

II. Responses to Comments

II. Responses to Comments

A. Introduction

Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 21091(d) and 21092.5 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 govern the lead agency's responses to comments on a Draft EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(a) states that "[T]he lead agency shall evaluate comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the draft EIR and shall prepare a written response. The lead agency shall respond to comments that were received during the notice comment period and any extensions and may respond to late comments." In accordance with these requirements, this section of the Final EIR provides the responses prepared by the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning (City) to each of the written comments received regarding the Draft EIR.

Section II.B, Matrix of Comments Received on the Draft EIR, includes a table that summarizes the environmental issues raised by each commenter regarding the Draft EIR. Section II.C, Responses to Comments, provides the City's responses to each of the written comments raised in the comment letters received on the Draft EIR. Copies of the original comment letters are provided in Appendix FEIR-1 of this Final EIR.

II. Responses to Comments

B. Matrix of Comments Received on the Draft EIR

Table II-1
Matrix of Comments Received on the Draft EIR

Letter No.	Commenter	Executive Summary	Project Description	Environmental Setting	Air Quality	Cultural Resources	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Land Use	Noise	Public Services—Police Protection	Public Services—Fire Protection	Public Services—Schools	Public Services—Parks and Recreation	Public Services—Libraries	Transportation	Tribal Cultural Resources	Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure	Utilities and Service Systems—Wastewater	Energy Conservation and Infrastructure	Cumulative Impact	Alternatives	General/Other	CEQA	Mitigation Measures	Support	
STATE AND REGIONAL																										
1	Scott Morgan Director, State Clearinghouse State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit Governor's Office of Planning and Research State of California 1400 Tenth St. Sacramento, CA 95814-5502																							X		

**Table II-1 (Continued)
Matrix of Comments Received on the Draft EIR**

Letter No.	Commenter	Executive Summary	Project Description	Environmental Setting	Air Quality	Cultural Resources	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Land Use	Noise	Public Services—Police Protection	Public Services—Fire Protection	Public Services—Schools	Public Services—Parks and Recreation	Public Services—Libraries	Transportation	Tribal Cultural Resources	Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure	Utilities and Service Systems—Wastewater	Energy Conservation and Infrastructure	Cumulative Impact	Alternatives	General/Other	CEQA	Mitigation Measures	Support
2	Scott Morgan Director, State Clearinghouse State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit Governor's Office of Planning and Research State of California 1400 Tenth St. Sacramento, CA 95814-5502																					X	X		
3	Mia Edmonson IGR/CEQA Branch Chief Caltrans District 7 100 S. Main St., MS16 Los Angeles, CA 90012-3721						X								X								X		

**Table II-1 (Continued)
Matrix of Comments Received on the Draft EIR**

Letter No.	Commenter	Executive Summary	Project Description	Environmental Setting	Air Quality	Cultural Resources	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Land Use	Noise	Public Services—Police Protection	Public Services—Fire Protection	Public Services—Schools	Public Services—Parks and Recreation	Public Services—Libraries	Transportation	Tribal Cultural Resources	Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure	Utilities and Service Systems—Wastewater	Energy Conservation and Infrastructure	Cumulative Impact	Alternatives	General/Other	CEQA	Mitigation Measures	Support	
4	Pete Cooke Site Mitigation and Restoration Program Chatsworth Regional Office Department of Toxic Substances Control 9211 Oakdale Ave. Chatsworth, CA 91311-6520																					X				
LOCAL																										
5	Shine Ling, AICP Manager, Transit Oriented Communities Metro One Gateway Plaza Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952														X											

**Table II-1 (Continued)
Matrix of Comments Received on the Draft EIR**

Letter No.	Commenter	Executive Summary	Project Description	Environmental Setting	Air Quality	Cultural Resources	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Land Use	Noise	Public Services—Police Protection	Public Services—Fire Protection	Public Services—Schools	Public Services—Parks and Recreation	Public Services—Libraries	Transportation	Tribal Cultural Resources	Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure	Utilities and Service Systems—Wastewater	Energy Conservation and Infrastructure	Cumulative Impact	Alternatives	General/Other	CEQA	Mitigation Measures	Support	
6	Ali Poosti Division Manager Wastewater Engineering Services Division LA Sanitation and Environment 2714 Media Center Dr. Los Angeles, CA 90065 1733																					X				
ORGANIZATIONS																										
7	Matt Dixon Abundant Housing LA Steering Committee 620 W. Wilson Ave., Unit H Glendale, CA 91203-2477 Mark Vallianatos Abundant Housing LA Steering Committee 3591 Canada St. Los Angeles CA 90065-2812																									X

**Table II-1 (Continued)
Matrix of Comments Received on the Draft EIR**

Letter No.	Commenter	Executive Summary	Project Description	Environmental Setting	Air Quality	Cultural Resources	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Land Use	Noise	Public Services—Police Protection	Public Services—Fire Protection	Public Services—Schools	Public Services—Parks and Recreation	Public Services—Libraries	Transportation	Tribal Cultural Resources	Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure	Utilities and Service Systems—Wastewater	Energy Conservation and Infrastructure	Cumulative Impact	Alternatives	General/Other	CEQA	Mitigation Measures	Support
	<p>Leonora Camer Abundant Housing LA Steering Committee 1013 16th St., Unit 102 Santa Monica CA 90403-4331</p> <p>Brent Gaisford Abundant Housing LA Steering Committee Downtown LA Resident, CD 14 Los Angeles 90013</p> <p>Gabe Rose Abundant Housing LA Steering Committee</p> <p>Chelsea Byers Abundant Housing LA Steering Committee</p>																								

**Table II-1 (Continued)
Matrix of Comments Received on the Draft EIR**

Letter No.	Commenter	Executive Summary	Project Description	Environmental Setting	Air Quality	Cultural Resources	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Land Use	Noise	Public Services—Police Protection	Public Services—Fire Protection	Public Services—Schools	Public Services—Parks and Recreation	Public Services—Libraries	Transportation	Tribal Cultural Resources	Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure	Utilities and Service Systems—Wastewater	Energy Conservation and Infrastructure	Cumulative Impact	Alternatives	General/Other	CEQA	Mitigation Measures	Support
8	Richard Adkins President Hollywood Heritage P.O. Box 2586 Hollywood, CA 90078-2586					X																	X		
9	Susan Hunter Housing is a Human Right 6500 Sunset Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90028-7202																						X		
INDIVIDUALS																									
10	Alek Friedman alek3773@gmail.com																						X		X
11	Lloyd J. Princeton Design Management Co. 5418 Tenth Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90043-2526																						X	X	

**Table II-1 (Continued)
Matrix of Comments Received on the Draft EIR**

Letter No.	Commenter	Executive Summary	Project Description	Environmental Setting	Air Quality	Cultural Resources	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Land Use	Noise	Public Services—Police Protection	Public Services—Fire Protection	Public Services—Schools	Public Services—Parks and Recreation	Public Services—Libraries	Transportation	Tribal Cultural Resources	Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure	Utilities and Service Systems—Wastewater	Energy Conservation and Infrastructure	Cumulative Impact	Alternatives	General/Other	CEQA	Mitigation Measures	Support	
FORM LETTERS																										
12	Abundant Housing LA form letter (multiple signatures)																									X
LATE LETTERS																										
13	Richard Drury Lozeau Drury LLP 1939 Harrison St., Ste. 150 Oakland, CA 94612-3507																					X	X	X		

II. Responses to Comments

C. Comment Letters

Comment Letter No. 1

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse
Office of Planning & Research
1400 Tenth St.
Sacramento, CA 95814-5502

Comment No. 1-1

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on 6/3/2019, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) available on the CEQA database for your retrieval and use. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project's ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

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

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

Check the CEQA database for submitted comments for use in preparing your final environmental document: <https://ceqanet.opr.ca.gov/2017081039/2>. Should you need more information or clarification of the comments, **we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.**

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

Response to Comment No. 1-1

As indicated above, this letter acknowledges that the EIR process for the Project has complied with State Clearinghouse review requirements.

Comment Letter No. 2

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse
Office of Planning & Research
1400 Tenth St.
Sacramento, CA 95814-5502

Comment No. 2-1

The comment (s) on your EIR was (were) received by the State Clearinghouse after the end of the state review period, which closed on 6/3/2019. **Please check the CEQA database for these comments:** <https://ceqanet.opr.ca.gov/2017081039/2> because they provide information or raise issues that should be addressed in your final environmental document.

The California Environmental Quality Act does not require Lead Agencies to respond to late comments. However, we encourage you to incorporate these additional comments into your final environmental document and to consider them prior to taking final action on the proposed project.

Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions concerning the environmental review process. If you have a question regarding the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number (2017081039) when contacting this office.

Response to Comment No. 2-1

This letter states that two comments were received by the State Clearinghouse after the end of the state review period and refers to a website. The two letters received by the State Clearinghouse are from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). The letter goes on to state that CEQA does not require Lead Agencies to respond to late comments but encourages them to do so. These letters are included and responded to as Comment Letter Nos. 3 and 4, respectively, below.

Comment Letter No. 3

Mia Edmonson
IGR/CEQA Branch Chief
Caltrans District 7
100 S. Main St., MS16
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3721

Comment No. 3-1

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above referenced project. The Project proposes to develop a new mixed-use project on a 1.1-acre site located within the Hollywood community of the City of Los Angeles. The Project includes 276 residential units, up to 24,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial retail and restaurant uses, and up to 412 vehicle parking spaces. Alternatively, up to 27,000 square-foot grocery store could be constructed in lieu of the proposed retail and restaurant uses.

Response to Comment No. 3-1

This introductory comment, which provides an accurate summary of the Project Description, is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 3-2

The mission of Caltrans is to provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability.

Response to Comment No. 3-2

This comment states the mission of Caltrans. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 3-3

Senate Bill 743 (2013) mandated that CEQA review of transportation impacts of proposed development be modified by using Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as the primary metric in identifying transportation impacts for all future development projects. For future project, you may reference to The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) for more information.

<http://opr.ca.gov/ceqa/updates/guidelines/>

Response to Comment No. 3-3

This comment states that Senate Bill (SB) 743 mandates that CEQA review of transportation impacts focus on VMT, which would replace level of service (LOS) as the primary tool for evaluating this topic. As discussed in Section IV.G, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, new CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(c) indicates that the provisions of Section 15064.3 shall apply statewide beginning on January 1, 2020, but that a lead agency may elect to be governed by its provisions immediately upon adoption.

On August 9, 2019, LADOT issued guidance on the implementation of the state mandated analysis of vehicles miles travelled:

On July 30, 2019, the City of Los Angeles adopted vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a criteria in determining transportation impacts under the State's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This adoption was required by Senate Bill (SB) 743 and the recent changes to Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines.... To manage this transition LADOT will honor executed MOUs for traffic studies that were processed under the prior LOS-based guidelines; however, we strongly recommend that these projects also evaluate VMT as part of their transportation analysis. The VMT analysis will help guarantee the project discloses the appropriate information as required by CEQA in the event that the project does not receive their entitlements prior to July 1, 2020, which is the State's official deadline for required compliance by all projects.

Because the Project was filed and the Draft EIR was circulated prior to the City's adoption of the new methodology, the Project is not required to provide a VMT analysis and the previous Appendix G threshold XVI.(b) pertaining to congestion management programs is addressed in the Draft EIR. The methods and findings of the Project's Transportation Impact Study were approved by LADOT in an Inter-Departmental Correspondence to the Department of City Planning on May 8, 2018, which is provided in Appendix J.2 of the Draft EIR.

Similarly, Caltrans is developing its formal Caltrans Transportation Impact Study Guidelines to implement SB 743. On November 9, 2016, Caltrans adopted its Local Development—Intergovernmental Review Program Interim Guidance that implements its Caltrans Strategic Management Plan 2015-2020 (SMP) and California Transportation Plan 2040. The Interim Guidance notes that the SMP is intended to articulate statewide goals and should not be used as specific thresholds for the review of individual development projects. The Interim Guidance directs lead agencies to consider “multi-modal solutions

from existing regional transportation plans, regional plans, transit plans, bicycle plans, and pedestrian plans.” To be comprehensive, the Draft EIR incorporated relevant analysis to demonstrate consistency with the interim guidance even though such analysis is not required. Specifically, as discussed in Sections IV.D, Land Use and Planning and IV.G, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, the Project would be located less than 0.5 mile from the Metro Red Line Hollywood and Vine Station as well as numerous bus lines; would provide up to 186 bicycle parking spaces depending on the development option; and would promote walkability by siting ground-floor retail and restaurant uses (or grocery uses) proposed for the Project Site along Argyle Avenue and Selma Avenue to encourage pedestrian activity and provide linkages to the existing commercial uses in the Project vicinity.

Comment No. 3-4

Caltrans is aware of challenges that the region faces in identifying viable solutions to alleviating congestion on State and Local facilities. With limited room to expand vehicular capacity, future development should incorporate multi-modal and complete streets transportation elements that will actively promote alternatives to car use and better manage existing parking assets. Prioritizing and allocating space to efficient modes of travel such as bicycling and public transit can allow streets to transport more people in a fixed amount of right-of-way.

Caltrans supports the implementation of complete streets and pedestrian safety measures such as road diets and other traffic calming measures. Please note the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) recognizes the road diet treatment as a proven safety countermeasure, and the cost of a road diet can be significantly reduced if implemented in tandem with routine street resurfacing.

Response to Comment No. 3-4

This comment acknowledges that there is limited room to expand vehicular capacity in the vicinity of the Project Site and states that prioritizing and allocating space to efficient modes of travel such as bicycling and public transit can allow streets to transport more people in a fixed amount of right-of-way. As discussed in Section IV.D, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, the Project is a mixed-use development consisting of residential and commercial uses. The location of the Project within Hollywood’s commercial and entertainment core would allow future residents easy access to neighborhood services, jobs, and public transportation. The Project Site is served by several bus lines operated by Metro and LADOT, as well as the Metro Red Line. The closest Metro station to the Project Site is the Metro Red Line Hollywood/Vine Station, located approximately 0.2 mile northwest of the Project Site. The Project would include the development of sidewalks in conformance with the Mobility Plan and other City requirements, and would also promote

pedestrian activity by siting all retail and restaurant uses proposed for the Project Site along Argyle Avenue and Selma Avenue and providing linkages to the existing commercial uses in the Project vicinity. In addition, the Project would enhance the pedestrian streetscape environment along Argyle Avenue and Selma Avenue by incorporating pedestrian friendly design features such as floor-to-ceiling glass, landscaped entrances, and wide sidewalks that would be separated from the streets by bike parking, trees, and other landscape features. Furthermore, the Project would provide 182 bicycle parking spaces for the retail/restaurant option or 186 bicycle parking spaces for the grocery store option. The Project's location and features described above would reduce VMT.

The comment further states that Caltrans supports the implementation of complete streets and pedestrian safety measures such as road diets and other traffic comment measures. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 3-5

We encourage the Lead Agency to integrate transportation and land use in a way that reduces Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by facilitating the provision of more proximate goods and services to shorten trip lengths, and achieve a high level of non-motorized travel and transit use. We also encourage the Lead Agency to evaluate the potential of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) applications in order to better manage the transportation network, as well as transit service and bicycle or pedestrian connectivity improvements.

For additional TDM options, please refer to the Federal Highway Administration's *Integrating Demand Management into the Transportation Planning Process: A Desk Reference* (Chapter 8). The reference is available online at:

<http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/fhwahop12035/fhwahop12035.pdf>

Response to Comment No. 3-5

This comment encourages the City to integrate transportation and land use in a way that reduces VMT and the associated GHG emissions, as well as to evaluate TDM strategies and ITS applications to better manage the transportation network. While this comment is directed at the City and applies to City policies, as discussed in detail above in Response to Comment No. 3-4, the Project's location and features would serve to reduce VMT. Furthermore, as discussed in Section IV.C, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of the Draft EIR, Project GHG emissions from mobile sources would result in a total of 1,069 MTCO_{2e} per year, which accounts for a 66-percent reduction in mobile source emissions with

implementation of VMT-reducing measures as compared to the Project without implementation of VMT-reducing measures. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 3-6

A discussion of mitigation measures appropriate to alleviate anticipated traffic impacts is needed. Any mitigation involving transit or Transportation Demand Management (TDM) is encouraged and should be justified to reduce VMT and greenhouse gas emissions. Such measures are critical to facilitating efficient site access.

Response to Comment No. 3-6

This comment requests a discussion of mitigation measures appropriate to address the Project's anticipated traffic impacts. As discussed in Section IV.G, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, and further addressed below, construction-related and operational transportation impacts are less than significant without mitigation.

Comment No. 3-7

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and Transportation Impact Study (TIS) date in [sic] March 2018 for this project, Caltrans has the following comments:

1. On page 8 of TIS, "Caltrans facilities were evaluated according to the requirements of the Caltrans Agreement which identifies a series of screening criteria that, if any are met by the Project, require a more detailed analysis of Caltrans facilities." On Appendix A of the TIS, Memorandum of Understanding, the memo was signed in June 2017 and the Notice of Preparation is prepared on August 18, 2017. However, the agreement between Caltrans and LADOT expired in December 2016. As a reminder, please do not use the agreement for any future TIS. Instead, Caltrans consultation for future methodology, study locations, and significant threshold is recommended.

Response to Comment No. 3-7

The City and traffic consultant have consulted with Caltrans throughout the environmental process (i.e., through the Notice of Preparation [NOP] process, LADOT Memorandum of Understanding [MOU], and public comment period for the review of the Draft EIR). The City's continued reliance on the Caltrans Agreement was based upon verbal direction from Caltrans that the Agreement would remain in effect until the City formally implements a VMT methodology, which occurred on July 30, 2019. The fundamental objective of the Caltrans Agreement was to establish criteria by which projects are excluded from requiring further analysis. The methodologies and assumptions used to

prepare the Transportation Impact Study, included as Appendix J.1 of the Draft EIR, complied with the screening criteria included in the Caltrans Agreement. The Transportation Impact Study included a screening analysis in the MOU, as provided in Appendix A of the Transportation Impact Study, to determine if additional evaluation of freeway mainline segments and ramps was necessary beyond the requirements of Metro's Congestion Management Program (CMP). The Project did exceed the Caltrans screening criteria. Therefore, further analyses of Caltrans facilities were conducted, and the results of the analysis are included in Appendix G of the Transportation Impact Study.

Comment No. 3-8

2. On page 65 of TIS, Table 8 (Trip Generation) stated that the project would generate a net of 2,013 new project daily trips and 170/179 A.M./P.M. peak hour trips. Table 14 (Trip Generation—Supermarket Option) stated that the project would generate a net of 1,971 new project daily trips and 117/192 A.M./P.M. peak hour trips. This TIS identified 108 related projects in the project vicinity including the Hollywood Center Project (previously named Millennium Hollywood Project). As you know, the existing LOS on US-101 is operating at or near capacity. Many of the project's and trips generated by other nearby projects would be traveling on the State facilities once the projects are built. As such, Caltrans anticipates potential significant cumulative traffic impacts on the State facilities. As a reminder, the decision makers should be aware of this issue and be prepared to mitigate potential significant cumulative traffic impacts.

Response to Comment No. 3-8

The comment accurately states the Project trip generation estimates for both the retail/restaurant and grocery store options, as well as the number of Related Projects identified in the Project vicinity.

The comment states that decision makers (i.e., the City of Los Angeles) should be prepared to mitigate cumulative traffic impacts on State facilities. The Transportation Impact Study adequately analyzed cumulative traffic impacts according to the applicable and adopted thresholds of significance, as determined by the City as the lead agency. It should be noted that Caltrans has not developed or identified specific incremental criteria to measure the significance of Project effects on freeway mainline segments or intersections with ramp termini. Therefore, it is not possible to identify whether a specific facility would be significantly affected. The lack of a defined Caltrans threshold to determine whether a project affects facilities results in the inability to identify a direct nexus to the potential impacts of a project as well as any mitigation measures that could be feasible and necessary to reduce impacts to a level of less than significance.

Estimates of future traffic conditions both without and with the Project (representing cumulative conditions) were developed as part of the traffic and supplemental analyses. The Transportation Impact Study accounted for both ambient growth and growth resulting from related projects, which results in a highly conservative estimate of future cumulative conditions. Specifically, the buildout years of many of these related projects are uncertain and may be well beyond the buildout year of the Project; moreover, notwithstanding that some related projects may never be approved or developed, they were all considered as part of the Transportation Impact Study and conservatively assumed to be completed by the Project buildout year of 2023. Both ambient growth and related projects growth were considered in the Future year 2023 and 2035 analyses of Caltrans facilities, which are presented in Appendix G of the Transportation Impact Study. The Project's proportionate share of future traffic growth with regard to Caltrans freeway mainline segments based on the methodology provided in Appendix B of Caltrans' Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies (December 2002), was calculated for informational purposes in the Project's Transportation Impact Study, but for the reasons explained above, is not correlated to any relevant Project requirement, potential impact, or identified need for mitigation.

Furthermore, the Transportation Impact Study was prepared with LADOT's adopted policies, procedures, and standards as outlined in LADOT's Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (December 2016). The intersections of freeway ramp termini are located within the City of Los Angeles, and as such the City's adopted significant impact threshold criteria were employed in the traffic analysis. The cumulative traffic analyses at intersections with development of the retail/restaurant and grocery store options are outlined in Chapter 6 and Chapter 8 of the Transportation Impact Study. Based on the collected data and substantial evidence provided in the Project's Transportation Impact Study it, was concluded that the Project's contributions to cumulative conditions at the freeway ramp termini intersections would be less than significant as shown in Table G-10 and Table G-11, respectively. Therefore, mitigation is not required or legally warranted.

Comment No. 3-9

3. On page 71 of TIS, Table 9 Existing with Project Conditions, "LOS based on field observation... the calculated average operating conditions may appear better than is observed." Caltrans cannot verify this statement as neither the referenced date of the observation nor the field data are provided in the TIS.

Response to Comment No. 3-9

As shown in Table 9 of the Transportation Impact Study, the text referenced by the commenter is applicable to Intersection #9 (Vine Street and Hollywood Boulevard) and Intersection #16 (Vine Street and Sunset Boulevard). The calculated LOS at Intersection #9 and Intersection #16 under Existing Conditions were based on the existing configuration

and traffic volumes and were calculated to be LOS C based on standard LADOT methodology. However, to account for queuing along major corridors and pedestrian conflicts that may not be reflected by standard methodology, and for the purposes of providing a more conservative analysis, the intersections were evaluated under LOS D significance thresholds.

Comment No. 3-10

4. Please provide the data supporting the existing condition description at Location No. 1 Vine Street & Franklin Avenue/US-101 SB Off-ramp and Location No. 2 Argyle Avenue & Franklin Avenue/US-101 NB on-Ramp. For example, Location No. 1, we are not able at this time to concur with the LOS "A" for both A.M./P.M. peak hour in Table 5, page 33 of TIS.
 - a. The Project is expected to add 85 and 118 vehicles per hour (vph) during A.M. and P.M. peak periods respectively (Figure 6, page 43 of TIS).
 - b. This off-ramp, with a length of about 1,400 feet, has a 2017 demand of 1,578 vph and 1,143 vph during the 2017 A.M./P.M. peak hours respectively.
 - c. There is one lane at the entrance, 2 lanes at it terminus with Vine St. with a total storage distance of about 2,400 feet equivalent to a capacity of about 85 vehicles. Based on the data, the LOS is lower than LOS "A".

Response to Comment No. 3-10

The LOS results presented in Table 5, Existing Conditions, of the Transportation Impact Study were calculated based on the Critical Movement Analysis methodology, LADOT's adopted methodology in accordance with its Transportation Impact Study Guidelines, and utilized traffic counts collected in May 2015, which were grown by 1 percent per year to reflect Year 2017 conditions. The methodology calculated the intersection's volume to capacity ratio, which is used to determine the intersection LOS. The intersection peak hour counts and the detailed traffic analysis worksheets are provided in Appendix C and D, respectively, of the Transportation Impact Study. The traffic analysis presented in the Transportation Impact Study was reviewed and approved by LADOT in its assessment letter (*Transportation Impact Assessment for the Modera Argyle Mixed-Use Project at 1546 North Argyle Avenue*, dated May 18, 2018) included as Appendix J.2 of the Draft EIR.

The commenter incorrectly states the number of vehicles per hour that the Project is anticipated to add to the US-101 Off-Ramp at Vine Street (Intersection #1). As shown in Figure 9 of the Transportation Impact Study, the Project would add six A.M. peak hour trips and 19 P.M. peak hour trips to the freeway off-ramp. As shown in Figure 12 of the

Transportation Impact Study, the Project's grocery store option would add two A.M. peak hour trips and 19 P.M. peak hour trips to the freeway off-ramp.

The commenter correctly states the existing freeway off-ramp peak hour volumes that are presented in Figure 4 of the Transportation Impact Study.

A freeway off-ramp queueing evaluation under Existing Conditions was conducted based on the Highway Capacity Methodology (HCM) and is provided in Table G-12 in Appendix G of the Transportation Impact Study. As shown therein, the vehicle queue length at the US-101 SB Off-Ramp at Vine Street does not exceed the available capacity under Existing Conditions. In addition, neither the retail/restaurant nor grocery store options for the Project would substantially worsen the queue at this location.

Comment No. 3-11

5. On page G-11 of TIS, the segment of US-101 between Western Ave. and Highland Ave. represents one of the congested bottlenecks in Los Angeles County with speeds well below the posted limit of 55 mph for both its north and south directions. The existing condition analysis on the mainline should reflect the existing demand and meet drivers' perception. Therefore, we do not concur with the existing conditions as listed in Table G-4, Existing Operating Conditions Freeway Segment Level of Service Evaluation.

Response to Comment No. 3-11

Caltrans has historically accepted various methodologies to calculate LOS on a freeway, including the HCM methodology based on density, where the volume of traffic is divided by the operating speed of the freeway to yield a calculation of the number of vehicles per lane per hour per mile of freeway. The density calculation was converted into LOS based on the definitions in 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board, 2010). The analysis presented in Table G-4 was conducted based on the HCM methodology using existing traffic volume data from Caltrans' Performance Measurement System (PeMS) database for a typical weekday in January 2017. The commenter's suggestion to utilize driver perception as a metric for assessing LOS on freeway mainline segments is neither a feasible nor valid methodology for the purposes of determining impacts. In addition, the commenter does not provide technical and/or substantial evidence for the objection to the existing conditions LOS listed in Table G-4 of the Transportation Impact Study.

Furthermore, regardless of the calculated existing LOS, the Project would not contribute to a substantial increase in cumulative traffic on the freeway mainline facilities, as detailed in Table G-7 of the Transportation Impact Study. As shown, the Project-related

trips account for approximately 0.38 percent of the total cumulative traffic growth on the freeway mainline segments.

Comment No. 3-12

6. For queuing analysis from pages G-19 to G-21, the analysis does not appear to reflect the existing conditions.
 - a. For example, Location No. 1, SB US-101 off-ramp at Vine St./Franklin Ave., the movements allowed are thru and right only with the right-turn movement that has an existing demand of 1,148 vhp [sic] vs. the thru movement with 130 vph. When calculating que length from those numbers, the results differ from those reflected in Table G-12.
 - b. As a reminder, Caltrans is concerned that additional traffic exiting the freeway may potentially back into the mainline through lanes if the queue exceeds the storage capacity on the off ramps. A queuing analysis should be performed using HCM methodology. The capacity of the off-ramp should be calculated by the actual length of the off-ramp between the terminuses to the gore point with a safety factor. The existing queue length should be calculated from the traffic counts, actual signal timing, and the actual percent of truck assignments with an adequate passenger car equivalent factor.
 - c. Signal optimization should be considered as a mitigation measure.

Response to Comment No. 3-12

The commenter states that the calculated queue length differs from the results presented in Table G-12. However, the comment does not provide the results of the calculation or technical support or any substantial evidence.

As stated in Response to Comment No. 3-10, a queuing evaluation at the analyzed freeway off-ramp locations was conducted based on HCM methodology and is presented in Tables G-12 through G-14 of the Transportation Impact Study. The queuing evaluation was conducted using existing traffic counts and the off-ramp capacities were measured between the termini to the gore point, consistent with the methodology identified by the commenter. The application of a "safety factor" as identified by the commenter would reflect an artificially reduced off-ramp capacity as compared to actual conditions in an effort to provide a more conservative queue evaluation. The "safety factor" is already considered in the queue evaluation with the utilization of the 95th percentile queue length. In other words, the queue lengths that can be expected at the off-ramp would be less than the calculations shown in Table G-12 through G-14 95 percent of the time.

The queue evaluation was conducted using the signal phasing that is in place at the intersection today and the predominant maximum signal cycle lengths for the area. Signal timing for each signal phase was optimized and would only differ from the signal timing plan if the traffic signal operation was not set to be responsive to actual traffic conditions. The intersections in question are part of the Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control (ATSAC) system in the City of Los Angeles and thus are intended to be responsive to traffic on all legs of the intersection and balance the overall delay of all traffic using the intersection.

As detailed on page G-7 of the Transportation Impact Study, is it projected that the queue at US-101 Southbound Off-Ramp at Vine Street and US-101 Southbound Off-Ramp at Gower Street would extend beyond the available capacity under Future Year 2035 Conditions, with and without the addition of Project traffic for either Project option. However, the addition of Project traffic does not substantially increase the off-ramp queue at either location (approximately one vehicle length at either location). The queues at the remaining two off-ramps would not extend onto the freeway mainline under any of the analyzed conditions.

The comment states that signal optimization should be considered as a mitigation measure. As stated in Response to Comment No. 3-8, Caltrans has not identified or adopted specific criteria by which to measure the significance of impacts to the freeway facilities, identify the need for a mitigation measure, or measure how any suggested mitigation measure would reduce the identified impact. Moreover, the comment does not identify an alleged impact that the suggested optimization would address. Notwithstanding, the freeway ramp termini intersection traffic signals are controlled by the City of Los Angeles and are already optimized based on the traffic levels on all approaches to the intersection. All traffic signals within the City of Los Angeles are equipped with the ATSAC system as well as the Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS). The ATSAC system allows for real-time adjustment of signal timing plans to reflect changing traffic conditions, identification of unusual traffic conditions caused by incidents, the ability to implement special purpose short-term signal timing changes in response to incidents, and the ability to identify signal equipment malfunctions quickly. ATCS is a computer-based traffic signal program that provides fully responsive traffic signal control based on real-time conditions, and automatically adjusts and optimizes traffic signal timing in response to current traffic demands on the entire signal network such that the number of stops and the amount of delay is minimized along the improved traffic signal coordination throughout the network. Thus, the traffic signals are continually optimized to respond to system-wide traffic demands. Therefore, even if an impact had been identified pursuant to any adopted threshold, signal optimization would not be considered a viable mitigation measure.

Comment No. 3-13

7. From page 79 to page 83, Signal Warrant Analysis, before making a determination on the need of a traffic signal at every studied intersection, the warrant analysis needs to be conducted for all warrant cases including other safety measures, pedestrian, etc., and not just the peak-hour warrant. We note that, based on Table 13 (page 83 of TIS) Signal Warrant Analysis, a signal is needed at Location No. 25, Gower Street & US-101 Southbound Off-ramp/Yucca Street.

Response to Comment No. 3-13

The suggestion that all warrant cases should be evaluated at every studied intersection is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

As noted on page 80 of the Transportation Impact Study, the intersection of Gower Street & US-101 Southbound Off-Ramp/Yucca Street (Intersection No. 25) as identified by the commenter meets the minimum peak hour traffic volume and delay requirements of Warrant 3 under Existing and Future Conditions, without the addition of Project traffic. However, as also stated on page 80 of the Transportation Impact Study, the satisfaction of the peak hour thresholds alone does not dictate the requirement of the installation of a traffic control signal. That decision is made by the agency or agencies with jurisdiction over the intersection (here, LADOT and Caltrans), which would consider additional factors such as spacing with adjacent intersections, interruption of traffic flow on the major streets, etc. It should be noted that neither Project option (retail/restaurant or grocery store) would add any trips to the US-101 Southbound Off-Ramp at Gower Street, as detailed in Figures 9 and 12 of the Transportation Impact Study, respectively. The Project would add no more than 14 trips to Gower Street at this intersection during either commuter peak hour, which accounts for less than 1 percent of the total traffic at the intersection. Thus, the Project's contribution of traffic to the intersection is nominal.

Comment No. 3-14

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

Response to Comment No. 3-14

This comment makes a general statement on stormwater. Please refer to the Project's Initial Study included as Appendix A of the Draft EIR for a complete discussion of

the Project's stormwater impacts. As evaluated therein, impacts with respect to both stormwater flows and water quality would be less than significant.

Comment No. 3-15

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

Response to Comment No. 3-15

This comment provides a general comment on construction-related truck trips and the need to obtain a permit from Caltrans for oversized transport vehicles to use state highways and recommends large truck trips be limited to off-peak hours, but does not raise any specific, substantive issues on the content of the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, the Project will comply with applicable Caltrans requirements. As detailed in the Construction Traffic Management Plan that is required to be prepared pursuant to Project Design Feature TR-PDF-1, construction related deliveries would be scheduled to occur outside of the commuter peak periods, to the extent feasible, to reduce the effect on traffic flow on the surrounding street system. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 3-16

Per phone the conversation with traffic consultant, Gibson Transportation Consulting, Inc. on May 28, 2019, the developer understands Caltrans's traffic concerns and is willing to discuss further and possibly enter into a fair share agreement in the future. We may provide additional comments or concurrence based on any follow-up meetings. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Alan Lin the project coordinator at (213) 897-8391 and refer to GTS # 07-LA-2016-02420AL-DEIR.

Response to Comment No. 3-16

This comment concludes the letter and raises the possibility of a fair share agreement. Section IV.G, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, and the Transportation Impact Study provide a thorough evaluation of potential transportation impacts based on the established significance thresholds and methodologies of the City of Los Angeles, the lead agency. As the lead agency, the City reserves its discretion to select the appropriate thresholds of significance and methodologies for the preparation of its EIRs. Caltrans has not identified or adopted specific criteria by which to measure the potential significance of impacts to the freeway facilities, identify the need for a mitigation measure, or measure how any such mitigation could reduce an identified impact. Absent evidence of any

impacts or any reasonable and legally enforceable plan for mitigation of any such impacts, the City would not include a discussion of any voluntary fees paid to another agency in the EIR or condition the Project on the payment of any such fees.

Comment Letter No. 4

Pete Cooke
Site Mitigation and Restoration Program
Chatsworth Regional Office
Department of Toxic Substances Control
9211 Oakdale Ave.
Chatsworth, CA 91311-6520

Comment No. 4-1

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has received the document for the above-mentioned project.

Based on the review of the document, the DTSC comments are as follows:

- 1) The document needs to identify and determine whether current or historic uses at the project site have resulted in any release of hazardous wastes/substances at the project area.

Response to Comment No. 4-1

This comment introduces the letter and states the document needs to identify any current or historic uses on the Project Site that have resulted in a release of hazardous materials. A full analysis of Hazards and Hazardous Materials is provided in the Project's Initial Study included as Appendix A of the Draft EIR. As discussed therein, the Project Site has previously been used as a film set, film vault, greenhouse, and office building. The use of film developing laboratory chemicals between the mid-1920s to the 1980s is considered a recognized environmental condition (REC) for the Project Site. Based on this finding, a Phase II subsurface investigation was conducted. Soil samples tested negative for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and tetrachloroethylene (PCE). However, PCE was detected in soil vapor samples at a maximum concentration of 850 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), which exceeds the environmental screening level (ESL) for residential uses of $240 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. This screening level is based on sampling that occurs directly beneath the concrete slab of residential construction. As discussed in Attachment A, Project Description, of this Initial Study, the residential portion of the Project would be located above ground floor commercial uses, as well as an underground parking garage. The ventilation system within the parking garage and the multiple levels of space between the residential units and any soils that may contain residual PCE in soil vapors would alleviate any potential hazards from these vapors. Additionally, the soil that contains the PCE vapors would be excavated for the construction of the parking garage. Excavation activities would be performed in accordance with a soil management plan (SMP) prepared

for the Project. Preparation and implementation of the SMP is now included as HAZ-PDF-1 and is reflected in Section III, Revisions, Clarifications, and Corrections to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR. The purpose of the SMP is to describe specific soil-handling controls required for complying with local, state and federal overseeing agencies; prevent unacceptable exposure to contaminated soil; and prevent the improper disposal of contaminated soils. Based on the above, the PCE detected in soil vapor beneath the site would not represent a hazard to the Project Site.

Comment No. 4-2

2) The document needs to identify any known or potentially contaminated site within the proposed project area. For all identified sites, the document needs to evaluate whether conditions at the site pose a threat to human health or the environment.

Response to Comment No. 4-2

As discussed in the Initial Study included as Appendix A of the Draft EIR, the Phase I included the results of consultation with local agency representatives and a review of available federal, state, and local databases including, but not limited to, Envirostor, Geotracker, ZIMAS, and the Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR). The Project Site is listed in the HAZNET database for generating 0.25 tons of ACM waste in 1994. Based on a lack of reported violations, this is not considered to represent a hazard to the Project Site. Various sites in the vicinity of the Project Site are listed in the databases as leaking underground storage tank (LUST) sites, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) enforcement actions and listed hazardous waste generators, and spill reports. However, the majority of these cases are in remediation or have been closed and none of them are considered to be an issue for the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment associated with identification of the Project Site on a hazardous materials list.

Comment No. 4-3

3) The document should identify the mechanism to initiate any required investigation and/or remediation for any site that may require remediation, and which government agency will provide appropriate regulatory oversight.

Response to Comment No. 4-3

Refer to Response to Comment Nos.4-1 and 4-2 above. As discussed therein, excavation activities at the Project Site would be performed in accordance with a SMP prepared for the Project, and the database listings identified are not considered to represent a hazard to the Project Site.

Comment No. 4-4

4) If during construction of the project, soil contamination is suspected, construction in the area should stop and appropriate health and safety procedures should be implemented. If it is determined that contaminated soil exists, the document should identify how any required investigation or remediation will be conducted, and which government agency will provide appropriate regulatory oversight.

Response to Comment No. 4-4

Refer to Response to Comment No. 4-1 above. As discussed therein, excavation activities would be performed in accordance with an SMP prepared for the Project. The purpose of the SMP is to describe specific soil-handling controls required for complying with local, state and federal overseeing agencies; prevent unacceptable exposure to contaminated soil; and prevent the improper disposal of contaminated soils.

Comment No. 4-5

DTSC provides guidance for Preliminary Endangerment Assessment (PEA) preparation, and cleanup oversight through the Voluntary Cleanup Program (VCP). For additional information on the VCP, please visit DTSC's web site at www.dtsc.ca.gov. If you would like to meet and discuss this matter further, please contact me at (818) 717-6555 or Pete.Cooke@dtsc.ca.gov.

Response to Comment No. 4-5

This comment concludes the letter and provides a point of contact. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 5

Shine Ling, AICP
Manager, Transit Oriented Communities
Metro
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Comment No. 5-1

Thank you for coordinating with the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) regarding the proposed Modera Argyle (Project) located at 1546 North Argyle Avenue in the City of Los Angeles (City). Metro is committed to working with local municipalities, developers, and other stakeholders across Los Angeles County on transit-supportive developments to grow ridership, reduce driving, and promote walkable neighborhoods. Transit Oriented Communities (TOCs) are places (such as corridors or neighborhoods) that, by their design, allow people to drive less and access transit more. TOCs maximize equitable access to a multi-modal transit network as a key organizing principle of land use planning and holistic community development.

The purpose of this letter is to outline recommendations from Metro concerning issues that are germane to our agency's statutory responsibility in relation to Metro bus facilities and services, which may be affected by the proposed Project. In addition to the specific comments outlined below, Metro would like to provide the Applicant with the Metro Adjacent Development Handbook (attached), which provides an overview of common concerns for development adjacent to Metro-owned right-of-way (ROW). The document and additional resources are available at www.metro.net/projects/devreview/.

Response to Comment No. 5-1

This introductory comment provides an overview of Metro and states the purpose of the letter. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 5-2**Project Description**

The Project is adjacent to Metro bus services and includes a new mixed-use project on a 1.1-acre site located within the Hollywood community of the City of Los Angeles. The Project includes 276 residential units, 13 of which would be restricted to Very Low Income households, up to 24,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial retail and restaurant uses, and up to 412 vehicle parking spaces.

Response to Comment No. 5-2

This comment correctly summarizes the retail/restaurant option Project Description but omits the grocery store option. As discussed in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, an approximately 27,000 square-foot grocery store could be constructed in lieu of the proposed retail and restaurant uses.¹ This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 5-3

Comments

Bus Stop Adjacency

1. Bus Layover: Metro Bus Line 757 uses two layovers on Selma Avenue (Ave.) adjacent to the Project. The first bus layover is on eastbound Selma Ave. east of Argyle Ave., and the second is on eastbound Selma Ave. west of El Centro Ave. Both layovers are crucial to the operations function, as Metro is obligated under State laws and by contract to provide Bus Operators with a 15 to 20 minute “recovery time” at the end of the line. Losing access to either layover zone on Selma Ave. will cause a severe hardship on the operation of Line 757. As Line 757 needs access to the bus layover area on eastbound Selma from 6:30 A.M. to 7 P.M. Monday through Friday, we suggest that any construction closures of eastbound Selma Ave. only be allowed at night or on weekends so as not to interfere with Bus Operations. If these times are not suitable to the Applicant, we request that the City of LA help Metro identify an alternate layover location for Line 757 before approving the project. We expect that at the end of construction, Metro Line 757 buses would return to the two curbside bus layovers locations on eastbound Selma Ave. between Argyle Ave. and El Centro Ave. In addition, Metro uses an off-street layover facility on the northwest corner of Selma/Argyle used by Lines 180, 212, and 217. We need to maintain bus access to this essential off-street facility 24 hours per day/7 days a week (buses enter from southbound Argyle Ave. and exit to westbound Selma Ave.).

Temporary or permanent loss of these layover facilities could constitute a significant impact to transit. The EIR should analyze the Project’s potential impacts on the layover facilities (during construction and operation) and incorporate specific project design features and/or mitigation measures to address these impacts, as appropriate.

¹ *Under the grocery store option, the Project’s ground floor layout would be slightly reconfigured, but the Project’s overall footprint, height, massing, and total floor area would not change.*

Response to Comment No. 5-3

The City and the Applicant understand the importance of the bus layovers currently in use along both sides of Selma Avenue adjacent to the Project. The Draft EIR did acknowledge that the construction of the Project could require the relocation of the bus layover area on the south side of Selma Avenue east of Argyle Avenue. As part of the Construction Traffic Management Plan prepared pursuant to Project Design Feature TR-PDF-1, the Project would coordinate with Metro to address the relocation of the bus layover stop.

The Applicant is continuing to work with Metro to identify an alternate layover location for both the construction period and for a permanent relocation. The rationale for seeking a permanent relocation is that both the retail/restaurant and grocery store options are anticipated to have outdoor dining areas along Selma Avenue, which are typically incompatible with an active bus stop or layover area. Based on the potential relocation options, additional coordination with the adjacent property owners would also be required to obtain their approval of the ultimate relocation site. The Applicant is also continuing to work with these adjacent property owners regarding this issue. If an alternate location acceptable to Metro and the adjacent property owners cannot be found, the bus layover east of Argyle Avenue on the south side of Selma Avenue will remain in place.

The off-street bus layover facility on the northwest corner of Selma/Argyle will not be affected by the Project and will remain in place during construction and operation of the Project.

Comment No. 5-4*Transit Orientation*

Considering the Project's proximity to the Hollywood/Vine Station, Metro would like to identify the potential synergies associated with transit-oriented development:

1. Land Use: Metro supports development of commercial and residential properties near transit stations and understands that increasing development near stations represents a mutually beneficial opportunity to increase ridership and enhance transportation options for the users of developments. Metro encourages the City and Applicant to be mindful of the Project's proximity to the Hollywood/Vine Station, including orienting pedestrian pathways towards the station.
2. Walkability: Metro strongly encourages the installation of wide sidewalks, pedestrian lighting, a continuous canopy of shade trees, enhanced crosswalks with ADA-compliant curb ramps, and other amenities along all public street frontages of the development site to improve pedestrian safety and comfort to

access the nearby rail station. The City should consider requiring the installation of such amenities as part of the conditions of approval for the Project.

3. Access: The Project should address first-last mile connections to transit, encouraging development that is transit accessible with bicycle and pedestrian-oriented street design connecting transportation with housing and employment centers. For reference, please view the First Last Mile Strategic Plan, authored by Metro and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), available on-line at: http://media.metro.net/docs/sustainability_path_design_guidelines.pdf
4. Active Transportation: Metro encourages the Applicant to promote bicycle use through adequate short-term bicycle parking, such as ground level bicycle racks, as well as secure, access-controlled, enclosed long-term bicycle parking for residents, employees and guests. Bicycle parking facilities should be designed with best practices in mind, including highly visible siting, effective surveillance, easy to locate, and equipment installed with preferred spacing dimensions, so they can be safely and conveniently accessed. Additionally, the Applicant should help facilitate safe and convenient connections for pedestrians, people riding bicycles, and transit users to/from the Project site and nearby destinations. The Applicant is also encouraged to support these connections with wayfinding signage inclusive of all modes of transportation.
5. Wayfinding: Any temporary or permanent wayfinding signage with content referencing Metro services, or featuring the Metro brand and/or associated graphics (such as bus or rail pictograms) requires review and approval by Metro Art & Design. Please contact Lance Glover, Senior Manager of Signage and Environmental Graphic Design, at 213-922-2360 or GloverL@metro.net.
6. Multi-modal Connections: With an anticipated increase in traffic, Metro encourages an analysis of impacts on non-motorized transportation modes and consideration of improved non-motorized access to the Project and nearby transit services, including pedestrian connections and bike lanes/paths. Appropriate analyses could include multi-modal LOS calculations, pedestrian audits, etc.
7. Parking: Metro encourages the incorporation of transit-oriented, pedestrian-oriented parking provision strategies such as the reduction or removal of minimum parking requirements for specific areas and the exploration of shared parking opportunities. These strategies could be pursued to reduce automobile-orientation in design and travel demand.
8. Transit Pass: Metro would like to inform the Applicant of Metro's employer transit pass programs including the Annual Transit Access Pass (A-TAP) and Business Transit Access Pass (B-TAP) programs which offer efficiencies and group rates that businesses can offer employees as an incentive to utilize public transit. For

more information on these programs, contact Devon Deming at DemingD@metro.net.

Response to Comment No. 5-4

The City and the Applicant concur with the synergies pointed out above by Metro. The addition of both residential and commercial land uses in a mixed-use project within a Transit-Oriented District like Hollywood encourages movement of people via pedestrian, bicycle and transit modes. As such, the Project would be designed to support connections to non-motorized transportation modes. As discussed throughout the Draft EIR, the Project Site is located approximately 0.2 mile from the Metro Red Line Hollywood/Vine Station. Additionally, Metro and LADOT operate numerous bus lines with stops located in close proximity to the Project Site.

As discussed in Section IV.G, Transportation, of the Draft EIR and Chapter 9 of the Transportation Impact Study included as Appendix J.1 of the Draft EIR, based on the 15-percent mode split for transit/walk-in trips, transit trips generated by the Project under both options would account for less than 0.1 percent of the average available capacity of the transit lines operating within walking distance from the Project Site during the A.M. and P.M. peak hours. Thus, the transit trips generated by the Project would not create a capacity impact to the transit system in the area. In addition, both Project options would include outdoor dining areas along the Project frontages. Thus, as previously detailed in Response to Comment No. 5-3, the Applicant is continuing to coordinate with Metro and adjacent property owners to identify an alternate location for the existing bus layover currently located along the northern boundary of the Project Site, as well as to discuss the potential of providing required facilities for Metro bus drivers within the Project Site.

The Project would include neighborhood-serving commercial uses consisting of either retail/restaurant uses or a grocery store at ground level that would promote pedestrian activity with access provided from both Selma Avenue and Argyle Avenue and further activate the streets in the surrounding area. Pedestrian access to the residential uses would be provided along Argyle Avenue via the residential lobby. The Project as proposed includes the development of sidewalks, pedestrian connections to the street system, and crosswalks in conformance with the Mobility Plan and in full ADA compliance. Pedestrian access points would be designed to provide adequate sight distance, sidewalks, and/or pedestrian movement controls that would meet the City's requirements to protect pedestrian safety. The sidewalks would be separated from the street with trees, bike parking, and other landscape features, with proper pedestrian lighting in accordance with City regulations. The proposed driveways along Selma Avenue are concentrated to the northeastern boundary of the Project Site to minimize vehicular/pedestrian crossings. The driveways would also be designed to limit potential impediments to visibility. In addition, vehicular circulation would be designed to not conflict with pedestrian and bicycle

circulation. Therefore, the impacts to bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be less than significant with operations of the Project. In addition, in accordance with the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC), both short-term and long-term bicycle parking is included in the Project.

Comment No. 5-5

Congestion Management Program

Beyond impacts to Metro facilities and operations, Metro must also notify the Applicant of state requirements. A Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA), with roadway and transit components, is required under the State of California Congestion Management Program (CMP) statute. The CMP TIA Guidelines are published in the “2010 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County,” Appendix D (attached).

Response to Comment No. 5-5

Section IV.G, Transportation, of the Draft EIR and Chapter 9 of the Transportation Impact Study included as Appendix J.1 of the Draft EIR include a full CMP analysis as described in the comment. The CMP analysis includes detailed analysis on the Project’s potential impacts on the arterial street system, the freeway system, and the transit system serving the study area. The analysis found that the Project did not have a significant impact on CMP facilities.

Comment No. 5-6

If you have any questions regarding this response, please contact me by phone at 213-922-2671, by email at LingS@metro.net, or by mail at the following address:

Metro Development Review
One Gateway Plaza MS 99-22-1
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Response to Comment No. 5-6

This comment concludes the letter and provides a point of contact. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 5-7

Attachment: Metro Adjacent Development Handbook: A Guide for Cities and Developers (54 pages)

Response to Comment No. 5-7

This attachment is the Metro Adjacent Development Handbook. Refer to Response to Comment Nos. 5-3 and 5-4, above.

Comment No. 5-8

Attachment: Congestion Management Program (8 pages)

Response to Comment No. 5-8

This attachment is the CMP guidelines. Refer to Response to Comment No. 5-5 above. As discussed therein, a CMP analysis was included in Section IV.G, Transportation, of the Draft EIR, as well as the Transportation Impact Study included as Appendix J.1 of the Draft EIR. The analysis found that the Project did not have a significant impact on CMP facilities.

Comment Letter No. 6

Ali Poosti
Division Manager
Wastewater Engineering Services Division
LA Sanitation and Environment

Comment No. 6-1

This is in response to your April 18, 2019 Notice of Completion and Availability of Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed mixed-use project located at 1546 N Argyle Ave and 6224 W Selma Ave, Los Angeles CA 90028. LA Sanitation, Wastewater Engineering Services Division has received and logged the notification. Upon review, there were no changes to the project and the previous response is valid. Please notify our office in the instance that additional environmental review is necessary for this project.

If you have any questions, please call Christopher DeMonbrun at (323) 342-1567 or email at chris.demonbrun@lacity.org

Response to Comment No. 6-1

This comment acknowledges receipt of the Notice of Completion and states LA Sanitation's previous response is still valid. Refer to Section IV.1.2, Utilities and Service Systems—Wastewater, of the Draft EIR, for a full analysis of the Project's Wastewater impacts. As discussed therein, impacts would be less than significant.

Comment Letter No. 7

Matt Dixon
Abundant Housing LA Steering Committee
620 W. Wilson Ave., Unit H
Glendale, CA 91203-2477

Mark Vallianatos
Abundant Housing LA Steering Committee
3591 Canada St.
Los Angeles CA 90065-2812

Leonora Camer
Abundant Housing LA Steering Committee
1013 16th St., Unit 102
Santa Monica CA 90403-4331

Brent Gaisford
Abundant Housing LA Steering Committee
Downtown LA Resident, CD 14
Los Angeles 90013

Gabe Rose
Abundant Housing LA Steering Committee

Chelsea Byers
Abundant Housing LA Steering Committee

Comment No. 7-1

We are writing to you in support of the proposed 276-unit mixed-use development, including 33 dedicated Extremely Low Income units, at 1546 North Argyle Avenue, case ENV-2016-3743-EIR. It will also include either 24,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial retail and restaurant uses, or a 27,000 square foot grocery store. The project will encompass up to 260,250 square feet of floor area and have a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 5:4:1. We urge the city to grant the incentive and waiver to permit the 14% Density Bonus, 20% increase in allowable FAR and 20% reduction in the project's rear yard.

The greater Los Angeles region is facing a severe housing shortage. This project will provide much needed housing. By creating new housing in this neighborhood, it will help to

reduce issues of gentrification and displacement in other parts of the region. Abundant Housing LA believes that these housing challenges can only be addressed if everyone in the region does their part.

Response to Comment No. 7-1

This comment expresses support for the Project and summarizes the Project Description. However, the comment incorrectly states that 33 of the proposed residential units would be dedicated Extremely Low Income Units. As discussed in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, 13 of the proposed residential units (5 percent of the Project Site's base density) would be restricted to Very Low Income households. This comment also urges the City to grant the Project's requested Density Bonus. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 7-2

This project is in a great location for housing. It is one block away from the Metro Red Line, which runs from North Hollywood to downtown LA, as well as DASH Hollywood. There is frequent Metro bus service 4 blocks away (Line 2 which runs between Westwood and downtown LA). There are an elementary school, middle school, and high school all within one mile, and many desirable neighborhood amenities such as restaurants, retail, and theaters are in easy walking and bicycling distance.

Response to Comment No. 7-2

This comment summarizes the available transit and amenities near the Project Site. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 7-3

It is great to see the developer using the Density Bonus program to bring both market rate and badly needed affordable housing to the city. Affordable housing programs that depend on a percentage of new construction being affordable need a lot of new construction to have an impact, and the city should work to increase the number of developers using the Density Bonus. The proposal for a Conditional Use to allow greater density in return for greater affordability shows that the appetite for an even larger Density Bonus program is there in the development community.

This project is a good project for Los Angeles and for the region. Again, we urge the city to grant the Density Bonus On-Menu Incentives and the Waivers of Development Standards.

Response to Comment No. 7-3

This comment expresses the support for use of the Density Bonus program. However, the comment incorrectly states that the Project would seek a Conditional Use to allow additional density as well as a Waiver of Development Standards. As discussed in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Project's proposed 14-percent density bonus is authorized by LAMC Section 12.22-A,25, and no separate Conditional Use to allow additional density is being sought. Furthermore, no Waiver of Development Standards is being requested. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 8

Richard Adkins
President
Hollywood Heritage
P.O. Box 2586
Hollywood, CA 90078-2586

Comment No. 8-1**1. The proposed project occupies a portion of a very important site in Hollywood History.**

Hollywood Heritage appreciates the opportunity to respond to the DEIR for the Project called Modera Argyle (ENV-2016-3743-EIR). The Project, as currently outlined in the DEIR, is to be built in the historic core of Hollywood, most specifically on land which was the first site of the Lasky Studio in Hollywood. The western most block of the Lasky Studio bordered by Argyle, Vine, Selma, and Sunset has already been redeveloped. The project area encompasses the eastern most part of the Lasky site. As the steward of the Hollywood Heritage Museum, a building which was formerly located on this property, Hollywood Heritage has as its mission to continue to keep the story of this important studio site alive.

Response to Comment No. 8-1

This comment introduces the letter and summarizes the commenter's interest in the Project Site. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 8-2

The historic assessment contained in the Appendix of the DEIR, provides an overview of this important piece of property. It correctly identifies two existing buildings, which are important property types to the movie industry. Hollywood Heritage acknowledges that the film lab building, now Ametron headquarters, has been substantially altered and does not convey any of its former significance. Hollywood Heritage would however like to encourage the applicant to work with Hollywood Heritage to interpret the history of this site and film lab on site.

Response to Comment No. 8-2

This comment acknowledges the findings of the Historic Report included as Appendix C.1 of the Draft EIR and encourages the Applicant to work with Hollywood

Heritage to further interpret the history of the Project Site. Specific issues raised by the commenter are addressed in Comment Nos. 8-3 and 8-4 below.

Comment No. 8-3

2. Hollywood Heritage requests further analysis of the significance of the film vault, a significant property type in Hollywood.

Also identified on the site is a series of film vaults. The assessment did not evaluate these vaults as significant. Hollywood Heritage would like the City to reconsider this evaluation in light of the fact that this particular property type is extraordinarily rare and that there are few if any examples of film vaults left, which are not on studio sites. Just recently the only other identified set of film vaults not on a studio site was demolished at 1040 Seward Street. Film vaults have been identified in the entertainment context for SurveyLA as a character defining feature of studio sites. The assessment and cultural resources section should be amended to include accurate information about the number and location of film vaults in Los Angeles and in particular any film vaults that are not located within working studio sites. Hollywood Heritage disagrees with the consultant assessment that these film vaults are not significant and would like more consultation with the applicant regarding the disposition of this potential resource.

Response to Comment No. 8-3

The commenter requests further analysis of the significance of the film vaults. The Historic Resource Assessment (Historic Report) prepared for the Project and included as Appendix C.1 of the Draft EIR contains exhaustive information on the history and development of early film laboratories in the Hollywood area. Film laboratories often included film vaults. However, as noted in the Historic Report: "Given that the vaults were constructed as a component of the film laboratory, they should not be considered as their own property type but rather one component of the film laboratory. As described in the history below, film vaults were not generally constructed independent of a larger film laboratory or film studio operation."² As nitrate film is highly flammable, it required storage in fire-proof concrete vaults separated from other buildings. Constructed as a necessary part of film laboratories and studios, film vaults are essentially ancillary areas for storage. Nitrate film is an archaic material and no longer produced or used.

² Refer to page 33 of the Historic Report included as Appendix C.1 of the Draft EIR.

While it is true that there are increasingly fewer film vaults than there were historically, according to Hollywood historian Marc Wanamaker, historic film vaults currently exist at the following motion picture studios:³

- Fox Pico: Film vaults, constructed circa 1935, are located in the editing building. Vaults are on the ground floor of a 2- to 3-story, reinforced concrete building, with a gallery above leading to a row of editing rooms.
- Paramount: Film vaults, constructed circa 1927, are located near “deMille A-tank,” adjacent to an editing and projection building.
- Universal: Film vaults, constructed circa 1930s, are numerous and located throughout the property, and have been used for general storage since the 1980s.
- Warner Brothers: Film vaults, constructed circa 1930s, are located in the editing building, similar to Fox Pico.

It is well beyond the scope of the proposed Project’s CEQA analysis to identify film vaults throughout Los Angeles that are not located within known studio sites. While it is possible vaults exist at private residences or other private properties, it is nearly impossible to know where these vaults may be located, and it is not possible to access private property to further research potential locations. As noted in the Historic Report, actor Harold Lloyd had a film vault constructed in his Beverly Hills estate. While existence of this film vault was reported in connection to a fire in the vaults in 1943, there is no other documentation of film vaults citywide, nor is there a way to identify where other film vaults were located before nitrate film was phased out in 1949–1950.

While the commenter contends that film vaults are individually significant in their own right, outside of a larger film studio or campus of film laboratory buildings, no additional information is provided to support this conclusion. In addition, the commenter contends that film vaults have been identified in the entertainment context for SurveyLA as a character defining feature of studio sites. While the summary table for the Entertainment Industry historic context notes that major motion picture studios contained a variety of building types, it does not specifically note film storage buildings. Based on extensive research, the Historic Report concludes that the film vaults have generally always been connected with a larger film studio or campus of film laboratory buildings. The film vaults at the subject property were originally part of a larger campus and do not on their own

³ *Wanamaker, Marc, phone conversation with Jenna Snow, February 15, 2019. Marc Wanamaker is a leading authority on Hollywood history, author of over 20 books on the topic, and principal officer of Bison Archives, a private collection of historic photographs and ephemera related to the motion picture industry.*

represent a unique type. There is no evidence these vaults in particular represented an important aspect of film storage that changed the way film was stored or had broad, wide-reaching influence on film history. Rather, the film vaults at the subject property were typical and utilitarian, with their design following the known history of such structures, constructed as ancillary storage structures at a property principally used as a film laboratory.

Comment No. 8-4

An overlooked historical element of film production related sites is the sequential ownership and operation of sites by like industries. On this parcel, in addition to Ametron as its most current operator, was also the Burns Revier Studio and Laboratory, the Lasky Feature Play Company, Famous Players Lasky studio, Otto K. Olesen lighting, and NBC radio city, all entertainment industry entities whose business involved interaction with other production companies which informed operations and subsequently services and construction on properties they owned or managed. It is through this lineage of production that these vaults were built and used, contributing to the historic industrial life of Hollywood.

Response to Comment No. 8-4

The commenter appears to argue that the subject property is significant for “the sequential ownership and operation... by like industries... whose business involved interaction with other production companies.”

Consistent with the commenter’s suggestion, the Historic Report finds that the subject property has potential significance for its association with the early history of Famous Players–Lasky Corporation. Originally designed as a state-of-the-art film laboratory, Building A, the primary building on the site, served as an important location for film processing, as well as innovation related to technical aspects of filmmaking between 1923, when it was constructed, and 1926, when Famous Players–Lasky Corporation moved to the current Paramount studio lot on Melrose Avenue. However, as described in the Historic Report, and summarized below, Building A was not found significant for association with later owners or tenants, and has been substantially altered and is not able to convey significance with early film history in the 1920s.

As described in the Historic Report and Section IV.B, Cultural Resources, of the Draft EIR, the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) is an authoritative guide used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the State’s historic and archaeological resources and indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 4852(c): “The California Register provides that integrity is the authenticity of an historical resources’ physical identity evidenced by the

survival of characteristics that existed during the resource's period of significance.... It is possible that historical resources may not retain sufficient integrity to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register, but they may still be eligible for listing in the California Register." Guidance prepared for the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) provides the following regarding properties eligible under National Register criterion A ("associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history"), which is comparable to California Register criterion 1 ("associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States"):

Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance. To be listed in the National Register of Historic Places, a property must not only be shown to be significant under the National Register criteria, but it also must have integrity. The evaluation of integrity is sometimes a subjective judgment, but it must always be grounded in an understanding of a property's physical features and how they relate to its significance. Historic properties either retain integrity (this is, convey their significance) or they do not. Within the concept of integrity, the National Register criteria recognizes seven aspects or qualities that, in various combinations, define integrity. To retain historic integrity a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects. The retention of specific aspects of integrity is paramount for a property to convey its significance. Determining which of these aspects are most important to a particular property requires knowing why, where, and when the property is significant. The following sections define the seven aspects and explain how they combine to produce integrity.

SEVEN ASPECTS OF INTEGRITY

- *Location*
- *Design*
- *Setting*
- *Materials*
- *Workmanship*
- *Feeling*
- *Association*⁴

⁴ *United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, How to Apply National Register Criteria, 1997, p. 44.*

Furthermore, in assessing properties eligible under National Register Criterion A/ California Register Criterion 1 for integrity, the following guidance is applicable: “A property that is significant for its historic association is eligible if it retains the essential physical features that made up its character or appearance during the period of its association with the important event, [or] historical pattern.”⁵

Specifically, Building A has been substantially altered since the 1920s and looks nothing like it did during the period associated with Famous Players–Lasky Corporation. It lacks integrity of design, materials, and workmanship, feeling and association as all elevations have been substantially altered with removal of all fenestration, addition to the southeast corner of the building, addition of the loading dock, reconfiguration of the main entrance, and recladding of exterior walls.

The commenter asserts that the film vaults were used by subsequent owners and tenants of the subject property. Ownership of the subject property is described in detail in the Historic Report and was determined by chain of title. Tenant information is also described in detail in the Historic Report and was based on information provided in historic Los Angeles City Directories. Subsequent to Famous Players–Lasky Corporation, the subject property was owned and used by General Film Laboratories (1952–1968) and De Lux General/Deluxe Laboratories (1969–1988). The subject property was not found significant for association with either of these owners. It is not known how either company used the film vaults during their tenure at the subject property. While it is possible these two companies used the film vaults as storage, nitrate film was phased out in 1949–1950 in favor of acetate-based safety film.

The commenter notes ownership and operation of the subject property by Otto K. Olesen. While the lighting company had offices nearby at 1645 Hudson Avenue (1921 *Los Angeles City Directory*) and 1560 Vine Street (1938 *Los Angeles City Directory*), there is no evidence that the company ever owned or occupied the subject property. The commenter also notes ownership and operation by “NBC radio city.” Again, while NBC Radio City opened in 1938 nearby the subject property, it occupied the prominent northwest corner at Sunset Boulevard and Vine Street and not the subject property. The commentator does not offer any evidence the subject property was ever associated with Olesen or NBC Radio City.

⁵ *United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, How to Apply National Register Criteria, 1997, p. 46.*

Comment No. 8-5

Do [sic] to its settlement Agreement with the CRA/LA Hollywood Heritage continues to review demolition permits for proposed projects in the CRA area. To date we have not received a demolition request for these buildings, which we assume is because the project has not yet been approved. Our comments on the demolition permit will reflect some of the concerns noted above unless further information regarding the vaults and documentation of the project is forthcoming.

Response to Comment No. 8-5

This comment notes that a demolition permit is not available for review at this time. As of the date of this publication, no demolition permits have been issued. The Applicant will adhere to all City regulations and permitting processes with respect to future demolition of the on-site buildings.

Comment No. 8-6**3. About Hollywood Heritage**

Hollywood Heritage is a non-profit organization dedicated to preservation of the historic built environment in Hollywood and to education about the early film industry and the role its pioneers played in shaping Hollywood's history. Our mission is not just the protection of individual "landmark" buildings but of the collection of historic resources as a whole, preserving patterns of connectivity that tell the story of Hollywood's historic development, the "setting". [sic] This includes preserving structures from each period of development so that historic patterns can be perceived physically. Hollywood Heritage does not oppose growth, but believes that the majority of sites in the historic core (mostly now identified in land use designations as "regional center") should be developed to be compatible "infill" which should support, not further compromise, the Hollywood that attracts millions of visitors a year with its historic "sense of place."

Hollywood Heritage looks forward to further communication with the applicant in order to resolve these concerns.

Response to Comment No. 8-6

This comment concludes the letter and summarizes Hollywood Heritage's mission. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 9

Susan Hunter
Housing is a Human Right
6500 Sunset Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90028-7202

Comment No. 9-1

It has come to our attention that the proposed project is in violation of the CRA Hollywood Redevelopment Plan as the Plan Area does not meet with [sic] Health & Safety Code DIV 24, PART 1, Chapter 4 (2) (A) (i) Prior to the time limit on the effectiveness of the redevelopment plan established pursuant to Sections 33333.2, 33333.6, and 33333.10 at least 15 percent of all new and substantially rehabilitated dwelling units developed within a project area under the jurisdiction of an agency by public or private entities or persons other than the agency shall be available at affordable housing cost to, and occupied by, persons and families of low or moderate income. Not less than 40 percent of the dwelling units required to be available at affordable housing cost to, and occupied by, persons and families of low or moderate income shall be available at affordable housing cost to, and occupied by, very low income households.

Response to Comment No. 9-1

This comment states that the Project is in violation of the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan because the area does not meet the requirements of Health and Safety Code Section 33413(b)(2)(A)(i), which the commenter partially cites. The requirements outlined therein do not apply to individual construction projects. Specifically, Health and Safety Code Section 33413(b)(3) (the subsection immediately following the provision quoted by the commenter) clearly states: “The **requirements of this subdivision shall apply, in the aggregate**, to housing made available pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, **and not to each individual case of rehabilitation, development, or construction of dwelling units**, unless an agency determines otherwise.” [Emphasis added.] Section 410.4 of the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan also clearly states the following:

*At least fifteen percent (15%) of all new or rehabilitated units developed within the Project Area by public or private entities or persons other than the Agency shall be for persons and families of low or moderate income; and of such fifteen percent, not less than forty percent (40%) thereof shall be for very low income households. **The percentage requirements set forth in this Section shall apply in the aggregate to housing in the Project Area not to each individual case of rehabilitation, development or construction of dwelling units.*** [Emphasis added.]

Furthermore, as discussed in Section IV.D, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, the Project would include 5 percent of the Project's permitted base density as Very Low Income units, in conformance with State and City density bonus law, and would also be consistent with the applicable policies of the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan.

Comment No. 9-2

Proposed project is in violation of Health & Safety Code §50052.5, to persons and families of low- or moderate-income, as defined in Health & Safety Code §50093, very low-income households, as defined in Health & Safety Code §50105, and extremely low-income households as defined in Health & Safety Code §50106.

Response to Comment No. 9-2

This comment states that the Project is in violation of Health and Safety Code Section 50052.5 but does not provide any further explanation. Health and Safety Code Section 50052.5 contains various definitions pertaining to allowable affordable housing costs for housing projects that receive funding from the State's Department of Housing and Community Development. The Project is not receiving any such funding or other public assistance. Furthermore, the Project's restricted affordable units will be subject to affordable housing cost regulations promulgated by the City's Housing and Community Investment Department. The comment therefore does not apply to the Project.

Comment No. 9-3

The proposed project must conform to all local Community and CRA Redevelopment Plans. Per AB 1505 (Bloom), the proposed project lacks a large amount of affordable housing to help with the deficit of over 2,000 units that the current CRA Redevelopment Plan area has.

Response to Comment No. 9-3

This comment states that the Project must conform to Community Plan and Redevelopment Plan requirements. As discussed in Section IV.D, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, the Project is consistent with the applicable policies of the Hollywood Community Plan and the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan. The comment also references AB 1505, which authorizes but does not mandate the adoption of inclusionary housing laws by local jurisdictions. No inclusionary housing law or policy applies to the Project. Furthermore, as discussed in Section IV.D, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, the Project is consistent with those housing-related regulations and policies that do apply to the Project, including the City's density bonus law and the City's Housing Element.

Comment No. 9-4

We are not within compliance of the law, which the agency has a right to enforce and deem that the project should supply 100% affordable housing in order to help with the current deficit.

Response to Comment No. 9-4

This comment states that the Lead Agency has a right to require 100 percent of the proposed housing units to be affordable units. As noted in Response to Comment No. 9-3, no inclusionary housing law or policy applies to the Project. Furthermore, no other City or State law or policy would permit the City to mandate that the Project consist entirely of affordable units.

Comment No. 9-5

At the least should be 15%, which will only mean the deficit in affordable housing won't be met as quickly.

Response to Comment No. 9-5

This comment states that the Lead Agency should require at least 15 percent of the proposed housing units to be affordable units. As discussed in Response to Comment Nos. 9-1 and 9-4, the Project is in conformance with all applicable City and State housing laws and policies. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 9-6

CEQA fails to examine the lack of meeting affordable housing requirements area wide, therefore the proposed project will have to include 15% (41 units of) affordable housing to help diminish the overall lack of affordable housing available.

Response to Comment No. 9-6

This comment states that CEQA fails to examine the lack of meeting affordable housing requirements area wide. This comment does not address any specific aspect of the Draft EIR.

Comment No. 9-7

Until such time as the Plan Area meets the affordable housing requirements deemed under State law, then any future projects moving forward will have to include enough affordable housing in all categories in order to reach compliance.

Response to Comment No. 9-7

This comment does not address any specific aspect of the Draft EIR and states that future projects will need to include enough affordable housing units to reach compliance. As discussed above in Response to Comment No. 9-1, the Project would include 5 percent of the Project's permitted base density as Very Low Income units, meeting City density bonus law requirements. As discussed in Response to Comment No. 9-4, no other State or City housing law or policy mandates additional affordable units to be provided by the Project.

Comment Letter No. 10

Alek Friedman
alek3773@gmail.com

Comment No. 10-1

I am a resident of Hollywood, living just walking distance (!) from the proposed project at **1546 N. Argyle Avenue**/6224 W. Selma Avenue, Hollywood CA 90028. I am truly excited about the project, and would like to express my full **SUPPORT**. The area definitely needs an improvement, and this proposed contemporary development will, no doubt, bring positive transformation to the area.

I love the proposed design, especially the color scheme of the building—elegant white & light-grayish, and glass balconies. This will give this area a nice, fresh feel—and a vibrant atmosphere.

To be honest, the proposed development is MUCH better than most projects recently built... So, I am happily giving the developer **4 stars** for the style and design (by the way, I have experience in architecture and urban development advocacy).

And I am referring to the latest post on Urbanize.LA:
<https://urbanize.la/post/new-look-hollywoods-modera-argyle-apartments>

Response to Comment No. 10-1

This comment expresses support for the Project. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 10-2

I do have one suggestion—in regards to the development. I believe, the sidewalks adjacent to the proposed building should definitely have decorative sidewalks/**pavers**. As I'm sure you know, most U.S. cities offer sidewalks with much better covering than L.A. does. Even in San Diego, Santa Barbara, and San Francisco you see much more attractive sidewalk pavement than in L.A.; hence many more pedestrians in those cities! Thankfully, some parts of L.A. (incl. Downtown, the Sunset Strip, Westwood, and mid-Wilshire area) started using decorative pavers.

In order to promote walkability in Hollywood and improve the look of a new mixed-use development, a major improvement to sidewalks is needed. **Decorative pavers is a**

“**Must**” for the Modera Argyle project! Therefore, I strongly urge the developer to consider adding decorative **pavers**.

Response to Comment No. 10-2

This comment urges the Applicant to consider decorative pavers. While the Project does not propose the use of decorative pavers, the Project would promote pedestrian activity by siting all retail and restaurant uses proposed for the Project Site along Argyle Avenue and Selma Avenue and provide linkages to the existing commercial uses in the Project vicinity. In addition, the Project would enhance the pedestrian streetscape environment along Argyle Avenue and Selma Avenue by incorporating pedestrian friendly design features such as floor-to-ceiling glass, landscaped entrances, and wide sidewalks that would be separated from the streets by bike parking, trees, and other landscape features.

Comment No. 10-3

Thank you so much for reviewing my comments, and for consideration. *Please forward this suggestion to all parties fo [sic] interest. Thanks again!

You can contact me, should you have any questions or concerns.

Response to Comment No. 10-3

This comment concludes the letter and requests that it be forwarded to all parties of interest. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment Letter No. 11

Lloyd J. Princeton
Design Management Co.
5418 Tenth Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90043-2526

Comment No. 11-1

I just received notice that the Draft EIR is available for a proposed project next door to where I live. My question: what type of influence can the public have at this stage? Modify/cancel/delay/revise the project?

Thank you!

Response to Comment No. 11-1

This comment acknowledges receipt of the Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Project and requests additional information on the public's ability to influence decision makers. As noted in the NOA, the Draft EIR was circulated for the mandatory 45-day public comment period beginning on April 18, 2019. On April 22, 2019, the City responded to the commenter with the following:

The Modera Argyle Draft EIR is available for public review and comments (please note all comments must be submitted in writing in accordance with the directions included on the Notice of Completion and Availability). At this time the public is welcome to submit comments pertaining to the Draft EIR and/or the project in general. Please note that any comments regarding the Draft EIR must be submitted by Monday June 3, 2019 at 4 PM. Comments not focused on the Draft EIR can be submitted throughout the planning process and will be included as part of the record (as long as they are submitted in writing).

The public comment period concluded on June 3, 2019 (reflecting a total comment period of 46 days), and no further comments from the commenter were received.

Comment Letter No. 12

Abundant Housing LA form letter
(multiple signatures—see following list)

Comment No. 12-1

I am writing to you in support of the proposed 276-unit mixed-use development, including 33 dedicated Extremely Low Income units, at 1546 North Argyle Avenue, case ENV-2016-3743-EIR. It will also include either 24,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial retail and restaurant uses, or a 27,000 square foot grocery store. The project will encompass up to 260,250 square feet of floor area and have a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 5:4:1. I urge the city to grant the incentive and waiver to permit the 14% Density Bonus, 20% increase in allowable FAR and 20% reduction in the project's rear yard.

The greater Los Angeles region is facing a severe housing shortage. This project will provide much needed housing. By creating new housing in this neighborhood, it will help to reduce issues of gentrification and displacement in other parts of the region. These housing challenges can only be addressed if everyone in the region does their part.

Response to Comment No. 12-1

This comment, which was received from the 28 individuals listed below, is substantively the same as Comment No. 7-1. Refer to Response to Comment No. 7-1 above.

Comment No. 12-2

This project is in a great location for housing. It is one block away from the Metro Red Line, which runs from North Hollywood to downtown LA, as well as DASH Hollywood. There is frequent Metro bus service 4 blocks away (Line 2 which runs between Westwood and downtown LA). There are an elementary school, middle school, and high school all within one mile, and many neighborhood amenities such as restaurants, retail, and theaters are in easy walking and bicycling distance.

Response to Comment No. 12-2

This comment, which was received from the 28 individuals listed below, is identical to Comment No. 7-2. Refer to Response to Comment No. 7-2 above.

Comment No. 12-3

It is great to see the developer using the Density Bonus program to bring both market rate and badly needed affordable housing to the city. Affordable housing programs that depend on a percentage of new construction being affordable need a lot of new construction to have an impact, and the city should work to increase the number of developers using the Density Bonus. The proposal for a Conditional Use to allow greater density in return for greater affordability shows that the appetite for an even larger Density Bonus program is there in the development community.

This project is a good project for Los Angeles and for the region. Again, I urge the city to grant the Density Bonus On-Menu Incentives and the Waivers of Development Standards.

Response to Comment No. 12-3

This comment, which was received from the 28 individuals listed below, is identical to Comment No. 7-3. Refer to Response to Comment No. 7-3 above.

Comment No. 12-4

Personally sent by [commenter's name] using Abundant Housing LA's Advocacy Tool. Abundant Housing LA is a grassroots pro-housing organization.

Response to Comment No. 12-4

This comment, which was received from the 28 individuals listed below, concludes the letter and states it was sent using an advocacy tool. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

David Barboza
dejaybe@gmail.com

Lauren Borchard
laurenborchard@gmail.com

Liz Barillas
trunkschan90@yahoo.com

Jamison Bradley
jsbradley523@gmail.com

Patricia Bijvoet
patriciabijvoet@mac.com

Nicholas Burns III
nkburns3@gmail.com

Joshua Blumenkopf
jblumenkopf@gmail.com

Leonora Camner
leonorasc@gmail.com

Alex Chen
aznyellojersey@gmail.com

Sean McKenna
sean-mckenna@outlook.com

Anthony Dedousis
anthonydpdedousis@gmail.com

Mark Montiel
mrkmontiel@yahoo.com

Andy Freeland
andy@andyfreeland.net

Paul Moorman
pmoorman@illinoisalumni.org

Steve Gifford
stevegifford@outlook.com

Prabhu Reddy
prabhu.r.reddy@gmail.com

Steven Guerry
steven.guerry@gmail.com

Derek Ryder
derekryder.101@gmail.com

Tami Kagan-Abrams
tami@abramsgroup.org

Judd Schoenholtz
judd@openlistings.com

Luke Klipp
lukeklipp@gmail.com

Daniel Schreiner
dan000419@aol.com

Gerald Lam
geraldlam05@gmail.com

Zennon Ulyate-Crow
zennonuc@gmail.com

Matthew Luery
matthew.luery@gmail.com

Ryan Welch
ry@rywelch.com

Andy May
andymay@yahoo.com

William Wright
willrobwright@gmail.com

Comment Letter No. 13

Richard Drury
Lozeau Drury LLP
1939 Harrison St., Ste. 150
Oakland, CA 94612-3507

Comment No. 13-1

I am writing on behalf of Supporters Alliance For Environmental Responsibility (“SAFER”), regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report; (“DEIR”) prepared for the Project known as Modera Argyle Project aka ENV-2016-3743-EIR and SCH #2017081039, including all actions related or referring to the proposed development of a new 260,250 square feet, mixed use seven story building consisting of a ground level mezzanine and six residential floors, containing 276 units, above four subterranean parking levels located at 1546 North Argyle Avenue and 6224 West Selma Avenue in the City of Los Angeles (“Project”).

Response to Comment No. 13-1

This comment introduces the letter and correctly summarizes the Project Description. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 13-2

After reviewing the DEIR, we conclude that the DEIR fails as an informational document and fails to impose all feasible mitigation measures to reduce the Project’s impacts. SAFER requests that the Department of City Planning address these shortcomings in a revised draft environmental impact report (“RDEIR”) and recirculate the RDEIR prior to considering approvals for the Project. We reserve the right to supplement these comments during review of the Final EIR for the Project and at public hearings concerning the Project.

Response to Comment No. 13-2

This comment states that the Draft EIR failed to impose all feasible mitigation measures and requests recirculation of the Draft EIR; however, no specific issues with the Draft EIR are raised. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 13-3

Galante Vineyards v. Monterey Peninsula Water Management Dist., 60 Cal. App. 4th 1109, 1121 (1997).

Response to Comment No. 13-3

This comment is a sentence fragment referring to a 1997 court decision which set aside an EIR for construction of a new dam and reservoir because it did not adequately evaluate impacts on nearby vineyards. With no additional information, it is unclear how this court decision would affect the Project's Draft EIR. The surrounding uses are described in detail in Section II, Project Description, and Section III, Environmental Setting, of this Draft EIR, and impacts are fully evaluated throughout Section IV, Environmental Impact Analysis, of the Draft EIR. Nevertheless, this comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 13-4

We hereby request that City of Los Angeles ("City") send by electronic mail, if possible or U.S. Mail to our firm at the address below notice of any and all actions or hearings related to activities undertaken, authorized, approved, permitted, licensed, or certified by the City and any of its subdivisions, and/or supported, in whole or in part, through contracts, grants, subsidies, loans or other forms of assistance from the City, including, but not limited to the following:

- Notice of any public hearing in connection with the Project as required by California Planning and Zoning Law pursuant to Government Code Section 65091.
- Any and all notices prepared for the Project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), including, but not limited to:
 - Notices of any public hearing held pursuant to CEQA.
 - Notices of determination that an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is required for a project, prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.4.
 - Notices of any scoping meeting held pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.9.
 - Notices of preparation of an EIR or a negative declaration for a project, prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21092.
 - Notices of availability of an EIR or a negative declaration for a project, prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21152 and Section 15087 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations.
 - Notices of approval and/or determination to carry out a project, prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21152 or any other provision of law.

- Notices of approval or certification of any EIR or negative declaration, prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21152 or any other provision of law.
- Notices of determination that a project is exempt from CEQA, prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21152 or any other provision of law.
- Notice of any Final EIR prepared pursuant to CEQA.
- Notice of determination, prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21108 or Section 21152.

Please note that we are requesting notices of CEQA actions and notices of any public hearings to be held under any provision of Title 7 of the California Government Code governing California Planning and Zoning Law. **This request is filed pursuant to Public Resources Code Sections 21092.2 and 21167(f), and Government Code Section 65092**, which requires agencies to mail such notices to any person who has filed a written request for them with the clerk of the agency's governing body.

Please send notice by electronic mail, if possible or U.S. Mail to:

Richard Drury
Stacey Osborne
Komalpreet Toor
Lozeau Drury LLP
1939 Harrison Street, Suite 150
Oakland, CA 94612
510 836-4200
richard@lozeaudrury.com
stacey@lozeaudrury.com
komal@lozeaudrury.com

Please call if you have any questions. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Response to Comment No. 13-4

This comment concludes the letter and requests to be notified of any actions or hearings by the City. The commenter will be added to the Project's distribution list.