessible open space that is integrated with citywide/regional public open space areas. The Project would also support the City's Housing Element and the RHNA for the City through the provision of 986 residential units, including 200 affordable units. The Project would also exceed the open space requirements of the LAMC and would support the housing and open space goals of the Central City North Community Plan through the provision of needed housing and open space areas. The Project would also support the Community Plan objective to locate new housing in a manner which reduces vehicular trips as the Project would provide housing in proximity to public transit, existing jobs, destinations, and other neighborhood services.

Overall, the Project reflects a development that is consistent with the overall vision of the City and SCAG to locate supporting and harmonious uses within one site to create sustainable communities and enhance quality of life throughout the City and the region. As such, the Project would be consistent with, and contribute to, the implementation of local, regional, and State land use, mobility, and air quality objectives. Additionally, the Project's significant and unavoidable noise and vibration impacts would only occur during temporary and periodic construction activities, similar to those occurring at development sites in urban areas, particularly within infill locations. As such, the benefits of the Project, as outlined above, would outweigh the effects of the significant and unavoidable temporary construction impacts of the Project. Furthermore, as detailed in Section V, Alternatives, of this Draft EIR, no feasible alternative was identified that would meet the Project's objectives and also eliminate all of the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts.

### **3. Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c) indicates that an EIR should evaluate significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by implementation of a proposed project. As stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c), "[u]ses 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."

The Project would necessarily consume a limited amount of slowly renewable and non-renewable resources that could result in irreversible environmental changes. This

consumption would occur during construction of the Project and would continue throughout its operational lifetime. The development of the Project would require a commitment of resources that would include: (1) building materials and associated solid waste disposal effects on landfills; (2) water; and (3) energy resources (e.g., fossil fuels) for electricity, natural gas, and transportation. As demonstrated below, the Project would not consume a large commitment of natural resources or result in significant irreversible environmental changes.

### **a. Building Materials and Solid Waste**

Construction of the Project would require consumption of resources that do not replenish themselves or which may renew so slowly as 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), and petrochemical construction materials (e.g., plastics).

As discussed in Section IV.O.3, Utilities and Service Systems—Solid Waste, of this Draft EIR, during construction of the Project, a minimum of 75 percent of construction and demolition debris would be diverted from landfills. The Project would also comply with Ordinance No. 181,519 requiring the Project's contractor to deliver all construction and demolition waste to a Certified Construction and Demolition Waste Processing Facility. In addition, during operation, the Project would provide on-site recycling containers within a designated recycling area for Project occupants to facilitate recycling in accordance with the City of Los Angeles Space Allocation Ordinance (Ordinance No. 171,687) and the Los Angeles Green Building Code. In accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 1826, the Project would also provide for the recycling of organic waste. Overall, the Project would adhere to State and local solid waste policies and objectives that further goals to divert waste. Thus, the consumption of non-renewable building materials such as aggregate materials and plastics would be reduced.

### **b. Water**

Consumption of water during construction and operation of the Project is addressed in Section IV.O.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR. As evaluated therein, given the temporary nature of construction activities, the anticipated water demand associated with construction activities would be less than the net new water demand of the Project at buildout. During operation, the estimated water demand for the Project would not exceed the available supplies projected by the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), as confirmed by the Water Supply Assessment prepared by LADWP for the Project and included as Attachment F of Appendix M.1 of this Draft EIR. Thus, LADWP would be able to meet the water demand of the Project, as well as the existing and planned future water demands of its service area. In addition, pursuant to

Project Design Feature WAT-PDF-1, set forth in Section IV.O.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, the Project would implement a variety of conservation measures in excess of code requirements. Thus, as evaluated in Section IV.O.1, Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure, of this Draft EIR, while Project construction and operation would result in some irreversible consumption of water, the Project would not result in a significant impact related to water supply.

### c. Energy Consumption

During ongoing operation of the Project, non-renewable fossil fuels would represent the primary energy source, and thus the existing finite supplies of these resources would be incrementally reduced. Fossil fuels, such as diesel, gasoline, and oil, would also be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment. Project consumption of non-renewable fossil fuels for energy use during construction and operation of the Project is addressed in Section IV.D, Energy, of this Draft EIR. As discussed therein, construction activities for the Project would not require the consumption of natural gas but would require the use of fossil fuels and electricity. On- and off-road vehicles would consume an estimated 351,644 gallons of gasoline and approximately 543,957 gallons of diesel fuel throughout the Project's construction period (2028–2034). For comparison purposes, the fuel usage during Project construction would represent approximately 0.01 percent of the 2028 (start year of Project construction) annual on-road gasoline-related energy consumption and 0.09 percent of the 2028 annual diesel fuel-related energy consumption in Los Angeles County, as shown in Appendix D of this Draft EIR.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, as detailed in Section IV.D, Energy, of this Draft EIR, a total of approximately 131,460 kWh of electricity is anticipated to be consumed during all phases of Project construction, including demolition. The electricity demand at any given time would vary throughout the construction period based on the construction activities being performed and would cease upon completion of construction. When not in use, electric equipment would be powered off so as to avoid unnecessary energy consumption. In addition, trucks and equipment used during proposed construction activities would comply with CARB's anti-idling regulations as well as the In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets regulation. Further, on-road vehicles (i.e., haul trucks, vendor trucks, and worker vehicles) would be subject to federal and State fuel efficiency requirements. Therefore, the Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Thus, impacts related to the consumption of fossil fuels during construction of the Project would be less than significant.

---

<sup>2</sup> *The gasoline percentage is derived by taking the total amount of gasoline usage during construction (351,644 gallons) and dividing that number by the total amount of gasoline usage during operation (3.615 billion gallons) to arrive at 0.01 percent. The diesel percentage is derived by taking the total amount of diesel usage during construction (543,957 gallons) and dividing that number by the total amount of gasoline usage during operation (621 million gallons) to arrive at 0.09 percent.*

During operation, the Project's increase in electricity and natural gas demand would be within the anticipated service capabilities of LADWP and the Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), respectively. Specifically, the Project's electricity and natural gas demand would represent 0.04 and 0.003 percent, respectively, of LADWP and SoCalGas' projected sales in 2034, the Project's build-out year. In addition, as discussed in Section IV.D, Energy, of this Draft EIR, the Project would comply with 2022 Title 24 standards and applicable 2022 CALGreen requirements. Gasoline and diesel fuel consumption during operation are estimated to be 465,427 gallons and 85,579 gallons, respectively, which would account for 0.014 percent of gasoline and diesel fuel consumption in Los Angeles County. In addition, the Project includes a number of features that would reduce VMT, such as increasing the density of housing in comparison to existing on-site uses and being located close to major job or residential centers (Downtown Los Angeles).

Based on the above, the Project would not cause the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy and would be consistent with the intent of Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines. In addition, Project operations would not conflict with adopted energy conservation plans. Refer to Section IV.D, Energy, of this Draft EIR, for further analysis regarding the Project's consumption of energy resources.

#### **d. Environmental Hazards**

The Project's potential use of hazardous materials is evaluated in Section IV.G, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of this Draft EIR. As discussed therein, the types and amounts of hazardous materials that would be used in connection with the Project would be typical of those used in commercial and residential developments. Specifically, operation of the Project would use limited quantities of potentially hazardous materials, including cleaning agents, paints, pesticides, and other materials used for landscaping. Construction of the Project would also involve the temporary use of potentially hazardous materials, including fuel and oils associated with construction equipment, as well as coatings, paints, adhesives, and caustic or acidic cleaners. However, all potentially hazardous materials used during construction and operation would be used and stored in accordance with manufacturers' specifications and instructions and handled in compliance with applicable federal, State, and local regulations. Any associated risk would be reduced to a less than significant level through compliance with these standards and regulations.

Based on the above, compliance with regulations and standards would serve to protect against significant and irreversible environmental change that could result from the accidental release of hazardous materials.

## e. Conclusion

Based on the above, Project construction and operation would require the irreversible commitment of limited, slowly renewable, and non-renewable resources, which would limit the availability of these resources and the Project Site for future generations or for other uses. However, the consumption of such resources would not be substantial and would be consistent with regional and local growth forecasts and development goals for the area. The loss of such resources would not be highly accelerated when compared to existing conditions and such resources would not be used in a wasteful manner. Therefore, although irreversible environmental changes would result from the Project, such changes would be less than significant, and the limited use of nonrenewable resources that would be required by Project construction and operation is justified in light of the benefits of the Project outlined above in Section 2. Reasons Why the Project is Being Proposed, Notwithstanding Significant and Unavoidable Impacts.

## 4. Growth-Inducing Impacts

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) requires that growth-inducing impacts of a project be considered in a Draft EIR. Growth-inducing impacts are characteristics of a project that could directly or indirectly foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. According to the CEQA Guidelines, such projects include those that would remove obstacles to population growth (e.g., a major expansion of a wastewater treatment plant that, for example, may allow for more construction in service areas). In addition, as set forth in the CEQA Guidelines, increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, thus requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. The CEQA Guidelines also require a discussion of the characteristics of projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. Finally, the CEQA Guidelines also state that it must not be assumed that growth in an area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

### a. Population

As discussed in Section II, Project Description, of this Draft EIR, the Project would develop 986 residential units, including 200 affordable units. Based on generation factors from the LADOT's Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Calculator, the Project's residential units would generate approximately 2,399 residents.<sup>3</sup> According to SCAG's 2024–2050

---

<sup>3</sup> *Population generation factors by use type from the Los Angeles Department of Transportation and Los Angeles Department of City Planning, City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Documentation Version 1.3, (Footnote continued on next page)*

RTP/SCS, the forecasted population for the City of Los Angeles Subregion in 2021 is approximately 3,932,100 people.<sup>4</sup> As projected by the 2024–2050 RTP/SCS, the City of Los Angeles Subregion is anticipated to have a population of approximately 4,093,950 people, an increase of approximately 161,850 people or 4.12 percent.<sup>5</sup> The estimated 2,399 new residents generated by the Project would represent approximately 1.48 percent of the population growth forecasted by SCAG’s 2024–2050 RTP/SCS in the City of Los Angeles Subregion between 2021 and 2034. Therefore, the Project’s residents would be well within SCAG’s population projections in the 2024–2050 RTP/SCS for the Subregion and would not result in a significant direct growth-inducing impact.

## b. Employment

The Project would have the potential to generate indirect population growth in the vicinity of the Project Site as a result of the employment opportunities generated by the Project. During construction, the Project would create temporary construction-related jobs. However, due to the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California, and the operation of the market for construction labor, construction workers are not likely, to any notable degree, to relocate their households as a consequence of the construction job opportunities presented by the Project. Therefore, given the availability of construction workers, the Project would not be considered growth-inducing from a short-term employment perspective. Rather, the Project would provide a public benefit by providing new employment opportunities during the construction period.

Based on employee generation factors from the LADOT, the Project is estimated to generate approximately 146 new employees on the Project Site.<sup>6</sup> Based on SCAG’s 2024–2050 RTP/SCS growth forecast, approximately 1,974,725 jobs were projected for the City in 2021. By 2034, the City is expected to add another 134,713 employees (an increase

---

*May 2020, Table 1. Multi-Family Residential = 2.25 and Affordable Housing-Family = 3.14. Therefore,  $(786 * 2.25) + (200 * 3.14) = 2,397$ . However, because the VMT calculator itself uses 2.2533455879541 residents per multifamily unit, the resulting population is 2,399  $(786 * 2.2533455879541) + (200 * 3.14) = 2,399$ .*

<sup>4</sup> *The 2021 interpolated value is calculated using SCAG’s 2019 and 2035 values to find the average population increase between years and then applying that annual increase to 2019:  $[(4,106,000 - 3,907,000) \div 16] \times 2 + 3,907,000 = 3,932,100$  persons.*

<sup>5</sup> *The 2034 interpolated value is calculated using SCAG’s 2019 and 2035 values to find the average population increase between years and then applying that annual increase to 2019:  $[(4,106,000 - 3,907,000) \div 16] \times 15 + 3,907,000 = 4,093,950$  persons.*

<sup>6</sup> *Employee generation factors by use type from the Los Angeles Department of Transportation and Los Angeles Department of City Planning, City of Los Angeles VMT Calculator Documentation Version 1.3, May 2020, Table 1. They are in employees per 1,000 square feet, and include: General Retail = 2.0; High Turnover Sit-down Restaurant = 4.0.*

of 6.82 percent) for a total of approximately 2,109,438 jobs.<sup>7</sup> The Project's increase of 146 employees would represent 0.11 percent of the projected employment growth in the City between 2021 and 2034.<sup>8</sup> These employment positions would include a range of permanent and part-time positions that may be filled, in part, by persons already residing in the vicinity of the workplace and who generally do not relocate their households due to such employment opportunities, and other persons who would commute to the Project Site from other communities in and outside of the City.

Overall, the provision of new jobs would constitute a small percentage of employment growth, would not be considered "unplanned growth," and would not produce such a high quantity of new jobs that it would have the possibility to induce unplanned residential growth. Therefore, the Project would not cause an exceedance of SCAG's employment projections or induce substantial indirect population or housing growth related to Project-generated employment opportunities. As such, given that the Project would not directly contribute to substantial unplanned population growth in the Project area through the development of residential uses and as some of the employment opportunities generated by the Project would be filled by people already residing in the vicinity of the Project Site or who would commute, the potential growth associated with Project employees who may relocate their place of residence would not be substantial.

### c. Utility Infrastructure Improvements

The area surrounding the Project Site is already developed with a mix of residential, commercial, and industrial uses, and the Project would not remove impediments to growth. The Project Site is located within a developed area with existing utilities, services, and roadway infrastructure. While the Project would require local infrastructure upgrades to improve fire flow, and connections to existing water, sewer, electricity, and natural gas lines on-site and in the immediate vicinity of the Project Site, such improvements would be limited to serving Project-related demand, and would not necessitate major local or regional utility infrastructure improvements that have not otherwise been accounted and planned for on a regional level.

---

<sup>7</sup> The 2021 interpolated value is calculated using SCAG's 2019 and 2035 values for the City of Los Angeles to find the average employment increase between years and then applying that annual increase to 2019:  $[(2,119,800 - 1,954,000) \div 16] \times 2 + 1,954,000 = 1,974,725$  jobs. The 2034 interpolated value is calculated using SCAG's 2019 and 2035 values for the City of Los Angeles to find the average employment increase between years and then applying that annual increase to 2019:  $[(2,119,800 - 1,954,000) \div 16] \times 15 + 1,954,000 = 2,109,438$  jobs.

<sup>8</sup>  $146 \text{ new Project employees} \div 134,713 \text{ City employment growth between 2021 and 2034} \times 100 = 0.11$  percent.

## **d. Conclusion**

Overall, the Project would be consistent with the growth forecast for the City of Los Angeles Subregion and would be consistent with regional policies to reduce urban sprawl, efficiently utilize existing infrastructure, reduce regional congestion, and improve air quality through the reduction of VMT. In addition, the Project would not require any major roadway improvements nor would the Project open any large undeveloped areas for new use. Any vehicle access improvements would be limited to driveways necessary to provide immediate access to the Project Site and to improve safety and walkability. Therefore, direct and indirect growth-inducing impacts would be less than significant.

## **5. Potential Secondary Effects of Mitigation Measures**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(a)(1)(D) states that “if a mitigation measure would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the effects of the mitigation measure shall be discussed but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.” With regard to this section of the CEQA Guidelines, the potential impacts that could result with the implementation of each mitigation measure proposed for the Project was reviewed. The following provides a discussion of the potential secondary impacts that could occur as a result of the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, listed by environmental issue area.

### **a. Cultural Resources (Archaeological Resources)**

Mitigation Measure CUL-MM-1 requires that, prior to the start of any Project ground disturbance activities, including demolition, grading and vegetation removal, the Project Applicant shall retain a qualified principal archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Archeology to prepare and implement a written Cultural Resources Monitoring and Treatment Plan (CRMTP). The CRMTP shall dictate the process for addressing known archaeological resources as well as unanticipated archaeological resources that may be unearthed during construction, which would include potential prehistoric and historical-period discoveries. This mitigation measure represents procedural actions that would not affect the physical environment and would be beneficial in protecting known archaeological resources as well as unanticipated archaeological resources that may be unearthed during construction. As such, implementation of this mitigation measure would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

## **b. Geology and Soils (Paleontological Resources)**

Mitigation Measure GEO-MM-1 requires the development of a site-specific Paleontological Resource Mitigation and Treatment Plan by a qualified paleontologist prior to ground-disturbing activities associated with the Project.

Mitigation Measure GEO-MM-2 requires that a qualified professional paleontologist attend preconstruction meetings to consult with grading and excavation contractors; that a paleontological monitor be on-site at all times during the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits of high paleontological resource potential (e.g., Quaternary old alluvial fan deposits), to inspect exposures for contained fossils; and that the paleontological monitor have the authority to temporarily divert or direct ground-disturbing activities in the immediate vicinity around the find until they are assessed for scientific significance and recovered (i.e., collected).

Mitigation Measure GEO-MM-3 requires that the paleontological monitor collect all significant paleontological resources encountered during monitoring, which will then be prepared in a properly equipped fossil-preparation laboratory to the point that specimens are ready for curation, and that specimens be identified to the finest taxonomic level that is reasonably possible before being sorted and catalogued as part of the mitigation program.

These mitigation measures would represent procedural actions that would not affect the physical environment and would be beneficial in protecting paleontological resources at the Project Site. As such, implementation of these mitigation measures would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

## **c. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Mitigation Measure HAZ-MM-1 requires surveys and testing for asbestos, lead-based paint, Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs), and universal wastes and any abatement work to be conducted in accordance with regulatory compliance. Mitigation Measure HAZ-MM-2 requires preparation of a Hazardous Materials Contingency Plan that outlines procedures in the event of discoveries of hazardous releases in soil, soil vapor, and groundwater during construction. Mitigation Measure HAZ-MM-3 requires a Subsurface Geophysical Survey to identify the locations of any possible subsurface structures, USTs, or other underground obstructions that may be present. Mitigation Measure HAZ-MM-4 requires confirmation that groundwater monitoring at the Cornfield Yard is complete, or if it is not, coordination with the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) and Union Pacific Railroad for further monitoring in accordance with regulatory requirements. Mitigation Measure HAZ-MM-5 requires additional testing to determine the appropriate Site Design Level under the City's Methane Ordinance, and that the methane mitigation features also incorporate any additional features required by LARWQCB to mitigate VOCs. Lastly, Mitigation Measure

HAZ-MM-6 requires coordination with California Department of Geologic Energy Management (CalGEM) and the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD), which serves as the surrogate for the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety (LADBS), to facilitate the well investigations and re-abandonment of the previously plugged/abandoned oil wells on the Project Site. Implementation of these mitigation measures would address impacts associated with the release of hazardous materials into the environment. These measures would be implemented in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements and regulatory oversight. As such, these measures would not include physical improvements that would result in adverse secondary impacts.

#### **d. Noise**

Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-1 requires the implementation of temporary sound barriers during construction. The noise and vibration from installation of the temporary and impermeable sound barrier would be short-term and would be required to comply with the City's noise regulations as described in Section IV.J, Noise, of this Draft EIR. In addition, upon completion of construction (or as otherwise indicated during the construction process), the temporary sound barrier would be removed. As such, implementation of this mitigation measure would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-2 requires implementation of temporary moveable noise barriers prior to construction of the off-site improvements. The noise and vibration from installation of the temporary sound barriers would be short-term and would be required to comply with the City's noise regulations as described in Section IV.J, Noise, of this Draft EIR. In addition, upon completion of construction (or as otherwise indicated during the construction process), the temporary sound barriers would be removed. As such, implementation of this mitigation measure would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-3 requires the Project Applicant to retain a structural engineer to document the conditions of the historic structure at 1231 Spring Street and to prepare a shoring design to protect the building from potential damage. Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-3 also requires implementation of vibration monitoring and control plan to ensure the historic structure at 1231 Spring Street, and the historic retaining wall and guardrail adjacent to the North Parcel are not impacted by adjacent construction activities. These activities would protect these historic resources and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

Mitigation Measure NOI-MM-4 provides for construction buffer zones to be implemented should off-site segments of the Zanja Madre be identified during construction. This mitigation measure would ensure that such segments of the Zanja Madre would not be altered by construction activities within the Project Site. As such this mitigation measure would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

## e. Tribal Cultural Resources

Mitigation Measure TCR-MM-1, would require that prior to commencing any ground-disturbance activities at the Project Site, the Applicant, or its successor, shall retain a tribal monitor that is qualified to identify subsurface tribal cultural resources. In the event that any subsurface objects or artifacts that may be tribal cultural resources are encountered during the course of any ground-disturbance activities, all such activities shall temporarily cease within the area of the discovery, the radius of which shall be determined by a qualified archaeologist in consultation with a qualified tribal monitor, until the potential tribal cultural resources are properly assessed and addressed pursuant to the mitigation measure. As part of this mitigation measure, prior to commencing any Ground Disturbance Activities, the archaeological monitor, in consultation with the tribal monitor(s), would provide Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training to construction crews involved in Ground Disturbance Activities. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce impacts with regard to tribal cultural resources and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

## 6. Effects Not Found to Be Significant

CEQA Guidelines Section 15128 states that an EIR shall contain a brief statement indicating reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and not discussed in detail in the EIR. An Initial Study was prepared for the Project and is included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR. The Initial Study provides a detailed discussion of the potential environmental impact areas and the reasons that each environmental area is or is not analyzed further in this Draft EIR. The City of Los Angeles determined through the Initial Study that the Project would not have the potential to cause significant impacts related to the impact areas listed below. Refer to the Initial Study included as Appendix A of this Draft EIR for a detailed analysis of these topic areas.

- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources (human remains)<sup>9</sup>
- Geology and Soils (the ability of soils to support the use of septic tanks)<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Impacts related to human remains are also summarized in Section IV.C, Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR.

<sup>10</sup> Impacts related to the ability of soils to support the use of septic tanks are also summarized in Section IV.E, Geology and Soils, of this Draft EIR.

- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (airport hazards and emergency response plan,)<sup>11</sup>
- Hydrology and Water Quality (flood flows and inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow)<sup>12</sup>
- Land Use and Planning (division of an established community)<sup>13</sup>
- Mineral Resources
- Noise (airport or airstrip-related noise)<sup>14</sup>
- Population and Housing (displacement of people or housing)<sup>15</sup>
- Public Services (schools, parks and libraries)
- Recreation
- Transportation (hazardous geometric design features)<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Impacts related to airport hazards, emergency response plan, and wildland fires are also summarized in Section IV.G, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of this Draft EIR.

<sup>12</sup> Impacts related to flood flows and inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow are also summarized in Section IV.H, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Draft EIR.

<sup>13</sup> Impacts related to the physical division of an established community are also summarized in Section IV.I, Land Use and Planning, of this Draft EIR.

<sup>14</sup> Impacts related to airport or airstrip-related noise are also summarized in Section IV.J, Noise, of this Draft EIR.

<sup>15</sup> Impacts related to the displacement of people or housing are also summarized in Section IV.K, Population and Housing, of this Draft EIR.

<sup>16</sup> Impacts related to hazardous geometric design features and emergency access are also summarized in Section IV.M, Transportation, of this Draft EIR.