

Robertson Lane Hotel Project

Draft Environmental Impact Report

State Clearinghouse No. 2014121026

Prepared for:

City of West Hollywood 8300 Santa Monica Boulevard West Hollywood, California 90069



Prepared by

DUDEK

38 North Marengo Avenue
Pasadena, California 91101

MARCH 2017

**Robertson Lane Hotel Project
Draft Environmental Impact Report**

State Clearinghouse No. 2014121026

Prepared for:

City of West Hollywood

8300 Santa Monica Boulevard
West Hollywood, California 90069

Prepared by:

Dudek

38 North Marengo Avenue
Pasadena, California 91101

March 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	ACR-I
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ES-1
ES.1 Introduction.....	ES-1
ES.2 Project Location and Setting.....	ES-1
ES.3 Project Description.....	ES-2
ES.4 Project Objectives	ES-3
ES.5 Areas of Controversy	ES-3
ES.6 Summary of Environmental Impacts	ES-4
ES.7 Alternatives to the Proposed Project.....	ES-5
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 Summary of the Proposed Project.....	1-1
1.2 The CEQA Environmental Process	1-2
1.3 Organization of the EIR	1-7
2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2-1
2.1 Project Location	2-1
2.2 Environmental Setting	2-2
2.3 Project Objectives	2-5
2.4 Proposed Project Characteristics.....	2-5
2.5 Construction.....	2-18
2.6 Intended Uses of the EIR	2-24
2.7 Project Approvals Required.....	2-24
2.8 References.....	2-25
3 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS.....	3-1
3.1 Aesthetics	3.1-1
3.1.1 Environmental Setting	3.1-1
3.1.2 Relevant Plan, Policies, and Ordinances.....	3.1-4
3.1.3 Thresholds of Significance	3.1-9
3.1.4 Methodology	3.1-9
3.1.5 Impact Analysis	3.1-11
3.1.6 Mitigation Measures	3.1-22
3.1.7 Significance after Mitigation	3.1-22
3.1.8 References.....	3.1-22

3.2	Air Quality	3.2-1
3.2.1	Environmental Setting	3.2-1
3.2.2	Relevant Plan, Policies, and Ordinances.....	3.2-7
3.2.3	Thresholds of Significance	3.2-16
3.2.4	Methodology	3.2-18
3.2.5	Impact Analysis	3.2-20
3.2.6	Mitigation Measures	3.2-33
3.2.7	Significance after Mitigation	3.2-34
3.2.8	References.....	3.2-35
3.3	Cultural Resources	3.3-1
3.3.1	Environmental Setting	3.3-1
3.3.2	Relevant Plan, Policies, and Ordinances.....	3.3-33
3.3.3	Thresholds of Significance	3.3-38
3.3.4	Methodology	3.3-39
3.3.5	Impact Analysis	3.3-52
3.3.6	Mitigation Measures	3.3-58
3.3.7	Significance after Mitigation	3.3-63
3.3.8	Additional Information	3.3-64
3.3.9	References.....	3.3-65
3.4	Geology and Soils.....	3.4-1
3.4.1	Environmental Setting	3.4-1
3.4.2	Relevant Plan, Policies, and Ordinances.....	3.4-5
3.4.3	Thresholds of Significance	3.4-8
3.4.4	Methodology	3.4-9
3.4.5	Impact Analysis	3.4-9
3.4.6	Mitigation Measures	3.4-14
3.4.7	Significance after Mitigation	3.4-14
3.4.8	References.....	3.4-15
3.5	Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	3.5-1
3.5.1	Environmental Setting	3.5-1
3.5.2	Relevant Plan, Policies, and Ordinances.....	3.5-5
3.5.3	Thresholds of Significance	3.5-16
3.5.4	Methodology	3.5-16
3.5.5	Impact Analysis	3.5-18
3.5.6	Mitigation Measures	3.5-27
3.5.7	Significance after Mitigation	3.5-28
3.5.8	References.....	3.5-28
3.6	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	3.6-1
3.6.1	Environmental Setting	3.6-1

3.6.2	Relevant Plans, Policies, and Ordinances	3.6-4
3.6.3	Thresholds of Significance	3.6-7
3.6.4	Methodology	3.6-8
3.6.5	Impact Analysis	3.6-8
3.6.6	Mitigation Measures	3.6-13
3.6.7	Significance after Mitigation	3.6-13
3.6.8	References	3.6-13
3.7	Hydrology and Water Quality	3.7-1
3.7.1	Environmental Setting	3.7-1
3.7.2	Relevant Plan, Policies, and Ordinances.....	3.7-4
3.7.3	Thresholds of Significance	3.7-14
3.7.4	Methodology	3.7-15
3.7.5	Impact Analysis	3.7-15
3.7.6	Mitigation Measures	3.7-23
3.7.7	Significance after Mitigation	3.7-23
3.7.8	References.....	3.7-23
3.8	Land Use and Planning	3.8-1
3.8.1	Environmental Setting	3.8-1
3.8.2	Relevant Plan, Policies, and Ordinances.....	3.8-2
3.8.3	Thresholds of Significance	3.8-5
3.8.4	Methodology	3.8-5
3.8.5	Impact Analysis	3.8-5
3.8.6	Mitigation Measures	3.8-28
3.8.7	Significance after Mitigation	3.8-28
3.8.8	References.....	3.8-28
3.9	Noise	3.9-1
3.9.1	Environmental Setting	3.9-1
3.9.2	Relevant Plan, Policies, and Ordinances.....	3.9-7
3.9.3	Thresholds of Significance	3.9-13
3.9.4	Methodology	3.9-15
3.9.5	Impact Analysis	3.9-15
3.9.6	Mitigation Measures	3.9-27
3.9.7	Significance after Mitigation	3.9-30
3.9.8	References.....	3.9-30
3.10	Public Services.....	3.10-1
3.10.1	Environmental Setting	3.10-1
3.10.2	Relevant Plan, Policies, and Ordinances.....	3.10-4
3.10.3	Thresholds of Significance	3.10-8
3.10.4	Methodology	3.10-9

3.10.5	Impact Analysis	3.10-9
3.10.6	Mitigation Measures	3.10-14
3.10.7	Significance after Mitigation	3.10-14
3.10.8	References	3.10-14
3.11	Transportation and Traffic	3.11-1
3.11.1	Environmental Setting	3.11-1
3.11.2	Relevant Plans, Policies, and Ordinances	3.11-12
3.11.3	Thresholds of Significance	3.11-17
3.11.4	Methodology	3.11-19
3.11.5	Impact Analysis	3.11-20
3.11.6	Mitigation Measures	3.11-48
3.11.7	Significance after Mitigation	3.11-48
3.11.8	References	3.11-51
3.12	Utilities and Service Systems.....	3.12-1
3.12.1	Environmental Setting	3.12-1
3.12.2	Relevant Plans, Policies, and Ordinances	3.12-4
3.12.3	Thresholds of Significance	3.12-8
3.12.4	Methodology	3.12-9
3.12.5	Impact Analysis	3.12-9
3.12.6	Mitigation Measures	3.12-16
3.12.7	Significance after Mitigation	3.12-16
3.12.8	References	3.12-16
3.13	Energy Consumption	3.13-1
3.13.1	Environmental Setting	3.13-2
3.13.2	Relevant Plan, Policies, and Ordinances.....	3.13-4
3.13.3	Thresholds of Significance	3.13-21
3.13.4	Methodology	3.13-21
3.13.5	Impact Analysis	3.13-22
3.13.6	Mitigation Measures	3.13-33
3.13.7	Significance after Mitigation	3.13-33
3.13.8	References	3.13-33
4	CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	4-1
4.1	CEQA Requirements	4-1
4.2	Related Projects	4-1
4.3	Cumulative Impact Analysis.....	4-4
4.3.1	Aesthetics	4-5
4.3.2	Air Quality	4-8
4.3.3	Cultural Resources	4-9
4.3.4	Geology and Soils.....	4-11

4.3.5	Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	4-12
4.3.6	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	4-13
4.3.7	Hydrology and Water Quality.....	4-15
4.3.8	Land Use and Planning	4-17
4.3.9	Noise	4-18
4.3.10	Public Services.....	4-23
4.3.11	Transportation and Traffic	4-24
4.3.12	Utilities and Service Systems.....	4-27
4.3.13	Energy Consumption	4-29
4.4	References.....	4-30
5	ALTERNATIVES.....	5-1
5.1	Selection of Alternatives.....	5-1
5.1.1	Proposed Project	5-1
5.1.2	Alternatives Considered But Rejected	5-3
5.2	Alternatives Carried Forward for Consideration	5-15
5.2.1	Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative	5-16
5.2.2	Alternative 2 – On-Site Parking Garage Alternative	5-17
5.3	Environmentally Superior Alternative	5-25
5.4	References.....	5-26
6	OTHER CEQA REQUIREMENTS.....	6-1
6.1	Significant Unavoidable Environmental Impacts	6-1
6.2	Effects Not Found to Be Significant.....	6-1
6.3	Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes	6-1
6.4	Growth-Inducing Impacts	6-3
7	LIST OF PREPARERS.....	7-1

APPENDICES

A	Initial Study and Scoping Report
B	Site Plans and Specific Plan
C	Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis Data
D	Cultural Resources Reports
E	Geotechnical Report
F	Hazardous Materials Reports
G	Civil Engineering and Sewer Reports
H	Noise Impact Modeling Data
I	Public Service Correspondence
J	Traffic Impact Study
K	Alternative 2 Subterranean Floor Plans

FIGURES

2-1 Regional Map..... 2-27

2-2 Project Site and Park Site..... 2-29

2-3 Conceptual Site Plan 2-31

2-4 Conceptual Park Site Plan..... 2-33

2-5 East and West Elevations..... 2-35

2-6 Robertson Lane Elevations 2-37

2-7 North and South Elevations 2-39

2-8 Building Sections 2-41

2-9 Building Sections including Park Site 2-43

2-10 Conceptual Landscaping Plan..... 2-45

3.1-1 Existing Conditions..... 3.1-23

3.1-2 Existing Conditions..... 3.1-25

3.1-3 Existing Conditions..... 3.1-27

3.1-4 Existing Conditions..... 3.1-29

3.1-5 Existing Conditions..... 3.1-31

3.1-6 Existing Conditions..... 3.1-33

3.1-7 Location of Key Views 3.1-35

3.1-8 Key View 1: Looking southwest across Santa Monica Boulevard toward
Project Site..... 3.1-37

3.1-9 Key View 2: Looking west across West Hollywood Park toward Project Site 3.1-39

3.1-10 Key View 3: Looking north along North Robertson Boulevard toward
Project Site..... 3.1-41

3.1-11 Key View 4: Looking southeast across Santa Monica Boulevard toward
Project Site..... 3.1-43

3.1-12 Shade/Shadow Analysis - Summer Solstice 3.1-45

3.1-13 Shade/Shadow Analysis - Autumn Equinox..... 3.1-47

3.1-14 Shade/Shadow Analysis - Spring Equinox 3.1-49

3.1-15 Shade/Shadow Analysis - Winter Solstice..... 3.1-51

3.9-1 Off-Site Sensitive Receptors..... 3.9-31

3.9-2 Noise Measurement Locations..... 3.9-33

3.11-1 Traffic Impact Study Intersections..... 3.11-53

3.11-2 Existing Intersection Lane Configuration 3.11-55

3.11-3 Project Trip Distribution - Inbound Trips..... 3.11-57

3.11-4 Project Trip Distribution - Outbound Trips 3.11-59

3.11-5 Weekday AM Peak Hour Project Only Traffic Volumes 3.11-61

3.11-6 Weekday Midday Peak Hour Project Only Traffic Volumes 3.11-63

3.11-7 Weekday PM Peak Hour Project Only Traffic Volumes..... 3.11-65

3.11-8 Project Only Street Segment Daily Traffic Volumes 3.11-67
 4-1 Related Projects 4-33

TABLES

ES-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation MeasuresES-7
 2-1 Existing Zoning..... 2-3
 2-2 Existing Site Uses Proposed for Removal 2-6
 2-3 Proposed Project Characteristics..... 2-10
 2-4 Construction Schedule 2-18
 3.2-1 Ambient Air Quality Standards 3.2-9
 3.2-2 South Coast Air Basin Attainment Classification..... 3.2-14
 3.2-3 Local Ambient Air Quality Data..... 3.2-15
 3.2-4 Frequency of Air Quality Standard Violations 3.2-16
 3.2-5 SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds 3.2-17
 3.2-6 Localized Significance Thresholds for Source-Receptor Area 2 (Northwest
 Coastal Los Angeles County) 3.2-20
 3.2-7 Construction Scenario Assumptions 3.2-25
 3.2-8 Estimated Unmitigated Maximum Daily Construction Emissions..... 3.2-27
 3.2-9 Baseline - Existing Commercial Uses Estimated Unmitigated
 Maximum Daily Operational Emissions..... 3.2-28
 3.2-10 Proposed Project Estimated Unmitigated Maximum Daily
 Operational Emissions 3.2-29
 3.2-11 On-Site Emissions and Localized Significance Thresholds Analysis
 for Project Construction (pounds/day)..... 3.2-32
 3.2-12 On-Site Emissions and Localized Significance Thresholds Analysis
 for Project Construction with Tier 3 Equipment (pounds per day) 3.2-34
 3.3-1 Previously Conducted Cultural Resources Studies Within 0.5 Mile of the
 Project Area 3.3-2
 3.3-2 Previously Recorded Cultural Resources Within 0.5 Mile of the Project Area..... 3.3-4
 3.3-3 Buildings Located Within the Project Area 3.3-5
 3.5-1 Greenhouse Gas Sources in California (2013)..... 3.5-2
 3.5-2 City of West Hollywood Baseline Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory (2008)..... 3.5-3
 3.5-3 Estimated Annual Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions 3.5-18
 3.5-4 Baseline Estimated Operational GHG Emissions..... 3.5-20
 3.5-5 Estimated Annual Operational GHG Emissions..... 3.5-21
 3.5-6 Project Consistency with Applicable City of West Hollywood’s Climate
 Action Plan Reduction Measures 3.5-22
 3.7-1 Existing Pipe Capacity 3.7-2
 3.7-2 Existing Average Daily Flowrate..... 3.7-3

3.8-1	Applicable Zoning Regulations	3.8-4
3.8-2	Robertson Lane Specific Plan versus Existing Zoning.....	3.8-8
3.8-3	General Plan Policy Consistency Analysis	3.8-8
3.9-1	Typical Sound Levels in the Environment and Industry	3.9-1
3.9-2	Existing Average Daily Traffic.....	3.9-4
3.9-3	Measured Noise Levels – February 2015	3.9-5
3.9-4	Measured Noise Levels – May 2014	3.9-7
3.9-5	Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Environments	3.9-8
3.9-6	Noise/Land Use Compatibility Matrix.....	3.9-11
3.9-7	Typical Construction Equipment Noise Emission Levels	3.9-17
3.9-8	Short-Term (Construction) Noise Levels.....	3.9-18
3.9-9	Outdoor Uses Noise Levels – Daytime Hours (8 a.m. to 10 p.m.)	3.9-21
3.9-10	Outdoor Uses Noise Levels – Nighttime Hours (10 p.m. to 8 a.m.).....	3.9-21
3.9-11	Noise from On-Site Stationary Equipment	3.9-23
3.9-12	Traffic Noise (Existing-Plus-Project Noise Levels)	3.9-24
3.9-13	Traffic Noise (Future-without-Project and Future-with-Project)	3.9-25
3.11-1	Study Intersections.....	3.11-2
3.11-2	LOS Definitions (City of West Hollywood).....	3.11-8
3.11-3	LOS Definitions (City of Beverly Hills and City of Los Angeles).....	3.11-9
3.11-4	Existing 2015 LOS Summary	3.11-10
3.11-5	Existing 2015 Daily Traffic Volumes.....	3.11-11
3.11-6	Significance Criteria	3.11-18
3.11-7	Project Trip Generation Estimates	3.11-22
3.11-8	Existing-plus-Project Peak Hour Impact Summary	3.11-24
3.11-9	Existing-plus-Project Roadway Segment Impact Summary	3.11-26
3.11-10	Area/Cumulative Projects Trip Generation	3.11-28
3.11-11	Future-without-Project LOS Summary.....	3.11-31
3.11-12	Future-without-Project Daily Volumes on Study Street Segments	3.11-32
3.11-13	Future-with-Project Peak Hour Impact Summary	3.11-32
3.11-14	Future-with-Project Roadway Segment Impact Summary	3.11-35
3.11-15	Construction Trip Generation Totals.....	3.11-37
3.11-16	Construction Impacts (Existing-plus-Project Construction).....	3.11-38
3.11-17	Construction Impacts (Future with and without Project Construction)	3.11-39
3.11-18	Existing-plus-Project CMP Impact Summary.....	3.11-43
3.11-19	Future-with-Project CMP Impact Summary	3.11-43
3.11-20	Existing-plus-Project Level of Service - Mitigated	3.11-50
3.11-21	Future-with-Project - Mitigated	3.11-50
3.12-1	Existing Sewer Capacity Study Results	3.12-1
3.12-2	Existing Water Use	3.12-3

3.12-3	Existing Solid Waste Generation	3.12-4
3.12-4	Anticipated Sewer Generation and Demand.....	3.12-10
3.12-5	Sewer Analysis Summary	3.12-10
3.12-6	Solid Waste Generated by the Proposed Project.....	3.12-15
3.13-1	Compliance Schedule by Engine Model Year for Vehicles with a GVWR 26,000 Pounds or Less	3.13-12
3.13-2	Hours of Operation for Construction Equipment.....	3.13-27
4-1	Geographic Scope and Method of Evaluation for Cumulative Impacts.....	4-2
4-2	Related Projects	4-2
5-1	Proposed Project Characteristics.....	5-2
5-2	Proposed Project Characteristics.....	5-18
5-3	Comparison of Impacts	5-25

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
°F	degrees Fahrenheit
AB	Assembly Bill
ACLU	American Civil Liberties Union
ACM	asbestos-containing material
ADT	average daily traffic
AEP	Annual Exceedance Probability
AGR	Agricultural Supply
AIA	Airport Influence Area
ALUC	Airport Land Use Commission
amsl	above mean sea level
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
ATCM	Airborne Toxic Control Measure
BNC	Blimped News Camera
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CAFE	Corporate Average Fuel Economy
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CALGreen	California's Green Building Standards
CAP	Climate Action Plan
CAPCOA	California Air Pollution Control Officers Association
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CAT	Climate Action Team
CBC	California Building Code
CC2	Commercial, Community 2
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDMG	California Division of Mines and Geology
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFC	chlorofluorocarbon
CFL	compact fluorescent light
CGS	California Geologic Survey
CHAB	Cultural Heritage Advisory Board
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Information System
City	City of West Hollywood
CIWM	California Integrated Waste Management
CLATS	Case Logging and Tracking System
CLOMR	Conditional Letters of Map Revision
CMA	Critical Movement Analysis
CN2	Commercial, Neighborhood 2
CNEL	community noise equivalent level
CNRA	California Natural Resources Agency

ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
CO	carbon monoxide
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
CO ₂ E	carbon dioxide equivalent
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
CRHP	California Register of Historic Places
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CTR	California Toxics Rule
CWA	Clean Water Act
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DPH	California Department of Public Health
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EDR	environmental database record
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EISA	Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007
EMFAC	Emission Factors model
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EPS	emissions performance standard
ERNS	Emergency Response Notification System
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
FAR	Floor Area Ratio
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
GHG	greenhouse gas
GLF	Gay Liberation Front
GVWR	gross vehicle weight rating
GWP	global warming potential
HABS	Historic American Building Survey
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual
HMS	Hazardous Materials System
HRI	Historic Resources Inventory
HTP	Hyperion Treatment Plant
HUAC	House Un-American Activities Commission
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
IND	Industrial Service Supply
IS	Initial Study
ITE	Intersection Capacity Utilization
IWMP	Integrated Waste Management Plan
kWh	kilowatt-hours
LACDPW	Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
LACFD	Los Angeles County Fire Department
LADOT	Los Angeles Department of Transportation
LADWP	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power

ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
LAPD	Los Angeles Police Department
LAUSD	Los Angeles Unified School District
LBP	lead-based paint
LCFS	Low Carbon Fuel Standard
L _{dn}	day–night average noise level
LED	light-emitting diode
L _{eq}	equivalent noise level over a given period
LGBT	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender
LID	Low Impact Development
L _n	statistical sound level
LOMR	Letters of Map Revision
LOS	level of service
Los Angeles RWQCB	Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board
LST	localized significance threshold
LSWPPP	Local Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
LSWPPP	Local Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
MCC	Metropolitan Community Church
Metro	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
MGD	million gallons per day
MGM	Metro Goldwin Meyer
MMT	million metric tons
MND	Mitigated Negative Declaration
mpg	miles per gallon
MUN	municipal and domestic supply
MW	megawatt
MWD	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
MWh	megawatt-hour
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NEHRP	National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program
NEHRPA	National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program Act
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
NO	nitric oxide
NO ₂	nitrogen dioxide
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NO _x	oxides of nitrogen
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NTR	National Toxics Rule
O ₃	ozone
OHP	Office of Historic Preservation
OPR	Office of Planning and Research

ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
Pb	lead
PCE	Passenger Car Equivalency
PDC	Pacific Design Center
PF	Public Facilities
PM ₁₀	particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter equal to or less than 10 microns
PM _{2.5}	particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter equal to or less than 2.5 microns
PPV	peak particle velocity
PRC	California Public Resources Code
PRIDE	Personal Rights in Defense and Education
PRIMP	Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program
PROC	Industrial Process Supply
proposed project	Robertson Lane Hotel Project
RFS	renewable fuel standard
RLSP	Robertson Lane Specific Plan
ROG	reactive organic compound or gas
RPS	Renewable Portfolio Standard
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
SANDAG	San Diego Association of Governments
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
SB	Senate Bill
SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCCIC	South Central Coastal Information Center
SCE	Southern California Edison
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy
sf	square feet
SHPO	State Office of Historic Preservation
SO ₂	sulfur dioxide
SoCalGas	Southern California Gas Company
SO _x	sulfur oxides
SRA	Source-Receptor Area
SRRE	Source Reduction and Recycling Element
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAC	toxic air contaminant
TDM	Transportation Demand Management
TIA	Transportation Impact Analysis
TPH	total petroleum hydrocarbon
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USC	University of Southern California
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan

ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
V/C	volume-to-capacity
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
VOC	volatile organic compound
ZEV	zero-emissions vehicle

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section provides a summary of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed Robertson Lane Hotel Project (proposed project). This section provides a summary of the proposed project, areas of known controversy and issues to be resolved, a summary of project alternatives, and a summary of all project impacts, associated mitigation measures, and ultimate level of significance after mitigation is applied.

ES.1 INTRODUCTION

This EIR has been prepared by the City of West Hollywood (City) to evaluate potential environmental effects that would result from development of the proposed project. This EIR has been prepared in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) statutes (Cal. Pub. Res. Code, Section 21000 et. seq., as amended) and implementing guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, Section 15000 et. seq.). The City is the lead agency under CEQA.

ES.2 PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

The 1.94-acre project site consists of six Assessor Parcels located along North Robertson Boulevard and North La Peer Drive within the City. The City's zoning map assigns the following addresses to the site: 645, 647, 653, 655, 661, 665, and 681 North Robertson Boulevard and 648, 650, 652, and 654 North La Peer Drive. The Assessor Parcel Numbers within the site are as follows: 4336-009-003, 4336-009-004, 4336-009-005, 4336-010-005, 4336-009-006, and 4336-009-007. The site is bounded to the west by North La Peer Drive, a two-lane, north-south street (hereafter referred to as La Peer Drive), and to the east by North Robertson Boulevard, a two-lane, north-south street (hereafter referred to as Robertson Boulevard). The project site has approximately 400 feet of street frontage along Robertson Boulevard and approximately 200 feet of street frontage along La Peer Drive. The maximum width of the site, measured as the distance between the La Peer Drive frontage and the Robertson Boulevard frontage, is approximately 280 feet. The project site is currently developed with three commercial buildings, three surface parking lots, and several concrete courtyards and patios interspersed among the buildings. The proposed project footprint also would extend below grade, underneath Robertson Boulevard, and underneath a portion of West Hollywood Park to accommodate an underground parking garage. Hereafter, the portion of West Hollywood Park that would be affected by the proposed project is referred to as the "park site." The park site is 1.2 acres in size. As such, the total project footprint is approximately 3 acres (project site plus the park site).

While the project site has street frontages to the east and west, it is bound by commercial properties to the north and south. The commercial properties abutting the north side of the project site are situated along Santa Monica Boulevard, a northeast-southwest trending four-lane roadway. Santa

Monica Boulevard is approximately 75 feet from the northwest corner of the project site. The southern border of the project site is approximately 350 feet from Melrose Boulevard to the south.

ES.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant, Faring Capital LLC, proposes to construct a multi-use hotel of approximately 262,315 square feet (sf) on the project site that would vary from 3 to 9 stories in height (equating to approximately 27 feet to 114 feet in height as measured from Robertson Boulevard). The hotel would have 241 guestrooms of varying configurations and sizes and would include retail space, restaurant space, outdoor dining, hotel meeting spaces, a nightclub, a gym and spa, back-of-house areas, a lobby, circulation space, and design showroom space. A pedestrian paseo would be created through the project site, and retractable bollards would be installed within Robertson Boulevard to allow for creation of a pedestrian space during special occasions such as (but not limited to) entertainment award parties, LGBT Pride, and the City's Halloween carnival.

The proposed project would demolish two of the existing on-site structures and the three existing surface parking lots with a total of approximately 197 parking spaces. A portion of the Factory building, a structure that is currently located on the project site, would be retained, rehabilitated and relocated within the site so that it is facing Robertson Boulevard. Two existing one-story commercial buildings located at the southeastern corner of the site would remain in place, as would six of the sixteen trees currently located on site. The project would also include construction of a subterranean parking garage, providing for a total of 1,151 parking spaces and 7 off-loading spaces. Three levels of subterranean parking would be constructed on site, beneath the proposed multi-use hotel building, and two levels of subterranean parking would be constructed below the western portion of West Hollywood Park, across from the project site. A subterranean tunnel extending beneath Robertson Boulevard would connect the two portions of the garage.

The proposed Robertson Lane Specific Plan sets forth development guidelines and procedures to accommodate the project described above on the project site. The project site is currently within the CN2 (Commercial, Neighborhood 2) and CC2 (Commercial, Community 2) zoning districts. The purpose of the Specific Plan is to guide redevelopment of the project site and would allow the proposed project to deviate from the Municipal Code in three primary areas: (1) the Specific Plan would allow for the development of hotel uses across the project site; hotel uses are currently allowed in the CC2 zone but are not allowed in the CN2 zone; (2) the Specific Plan would allow for building heights of 52 feet as measured along Robertson Boulevard, while the existing CN2 zone allows for a maximum building height of 25 feet, and it would allow for building heights of 110 feet as measured along La Peer Drive, while the existing CC2 zone allows for a maximum building height of 45 feet; and, (3) the Specific Plan would increase the allowable FAR on the site from 1:1 in the CN2 and 2:1 in the CC2 to 3.1:1 for the entire project site. The Specific Plan also establishes land use designations and development standards for the

project site. Adoption of the Specific Plan would enable the development of the multi-use hotel project described and analyzed herein.

ES.4 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The primary objectives of the proposed project include the following:

- Contribute to the City’s goal of expanding and enhancing the Design District as a national and international destination for high-end arts and design studios, offices, and related businesses.
- Increase the number of guestrooms on the City’s Westside and respond to the need for additional guestrooms and event/conference space within walking distance of the businesses and nightlife within the City’s Design District, the Pacific Design Center, and the Santa Monica Boulevard West commercial sub-area.
- Enhance pedestrian connections within the Design District and create a pedestrian paseo in a manner consistent with the *West Hollywood Design District Streetscape Master Plan*.
- Expand the availability of space for a variety of eclectic stores, restaurants, and entertainment venues in a vibrant, pedestrian-oriented, village-like setting that will serve visitors and residents throughout the day and night, further activating the west side of the City at the confluence of the Design District and the Santa Monica Boulevard West District.
- Redevelop and revitalize an underutilized site in a manner that maximizes development potential and exemplifies thoughtful urban in-fill design. Substantially expand the availability of off-street parking available to the general public and businesses in the immediate vicinity of the Design District and Santa Monica Boulevard West District in the most cost-effective manner, most importantly during the daytime hours and for special City events.
- Create a public outdoor gathering space, provide improved landscaping, and provide improved streetscape on Robertson Boulevard in a manner consistent with the *West Hollywood Design District Streetscape Master Plan*.
- Provide new permanent jobs and temporary construction jobs through redevelopment of an urban in-fill site.
- Generate new tax revenues, helping to secure a strong and continuous tax base and maximizing the direct and indirect fiscal and economic benefits for the City and the area.

ES.5 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

A public agency scoping meeting was held at the West Hollywood Library Community Meeting Room on January 7, 2015. The purpose of this meeting was to seek input from public agencies

and the general public regarding the environmental issues and concerns that may potentially result from the proposed project. Approximately 30 people attended the scoping meeting. Comment letters were also received in response to the Notice of Preparation and Initial Study for this project. Copies of the comment letters and a summary of the verbal comments received during the scoping meeting are provided in Appendix A. The primary areas of controversy identified by the public and agencies included the following potential issues (the EIR section that addresses the issue raised is provided in parentheses):

- Potential impacts associated with height, scale, and massing of the proposed building, including shade/shadow effects and light trespass into neighborhoods (Section 3.1, Aesthetics)
- Potential impacts to the Factory building (Section 3.3, Cultural Resources)
- Potential impacts related to increased water use at the site (Section 3.12, Utilities and Service Systems)
- Consistency of the project with land use plans, particularly plans for the streetscape along Robertson Boulevard and La Peer Drive (i.e., the West Hollywood Design District Streetscape Master Plan) (Section 3.8, Land Use and Planning)
- Potential noise impacts caused by use of the roof decks and mechanical equipment on the proposed structure (Section 3.9, Noise)
- Potential impacts to West Hollywood Park (Section 3.8, Land Use and Planning and Section 3.10, Public Services)
- Potential impacts due to truck traffic and parking during construction (Section 3.11, Transportation and Traffic)
- Cumulative impacts of the project, particularly related to increased parking demand and increased heights in the area, in combination with other nearby projects such as the Melrose Triangle Project and the La Peer Hotel Project (Section 4.0, Cumulative Impacts)
- Potential alternatives to the proposed project, particularly adaptive reuse of the Factory building (Section 5.0, Alternatives)

ES.6 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This EIR has been prepared to assess the potentially significant effects on the environment that could result from implementation of the proposed project. For a detailed discussion regarding potential significant impacts, please see Chapter 3.0, Environmental Analysis, of this EIR.

As required by CEQA, a summary of the proposed project's impacts is provided in Table ES-1, Summary of Project Impacts, below. Also provided in Table ES-1 is a list of the proposed mitigation measures that are recommended in response to the potentially significant impacts

identified in the EIR, as well as a determination of the level of significance of the impacts after implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

ES.7 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires consideration and discussion of alternatives to the proposed project in an EIR. Several alternatives, including alternate sites, were considered but rejected from consideration in this EIR. A review of those alternatives and the reasons for rejecting them is provided in Chapter 5.0 of this document. Two alternatives, including the No Project Alternative, are reviewed in detail in Chapter 5.0 of this document. This section summarizes the two alternatives to the project that were analyzed in detail as required under CEQA.

Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative

Alternative 1 assumes the proposed project would not proceed, no new permanent development or land uses would be introduced within the project site, and the existing environment would be maintained. The existing uses would continue to operate as they do currently. The existing surface parking lots would be retained and no new parking would be constructed either on site or under West Hollywood Park. A pedestrian paseo would not be created through the project site, and no retractable bollards would be installed within Robertson Boulevard to allow for creation of a gathering space during special events. Construction impacts associated with the proposed project would be avoided because no development would occur on the project site under the No Project Alternative. Operational impacts associated with the proposed project would be avoided because no changes to the project site would occur. The height, massing, and lighting of buildings on the project site would remain the same.

Alternative 2 – On-Site Parking Garage Alternative

This alternative would be identical to the proposed project with the exception of the subterranean parking. Under this alternative, instead of constructing three levels of subterranean parking on site and constructing two levels of subterranean parking below West Hollywood Park, five levels of subterranean parking would be constructed on the project site, extending 67 feet below the grade level of Robertson Boulevard. The garage would provide 1,152 parking spaces. Under this alternative, no subterranean parking would be built below West Hollywood Park. All other components of the project would remain the same under Alternative 2. For example, as with the proposed project, a portion of the Factory building would be retained, rehabilitated, and incorporated as part of the design of the multi-use hotel building. This alternative would also include construction of the pedestrian paseo and installation of retractable bollards within Robertson Boulevard, all in the same manner as the proposed project. The types of impacts and the magnitude of impacts for Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the proposed project.

However, Alternative 2 would not involve any construction activities within the park site, thereby eliminating construction-related impacts of the proposed project at the park site. But, because the proposed parking garage on the project would increase in depth, Alternative 2 would increase the amount of excavation activities, thereby increasing the amount of export that would be generated during construction and potentially increasing the amount of dewatering that may occur on the project site.

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Aesthetics</i>			
a. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
b. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No impact	N/A	No impact
c. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
d. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
Would the project have a cumulative aesthetic and/or lighting impact?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
<i>Air Quality</i>			
a. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
b. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
c. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	Potentially significant	MM-AQ-1 MM-AQ-2	Less than significant
d. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Potentially significant	MM-AQ-1 The following dust control measures shall be implemented by the contractor/builder to reduce fugitive dust coarse and fine particulate matter (PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5}) emissions generated during earthmoving construction activities: a. During clearing, grading, earthmoving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day's activities cease. b. During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this would include wetting down such areas later in the morning, after work is completed for the day, and whenever winds exceed 15 miles per hour (mph). c. Soil stockpiled for more than 2 days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. d. Speeds on unpaved roads shall be reduced to less than 15 mph.	Less than significant

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>e. All grading and excavation operations shall be halted when wind speeds exceed 25 mph.</p> <p>f. Dirt and debris spilled onto paved surfaces at the project site and on the adjacent roadways shall be swept, vacuumed, and/or washed at the end of each workday.</p> <p>g. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose material to and from the construction site shall be covered and/or a minimum 2 feet of freeboard shall be maintained.</p> <p>h. At a minimum, at each vehicle egress from the project site to a paved public road, a pad consisting of washed gravel (minimum size: 1 inch) shall be installed and maintained in clean condition to a depth of at least 6 inches and extending at least 30 feet wide and at least 50 feet long (or as otherwise directed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)).</p> <p>i. Any additional requirements of SCAQMD Rule 403 shall be reviewed and complied with.</p> <p>MM-AQ-2 During project demolition and construction, off-road equipment with engines rated at 150 horsepower or greater, shall meet, at a minimum, the Tier 3 California Emission Standards for Off-Road Compression-Ignition Engines as specified in California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Section 2423(b)(1). Based on the anticipated equipment for these phases, this measure would be applicable to, but not limited to, excavators, graders, rubber-tired dozers, and cranes.</p>	
e. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
Would the project have a cumulative air quality impact?	Potentially significant	MM-AQ-1 MM-AQ-2	Less than significant

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Cultural Resources</i>			
<p>a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</p>	Potentially significant	<p>MM-CUL-1 Documentation. Prior to project commencement of any building disassembly, relocation, and partial restoration activities associated with the Factory building, Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level 2 documentation of the building shall be performed and submitted to the following archives/organizations: Library of Congress, HABS/HAER/HALS Collection; West Hollywood Preservation Alliance; West Hollywood Heritage Project; Los Angeles Conservancy; National Trust for Historic Preservation; ONE Archives at the University of Southern California (USC); County of Los Angeles Library, West Hollywood Library; and other entities/repositories to be identified by the City of West Hollywood.</p> <p>MM-CUL-2 Documentation. Upon completion of the Factory building rehabilitation and restoration activities in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, the applicant shall submit a complete application for designation of the Factory building under W.H.M.C. Section 19.58.070 for listing as a West Hollywood Cultural Resource.</p> <p>MM-CUL-3 Salvage. Modular components of the Factory building that are in good condition and are not used as part of the project – in particular, embossed steel sidewall panels and steel windows –shall be stored at a location nearby for future use as needed. The applicant shall consult with a qualified architectural conservator on the appropriate storage of retained modular components.</p> <p>MM-CUL-4 Sensitive Treatment/Conservation. Prior to commencement of construction activities, the applicant shall develop Treatment Specifications for the cleaning, repair, and installation of modular components of the Factory building during and after construction. Prepared by a preservation architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards in Architecture and/or Historic Architecture, these specifications will ensure the appropriate conservation of materials to be retained as part of the project, including cataloguing of component</p>	Less than significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>parts and site preparation during dismantling and reassembly, as well as future cleaning and treatment of the building's materials as part of regular building maintenance.</p> <p>MM-CUL-5 Interpretation/Commemoration (Mitchell Camera Corporation). The applicant shall provide on-site interpretation/ commemoration of the Mitchell Camera Corporation use of the building, such as public art, historic photographs, display of Mitchell cameras, amongst others. The interpretation/commemoration plans shall be presented to the City of West Hollywood Historic Preservation Commission for comment prior to installation, and completed to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the hotel.</p> <p>MM-CUL-6 Interpretation/Commemoration (Oral History Project: Studio One). The applicant shall commission an oral history project in which patrons of Studio One and others are interviewed and given the opportunity to discuss the experience of visiting the nightclub and being part of the LGBTQ community in West Hollywood and Los Angeles during the 1970s and '80s. These interviews shall be digitally recorded (audio and/or visual) and made available on site, so that visitors will be able to listen to (and possibly see) the interviews in a location related directly to the original Studio One use of the building, as well as online. These interviews shall also be donated to organizations/entities/repositories such as the West Hollywood Preservation Alliance, West Hollywood Heritage Project, Los Angeles Conservancy, One Archives at USC, Los Angeles County Public Library, West Hollywood Branch, and LGBTQ Coalition. The oral history project shall be developed in coordination with the City of West Hollywood and to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.</p> <p>MM-CUL-7 Interpretation/Commemoration (Studio One). The applicant shall provide on-site interpretation/ commemoration of the Studio One use of the building, such as historic photographs, permanent display of the</p>	

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>oral history project (see MM-CUL-6) and/or public art. All interpretation/commemoration will be placed inside of or immediately adjacent to the Factory building. The interpretation/commemoration plans shall be presented to the City of West Hollywood Historic Preservation Commission for comment prior to installation and completed to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the hotel.</p> <p>MM-CUL-8 Rehabilitation/Restoration. The applicant shall rehabilitate the retained portion of the Factory building in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (the Standards). The design of new components at the Factory building's base, including new storefronts and a vehicular entrance to the subterranean parking area, shall also conform to the applicable Standards. All work will proceed under the direction of a historic preservation architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards in Architecture and/or Historic Architecture.</p> <p>MM-CUL-9 Rehabilitation/Restoration. The applicant shall remove non-historic features and restore missing character-defining features on the historic east façade (which under the project will become the north façade) of the Factory building dating to the 1929-1946 period of significance in compliance with the Standards, including, at minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Removal of a non-original exterior staircase. b. Removal of non-original concrete masonry unit walls that currently sit in front the building, enclosing a non-historic courtyard space (and obscuring the façade). c. Replacement of non-historic windows with salvaged original steel windows. d. Conservation of exterior materials, including removal of paint from poured-in-place concrete foundation, steel sidewall panels, window frames, and glazing; and replacement of broken glazing as necessary. 	

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>MM-CUL-10 Rehabilitation/Restoration. The applicant shall remove non-historic features and restore missing character-defining features on the historic west façade (which under the project will become the south façade) of the Factory building, dating to the 1974-1992 period of significance, including at minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Removal of non-historic steel entrance canopy and low concrete walls. b. Replacement of non-original entrance doors with replica doors dating to the period of significance. c. Conservation of exterior materials, including removal of paint from poured in place concrete foundation, steel sidewall panels, window frames, freight elevator doors, and glazing; and replacement of broken glazing as necessary. <p>MM-CUL-11 Construction Monitoring. Prior to commencement of any construction activity associated with the Factory building, the applicant shall retain a qualified architect meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards in Architecture and/or Historic Architecture to monitor all disassembly, construction and rehabilitation activities to ensure appropriate treatment of the building and character-defining features and materials during the construction project.</p>	
b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	Potentially significant	<p>MM-CUL-12 Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Resources. In the event that archaeological resources (sites, features, or artifacts) are exposed during construction activities for the proposed project, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of the find shall immediately stop until a qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, can evaluate the significance of the find and determine whether or not additional study is warranted. Depending on the significance of the find under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; 14 CCR 15064.5(f); PRC, Section 21082), the archaeologist may simply record the find and allow work to continue. If the discovery proves significant under</p>	Less than significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>c. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p>CEQA, additional work such as preparation of an archaeological treatment plan, testing, or data recovery may be warranted.</p> <p>MM-CUL-13 Paleontological Resources. Prior to commencement of any grading activity on site, the applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist, subject to the review and approval of the City's Building Official, or designee. The qualified paleontologist shall be on site during all rough grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities in depths greater than 10 feet below ground surface.</p> <p>The paleontologist shall prepare a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) for the proposed project. The PRIMP should be consistent with the guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontologists (2010) and should include but not be limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Attendance at the pre-construction conference by a qualified paleontologist or his/her representative. b. Monitoring of excavation activities by a qualified paleontological monitor in areas identified as likely to contain paleontological resources. The monitor shall be equipped to salvage fossils and/or matrix samples as they are unearthed in order to avoid construction delays. The monitor must be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment in the area of the find in the event paleontological resources are discovered. c. Because the underlying sediments may contain abundant fossil remains that can only be recovered by a screening and picking matrix, these sediments shall occasionally be spot screened through one-eighth to one-twentieth-inch mesh screens to determine whether microfossils exist. If microfossils are encountered, additional sediment samples (up to 6,000 pounds) shall be collected and processed. d. Preparation of recovered specimens to a point of identification and permanent preservation. This includes the washing and picking of mass samples to recover small invertebrate and vertebrate fossils 	<p>Less than significant</p>

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>and the removal of surplus sediment from around larger specimens to reduce the volume of storage for the repository and the storage cost for the developer.</p> <p>e. Identification and curation of specimens into a museum repository with permanent retrievable storage.</p> <p>f. Preparation of a report of findings with an appended itemized inventory of specimens. When submitted to the City of West Hollywood, the report and inventory would signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources.</p>	
d. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Potentially significant	<p>MM-CUL-14 Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains. In accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are found, the Los Angeles County Coroner shall be notified of the discovery. No further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the county coroner has determined, within 2 working days of notification of the discovery, the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the county coroner determines that the remains are, or are believed to be, Native American, he or she shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento within 48 hours. In accordance with California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the Most Likely Descendant from the deceased Native American. The Most Likely Descendant shall complete his or her inspection within 24 hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative would then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains.</p>	Less than significant
Would the project have a cumulative cultural resources impact?	Potentially significant	<p>MM-CUL-1 MM-CUL-2 MM-CUL-3 MM-CUL-4</p>	Less than significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		MM-CUL-5 MM-CUL-6 MM-CUL-7 MM-CUL-8 MM-CUL-9 MM-CUL-10 MM-CUL-11	
<i>Geology and Soils</i>			
a. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	Potentially significant	MM-GEO-1 The proposed project shall be designed in accordance with the recommendations from the site-specific Geotechnical Investigation. In the event that changes are made in the recommendations set forth in the final geotechnical report, the project design shall be updated in accordance with those changes. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit the final design and construction plans for review and approval by the City Building	Less than significant

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		Official or designee and the City Engineer or designee. The final design and construction plans shall show that the recommendations from the Geotechnical Investigation regarding foundation, site coefficient and seismic zonation, walls below grade, waterproofing and drainage, floor slab support, dewatering and groundwater control, excavation and slopes, and shoring have been incorporated into the final design.	
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Potentially significant	MM-GEO-1	Less than significant
iv. Landslides?	No impact	N/A	No impact
b. Would the project result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
c. Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Potentially significant	MM-GEO-1	Less than significant
d. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	Potentially significant	MM-GEO-1	Less than significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
e. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	No impact	N/A	No impact
Would the project have a cumulative geological impact?	Less than Significant	N/A	Less than significant
<i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i>			
a. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
b. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
Would the project have a cumulative impact on greenhouse gas emissions?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
<i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>			
a. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
b. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
c. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	No impact	N/A	No impact
d. Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	No impact	N/A	No impact

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	No impact	N/A	No impact
g. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
h. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	No impact	N/A	No impact
Would the project have a cumulative hazards or hazardous materials impact?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
<i>Hydrology/Water Quality</i>			
a. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
b. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			
c. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
d. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
e. Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			
f. Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
g. Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood delineation map?	No impact	N/A	No impact
h. Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows??	No impact	N/A	No impact
i. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
j. Would the project cause or expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
Would the project have a cumulative hydrology or water quality impact?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Land Use and Planning</i>			
a. Would the project physically divide an established community?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
b. Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
c. Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	No impact	N/A	No impact
Would the project have a cumulative land use and/or planning impact?	No impact	N/A	No impact
<i>Noise</i>			
a. Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Potentially significant	<p>Construction</p> <p>MM-NOI-1 Construction activities shall take place during the permitted time and day per Chapter 9.08.050 of the City of West Hollywood's (City's) Municipal Code. The applicant shall ensure that construction activities are limited to the hours of 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday (interior work only is permissible from 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. on Saturdays). This condition shall be listed on the project's final design to the satisfaction of the City Engineering Department.</p>	Less than significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>MM-NOI-2 The City of West Hollywood shall require the applicant to adhere to the following measures as a condition of approving the grading permit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project contractor shall, to the extent feasible, schedule construction activities to avoid the simultaneous operation of construction equipment so as to minimize noise levels resulting from operating several pieces of high noise level emitting equipment. • All construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers. Enforcement shall be accomplished by random field inspections by applicant personnel during construction activities, to the satisfaction of the City Engineering Department. • Construction noise reduction methods such as shutting off idling equipment, construction of a temporary noise barrier, maximizing the distance between construction equipment staging areas and West Hollywood Park, and use of electric air compressors and similar power tools, rather than diesel equipment, shall be used where feasible. • During construction, stationary construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from or shielded from sensitive receptors, including recreational users of West Hollywood Park. • During construction, stockpiling and vehicle staging areas shall be located as far as practical from noise sensitive receptors, including recreational users in West Hollywood Park. • Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the job superintendent shall be clearly posted at all construction entrances to allow surrounding property owners to contact the job superintendent if necessary. In the event the City receives a complaint, appropriate corrective actions shall be implemented and a report of the action provided to the reporting party. 	

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If equipment is being used that can cause hearing damage at adjacent noise receptor locations (distance attenuation shall be taken into account), portable noise barriers shall be installed that are demonstrated to be adequate to reduce noise levels at receptor locations below hearing damage thresholds. This may include erection of temporary berms or plywood barriers to create a break in the line-of-sight, or erection of a heavy fabric tent around the noise source. <p>Operation</p> <p>MM-NOI-3 Prior to certificate of occupancy, the amplified sound system shall be calibrated for the outdoor uses so as to not exceed the noise levels listed below. The amplified sound system sound output shall be measured at the distances provided below on a plane parallel from the face of the speaker and verified and documented by a qualified acoustical engineer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Level 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 75 A-weighted decibels (dBA) equivalent noise level (L_{eq}) at 15 feet, during daytime hours from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. ii. 60 dBA (L_{eq}) at 15 feet, during nighttime hours from 10 p.m. to 8 a.m. b. Level 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 75 dBA (L_{eq}) at 25 feet, during daytime hours from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. ii. 55 dBA (L_{eq}) at 25 feet, during nighttime hours from 10 p.m. to 8 a.m. c. Level 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 75 dBA (L_{eq}) at 35 feet, during daytime hours from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. ii. 65 dBA (L_{eq}) at 35 feet, during nighttime hours from 10 p.m. to 8 a.m. 	

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>d. Level 9:</p> <p>i. 85 dBA (L_{eq}) at 35 feet, during daytime hours from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m.</p> <p>ii. 65 dBA (L_{eq}) at 35 feet, during nighttime hours from 10 p.m. to 8 a.m.</p> <p>MM-NOI-4 Prior to certificate of occupancy, noise measurements shall be conducted to be reviewed and approved by City staff, to demonstrate that the habitable areas (hotel rooms) have been designed to reduce interior noise to 45 dBA or lower (community noise equivalent level (CNEL) or day-night average noise level (L_{dn})).</p> <p>MM-NOI-5 Prior to approval of the plans and specifications for the project, City staff shall review and approve the proposed heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC), outdoor mechanical equipment, and kitchen mechanical equipment unit specifications to ensure that the on-site stationary equipment does not exceed 55 dBA at 50 feet, or otherwise exceed any established noise thresholds for stationary sources.</p>	
b. Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
c. Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Potentially significant	<p>MM-NOI-3</p> <p>MM-NOI-4</p> <p>MM-NOI-5</p>	Less than significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
d. Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Potentially significant	MM-NOI-1 MM-NOI-2	Less than significant
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No impact	N/A	No impact
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No impact	N/A	No impact
Would the project have a cumulative noise impact?	Potentially significant	MM-NOI-1 MM-NOI-2 MM-NOI-3 MM-NOI-4 MM-NOI-5	Less than significant
<i>Public Services</i>			
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the			

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:			
Fire protection?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
Police protection?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
Schools?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
Parks?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
Other public facilities?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
Would the project have cumulative public services impacts?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
<i>Transportation and Traffic</i>			
a. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation	Potentially significant	MM-TRF-1 Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy by the City of West Hollywood (City), the applicant shall be responsible for widening the northbound approach to the intersection of Robertson Boulevard and Santa Monica Boulevard. The northbound approach shall be widened to one shared left/through lane and one exclusive right-turn lane, which shall be accomplished by shifting the center line to the west and removing two on-street parking spaces on the west side of Robertson Boulevard. By widening the northbound approach from one to two lanes, this improvement would provide additional capacity to serve the added vehicular demand as a result of the project.	Less than significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			
b. Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
c. Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
d. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
e. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
f. Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
Would the project have cumulative impacts on transportation and traffic?	Potentially significant	MM-TRF-1	Less than significant
<i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>			
a. Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
b. Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
c. Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant

**Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
d. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
e. Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
f. Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
g. Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
Would the project have cumulative public services and/or utilities impacts?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant

Table ES-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Topic	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Energy Consumption</i>			
a. Would the project result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
b. Would the project conflict with existing energy standards and regulations?	No impact	N/A	No impact
c. Would the project place a significant demand on local and regional energy supplies or require a substantial amount of additional capacity?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant
Would the project have cumulative energy consumption impacts?	Less than significant	N/A	Less than significant

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared by the City of West Hollywood (City) to evaluate potential environmental effects that would result from development of the proposed Robertson Lane Hotel Project (proposed project). This EIR has been prepared in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) statutes (Cal. Pub. Res. Code, Section 21000 et. seq., as amended) and implementing guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, Section 15000 et. seq.). The City is the lead agency under CEQA.

The applicant, Faring Capital LLC, proposes to construct a multi-use hotel of approximately 262,315 square feet (sf) that would vary from 3 to 9 stories in height (equating to approximately 27 feet to 114 feet in height as measured from Robertson Boulevard). The hotel would have 241 guestrooms of varying configurations and sizes and would include retail space, restaurant space, outdoor dining, hotel meeting spaces, a nightclub, a gym and spa, back-of-house areas, a lobby, circulation space, and design showroom space. The proposed project would demolish two of the existing on-site structures and the three existing surface parking lots with a total of approximately 197 parking spaces. A portion of the Factory building, a structure that is currently located on the project site, would be retained, rehabilitated and relocated within the site so that it is facing Robertson Boulevard. Two existing one-story commercial buildings located at the southeastern corner of the site would remain in place, as would six of the sixteen trees currently located on site. The project would also include construction of a subterranean parking garage, providing for a total of 1,151 parking spaces and 7 off-loading spaces. Three levels of subterranean parking would be constructed on site, beneath the proposed multi-use hotel building, and two levels of subterranean parking would be constructed below the western portion of West Hollywood Park, across from the project site. A subterranean tunnel extending beneath Robertson Boulevard would connect the two portions of the garage.

The proposed Robertson Lane Specific Plan sets forth development guidelines and procedures to accommodate the project described above on the project site. The project site is currently within the CN2 (Commercial, Neighborhood 2) and CC2 (Commercial, Community 2) zoning districts. The purpose of the Specific Plan is to guide redevelopment of the project site and would allow the proposed project to deviate from the Municipal Code in three primary areas: (1) the Specific Plan would allow for the development of hotel uses across the project site; hotel uses are currently allowed in the CC2 zone but are not allowed in the CN2 zone; (2) the Specific Plan would allow for building heights of 52 feet as measured along Robertson Boulevard, while the existing CN2 zone allows for a maximum building height of 25 feet, and it would allow for building heights of 110 feet as measured along La Peer Drive, while the existing CC2 zone allows for a maximum building height of 45 feet; and, (3) the Specific Plan would increase the

allowable FAR on the site from 1:1 in the CN2 and 2:1 in the CC2 to 3.1:1 for the entire project site. The Specific Plan also establishes land use designations and development standards for the site. Adoption of the Specific Plan would enable the development of the multi-use hotel project described and analyzed herein.

1.2 THE CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESS

CEQA requires preparation of an EIR when there is substantial evidence supporting a fair argument that a proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment. The purpose of an EIR is to provide decision makers, public agencies, and the general public with an objective and informational document that fully discloses the environmental effects of the proposed project. The EIR process is intended to facilitate the objective evaluation of potentially significant direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed project, and to identify feasible mitigation measures and alternatives that would reduce or avoid the proposed project's significant effects. In addition, CEQA specifically requires that an EIR identify those adverse impacts determined to be significant after mitigation.

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, an Initial Study was prepared and a Notice of Preparation distributed on December 11, 2014, to public agencies and organizations. The purpose of the Notice of Preparation was to provide notification that the City plans to prepare an EIR and to solicit input on the scope and content of the EIR. Approximately 27 copies of the Notice of Preparation were distributed and 27 written comment letters were received from various agencies, organizations, and individuals. These letters and the Notice of Preparation are included in Appendix A.

A public agency scoping meeting was held at the West Hollywood Library Community Meeting Room on January 7, 2015. The purpose of this meeting was to seek input from public agencies and the general public regarding the environmental issues and concerns that may potentially result from the proposed project. Approximately 30 people attended the scoping meeting. The following list summarizes the public comments, questions, and concerns that were received at the scoping meeting:

- **Aesthetics.** Concerns were raised regarding shade/shadow effects on neighboring properties (West Hollywood Park, Bossa Nova Brazilian restaurant, The Abbey and its patio, Hamburger Haven), on nearby street trees, and on landscaping at West Hollywood Park. Concerns were expressed that nearby properties would get no afternoon sun. Questions were asked regarding whether the landscape of the park would need to be redesigned due to loss of sunlight. Concerns were raised regarding the height, scale, and massing of the proposed building and about setting a precedent for higher building heights. Concern were raised regarding loss of views of the sky. Speakers requested visual representations of the proposed project from a street level

(specifically, views from Bossa Nova, Hamburger Haven, and The Abbey). Questions were brought up regarding how the building aesthetically contributes to the gateway area of the Melrose Triangle and how it can lead people to West Hollywood Park. Questions regarding how the walls facing Santa Monica Boulevard would be handled aesthetically and whether or not these walls would have graphics, architectural details to provide scale and visual interest, and whether billboards would be allowed on those elevations. Concerns were expressed about potential effects on views from West Hollywood Park. Concerns were also raised about lighting, including the potential for trespass onto adjacent neighborhoods and the potential for the night sky to be overly lit. Questions came up regarding what constraints the City placed on the structure with respect to lighting to avoid overly or inappropriately lit buildings.

- **Cultural Resources.** Concerns were raised regarding demolition of the Factory building. Speakers stated that the Factory is a historically and culturally significant resource and the EIR should evaluate it as such. Concern was expressed about loss of tourist income, loss of history in Hollywood, and loss of the character and charm of the City. Concern was raised that there are too many hotels in the City (hotels on Sunset Boulevard were referenced). One speaker stated that if there are hotels but nothing to see, the basis for the economy would be compromised. Concerns were expressed that West Hollywood will become “the town that used to be” due to the loss of historical resources and structures. The historic Route 66 extends through the City, and concern was expressed that the City would become the stretch of Route 66 with no remaining historic resources. Speakers expressed concern that the project design has already been pre-determined by the time the public is involved and that the Factory would be demolished and that a statement of overriding considerations would be adopted. Overall, concerns were expressed regarding the loss of historical and cultural resources in the City.

Speakers made the following statements specifically related to the Factory building:

- The building was built in 1929 as the Mitchell Motion Picture Camera factory and played a major part in the motion picture business.
- The building is like a “time capsule” for many major events throughout the 21st century. It housed one of the largest gay discos in the 1970s.
- The building housed Studio 1 and the backlot that was part of Studio 1, which hosted performances by major celebrities.
- The West Hollywood Preservation Alliance did a walkthrough of the property and found the building to be intact, with Art Deco-inspired tin paneling on the building’s sides that have been preserved.

Speakers requested that the Factory be preserved and adaptively reused and that a range of viable preservation alternatives be explored and considered in the EIR. A number of concepts and examples were presented, as summarized below:

- A marketplace, such as the Ferry Building in San Francisco or the and the Grand Central Market in downtown Los Angeles
 - The Ghirardelli Square in San Francisco
 - The pedestrian walkway, as proposed, can be moved
 - Incorporate the Factory building into the proposed project by moving the location of the proposed pedestrian walkway and using the Factory as part of the hotel
 - Historical buildings being used as artist studios and galleries in downtown Los Angeles
 - Related to the site’s proximity to the historic Route 66, one speaker gave the example of a motel made out of the teepees along Route 66. A similar concept could be applied to adaptively re-use the Factory into a hotel.
- **Hydrology and Water Quality / Utilities.** Questions were raised regarding how the water use of the proposed project compares with water used by the existing site uses. Concerns were expressed related to the current drought and the potential for increased water use due to the proposed project.
 - **Land Use and Planning.** Concerns were raised about changes in heights allowed on the site relative to the height requirements of the existing zoning designations. Questions were raised regarding what qualifies as a specific plan and what qualifies as a variance. Questions were raised regarding the impacts of a specific plan and the impacts of a variance. Concerns were raised about whether the EIR will evaluate potential effects on the conditional use permits of surrounding businesses, especially those that were given use permits contingent on parking spaces that would not be available during construction, such as The Abbey. Concerns were raised regarding the number of hotels that are being developed in the City, including multiple new hotels being developed along Sunset Boulevard. Questions were raised about how the project supports and enhances the concept of the “urban village” in the City. (How does the project fit into the City’s planning initiatives for the greater Melrose Triangle? How does the project promote walkability within the neighborhood and specifically in relation to Melrose Triangle, the Pacific Design Center, and Boys Town? How would the project accommodate or work with the proposed closure of Robertson Boulevard as described in the streetscapes proposed for Robertson Boulevard, Beverly Boulevard, and Melrose Avenue? How would the project contribute to related streetscape improvements proposed for La Peer Drive? How would the pedestrian boulevard terminate on La Peer Drive and connect to the west

sidewalk of La Peer Drive? How would the project lead people into the park? How would the proposed building address streetscape design at the pedestrian scale, and how would it establish a precedent for the streetscape on Robertson Boulevard and La Peer Drive?) Concerns were raised about lighting of the structure relative to the urban village goals set forth in the General Plan. Concerns were raised about impacts of construction on nearby businesses, such as Bossa Nova.

- **Noise.** Questions were raised regarding how the roof decks and mechanical equipment on the structure would be controlled to the extent that these uses do not interfere with adjacent neighborhoods (specifically, the neighborhoods of West Hollywood West and those north of Santa Monica Boulevard). Comments were raised regarding existing problems with noise from the Factory caused by opening of a door on the roof during nighttime hours.
- **Recreation.** Questions were raised regarding why recreation is not being examined further in the EIR, especially potential impacts to West Hollywood Park. Commenters asked if West Hollywood Park be impacted, especially considering the proximity of the project site to the park and the changes that are currently occurring at the park. Commenters requested that potential recreation issues be examined in the EIR.
- **Traffic and Transportation.** Concerns were expressed about traffic during construction, particularly truck traffic and truck traffic associated with concrete pours. Commenters requested the City to establish a notification system to let citizens know when construction processes and increased construction-related traffic is going to occur. Concerns were raised regarding parking impacts during construction. Concerns were expressed regarding parking for The Abbey and how this parking will be accommodated. Commenters asked how this project fits into City proposals for parking in the Melrose Triangle to support new development in the area and how the design of the project would work with the proposed closure of Robertson Boulevard.
- **Cumulative Effects.** Commenters requested evaluation of the cumulative effects of the proposed project plus the Melrose Triangle project, the nearby La Peer project, and other projects that have already been proposed and/or approved. Commenters requested evaluation of all issue areas in the cumulative analysis. Concerns were raised about cumulative parking demand in terms of public parking in the greater Melrose Triangle, parking for Boys Town, and parking that may be required to accommodate this proposed project, visitors to the project, future projects that may be attracted by this project, and the nearby proposed La Peer hotel. Concerns were raised about the potential cumulative effects of numerous 10-story buildings in the area, if the project were to set a precedent for taller buildings in the vicinity.

This EIR focuses on the environmental impacts identified as potentially significant during the Initial Study process, including the comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation. The issue areas analyzed in detail in this EIR include aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, public services, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems. Effects not found to be significant are addressed in the Initial Study (Appendix A) of this EIR.

This Draft EIR is being circulated for 45 days for public review and comment. The timeframe of the public review period is identified in the Notice of Availability attached to this Draft EIR. During this period, comments from the general public, organizations, and agencies regarding environmental issues analyzed in the Draft EIR and the Draft EIR’s accuracy and completeness may be submitted to the lead agency at the following address:

Jennifer Alkire, AICP, Senior Planner
City of West Hollywood
Community Development Department
8300 Santa Monica Boulevard
West Hollywood, California 90069
Email: jalkire@weho.org

General questions about this EIR and the EIR process should also be directed to the email address above. The City will prepare written responses to all comments pertaining to environmental issues raised in the Draft EIR if they are submitted in writing and postmarked by the last day of the public review period identified in the Notice of Availability.

Prior to approval of the proposed project, the City, as the lead agency and decision-making entity, is required to certify that this EIR has been completed in accordance with CEQA, that the proposed project has been reviewed and the information in this EIR has been considered, and that this EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City. CEQA also requires the City to adopt “findings” with respect to each significant environmental effect identified in the EIR) (Pub. Res. Code Section 21081; Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, Section 15091). For each significant effect, CEQA requires the approving agency to make one or more of the following findings:

- The proposed project has been altered to avoid or substantially lessen significant impacts identified in the Final EIR.
- The responsibility to carry out such changes or alterations is under the jurisdiction of another agency.

- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, which make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

If the City concludes that the proposed project will result in significant effects that cannot be substantially lessened or avoided by feasible mitigation measures and alternatives, the City must adopt a “statement of overriding considerations” prior to approval of the proposed project (Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 (b)). Such statements are intended under CEQA to provide a written means by which the lead agency balances in writing the benefits of the proposed project and the significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. Where the lead agency concludes that the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits outweigh the unavoidable environmental impacts, the lead agency may find such impacts “acceptable” and approve the proposed project.

In addition, public agencies, when approving a project, must also adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program describing the changes that were incorporated into the proposed project or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment (Pub. Res. Code Section 21081.6). The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is adopted at the time of project approval and is designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. Upon approval of the proposed project, the City will be responsible for implementation of the proposed project’s Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. This document will be attached to the Final EIR.

1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR

This EIR is organized as follows:

An **Executive Summary** of the EIR is provided at the beginning of this document. This summary outlines the conclusions of the environmental analysis and provides a summary of the proposed project and the project alternatives analyzed in the EIR. This section also includes a table summarizing all environmental impacts identified in this EIR along with the associated mitigation measures proposed to reduce or avoid each impact.

Chapter 1, Introduction, serves as a forward to this EIR, introducing the project, the applicable environmental procedures, and the organization of the EIR.

Chapter 2, Project Description, provides a thorough description of the proposed project elements, the purpose and need for the project, project objectives, and required discretionary approvals. This chapter also includes a description of the intended uses of the EIR and public agency actions.

Chapter 3, Environmental Analysis, describes the potential environmental effects of the proposed project, as well as proposed mitigation measures to reduce or avoid any potentially significant impacts. The discussion in Chapter 3.0 is organized by twelve environmental issue areas as follows:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Public Services
- Transportation and Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Energy Consumption

For each environmental issue area, the analysis and discussion are organized into seven subsections as described below:

- **Environmental Setting** – This subsection describes the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the proposed project at the time of publication of the Notice of Preparation. The environmental setting establishes the baseline conditions by which the City will determine whether specific Project-related impacts are significant.
- **Relevant Plans, Policies, and Ordinances** – This subsection describes the regulatory setting applicable to the environmental issue area and the proposed project at the time of publication of the Notice of Preparation.
- **Thresholds of Significance** – This subsection identifies a set of thresholds by which the level of impact is determined. Thresholds that were eliminated from further review in the EIR as part of the Initial Study analysis will be identified here.
- **Methodology** – This subsection describes how the analysis was conducted.
- **Impact Analysis** – This subsection provides a detailed analysis regarding the environmental effects of the proposed project, and whether the impacts of the proposed project would meet or exceed the established significance criteria.
- **Mitigation Measures** – This subsection identifies potentially feasible mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially reduce significant adverse project impacts.
- **Significance After Mitigation** – This subsection discusses whether project-related impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the EIR. If applicable, this subsection also identifies any

residual significant and unavoidable adverse effects of the proposed project that would result even with implementation of mitigation measures.

In addition to the seven subsections listed above, full citations for all documents referred to in each environmental issue area discussion are included at the end of each section or chapter.

Chapter 4, Cumulative Effects, discusses the cumulative effects of the project in combination with the effects of other projects in the vicinity.

Chapter 5, Alternatives, discusses alternatives to the proposed project, including a No Project Alternative. This subsection describes the rationale for selecting the range of alternatives discussed in the EIR and identifies the alternatives considered by the City that were rejected from further discussion as infeasible during the scoping process. Lastly, Chapter 5.0 includes a discussion of the environmental effects of the alternatives that were carried forward for analysis and identifies the environmentally superior alternative.

Chapter 6, Other CEQA Requirements, addresses significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided, the significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from implementation of the proposed project, and growth-inducing impacts associated with the proposed project.

Chapter 7, List of Preparers, gives names and contact information of those responsible for writing this EIR.

Appendices include various technical studies prepared for the proposed project, as listed in the Table of Contents.

The City, as the designated lead agency for the proposed project, is responsible for enforcing and verifying that each mitigation measure is implemented as required; however, the project applicants/developers shall be responsible for implementing the mitigation measures as required by the proposed project. As part of the Final EIR process, a mitigation monitoring and reporting program will be prepared.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK