I. Executive Summary

I. Executive Summary

In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15123, this section of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) contains a brief summary of the Arts Club West Hollywood Project (Project) and its potential environmental effects. More detailed information regarding the proposed Project and its potential environmental effects is provided in the following sections of this Draft EIR. Also included in this section of this Draft EIR is an overview of the purpose and focus of this Draft EIR, a general description of the proposed Project and proposed entitlements, a description of the organization of this Draft EIR, an overview of the proposed Project, a general description of areas of controversy, a description of the public review process for this Draft EIR, and a summary of the alternatives to the proposed Project evaluated in this Draft EIR.

1. Purpose of this Draft EIR

As described in Section 15123(a) and 15362 of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR is an informational document that will inform public agency decision-makers and the public of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize any significant effects, and describe reasonable project alternatives. Therefore, the purpose of this Draft EIR is to focus the discussion on the proposed Project's potential environmental effects that the City of West Hollywood (City), as the Lead Agency, has determined to be significant or those that may potentially be significant. In addition, feasible mitigation measures are recommended, when applicable, that could reduce or avoid the proposed Project's significant environmental impacts.

This Draft EIR serves as the environmental document for all actions associated with the proposed Project. This EIR is a "Project EIR" as defined by Section 15161 of the CEQA Guidelines and, as such, serves as an informational document for the general public and Project decision-makers. This Draft EIR is also intended to cover all state, regional, and local government discretionary approvals that may be required to construct or implement the proposed Project. Furthermore, this Draft EIR complies with Section 15064 of the CEQA Guidelines, which discusses determining the significance of the environmental effects caused by a project.

2. Draft EIR Focus and Effects Found Not To Be Significant

In accordance with Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR shall contain a brief statement indicating reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and not discussed in detail in the Draft EIR. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed for public comment to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, responsible agencies, and other interested parties on April 21, 2016, with a revised NOP issued on April 28, 2016, for a 30-day review period. The NOP, revised NOP, and NOP comment letters are included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR. Based on a review of the proposed Project and NOP comments, the City determined an Initial Study was not necessary and that the proposed Project had the potential for significant impacts in the following environmental issue areas:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use
- Noise
- Public Services—Sheriff Protection
- Public Services—Fire Protection
- Traffic, Access, and Parking
- Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure
- Utilities and Service Systems—Wastewater
- Utilities and Service Systems—Solid Waste
- Utilities and Service Systems—Energy

Based on a review of the proposed Project, the City determined the proposed Project would not have the potential to cause significant impacts related to Aesthetics—*Scenic Highways*; Agricultural Resources; Air Quality—*Odor*; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Geology and Soils—*Septic Tanks*; Hazards and Hazardous Materials—*Airport*; Hydrology and Water Quality—*Groundwater Recharge, Flooding, and Inundation*; Land Use and Planning—*Community Division and Conservation Plans*; Mineral Resources; Noise—*Airport*; Population and Housing; Public Services—*Schools, Parks,* and *Other Public Facilities*; Recreation; Transportation and Traffic—*Design Feature Hazards*; and Utilities and Service Systems—*Compliance with Solid Waste Regulations*. These issues are evaluated thoroughly in Section VII, Effects Found Not to Be Significant, of this Draft EIR.

3. Draft EIR Organization

This Draft EIR is comprised of the following sections:

I. Executive Summary. This section describes the purpose of this Draft EIR, Draft EIR focus and effects found not to be significant, Draft EIR organization, Project summary, areas of controversy and issues to be resolved, public review process, summary of alternatives, and a summary of environmental impacts and mitigation measures.

II. Project Description. This section describes the Project location, existing conditions, Project objectives, and characteristics of the proposed Project.

III. Environmental Setting. This section contains a description of the existing physical and built environment and a list of related projects anticipated to be built within the Project vicinity.

IV. Environmental Impact Analysis. This section contains the environmental setting, Project and cumulative impact analyses, mitigation measures (where necessary), and conclusions regarding the level of significance after mitigation for each of the following environmental issues: aesthetics; air quality; geology and soils; GHG emissions; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use; noise; sheriff protection; fire protection; traffic, access, and parking; water supply and infrastructure; wastewater; solid waste; and energy.

V. Alternatives. This section provides an analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed Project including: No Project/No Build Alternative; Reduced Density/8-Story Alternative; Reduced Density/7-Story Alternative; and Office/3-Story Alternative.

VI. Other CEQA Considerations. This section provides a discussion of significant unavoidable impacts that would result from the Project and the reasons why the proposed Project is being proposed notwithstanding the significant unavoidable impacts. An analysis of the significant irreversible changes in the environment is also presented here. This section also analyzes potential growth-inducing impacts of the proposed Project and potential secondary effects caused by the implementation of the mitigation measures for the Project.

VII. Effects Not Found to Be Significant. This section discusses, in detail, the possible effects of the Project that were determined not to be significant.

VIII. References. This section lists the references and sources used in the preparation of this Draft EIR.

IX. Acronyms and Abbreviations. This section provides a list of acronyms and abbreviations used in this Draft EIR.

X. List of Preparers. This section lists the persons who contributed to the preparation of this Draft EIR.

This Draft EIR includes the environmental analysis prepared for the proposed Project and the following appendices:

- Appendix A—Notice of Preparation (NOP) and NOP Comments Letters
- Appendix B—Air Quality
- Appendix C—Geotechnical Report
- Appendix D—Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
- Appendix E—Hydrology and Water Quality Technical Report
- Appendix F—Noise Memo and Calculation Worksheets
- Appendix G—Public Services Response Letters
- Appendix H—Transportation Study
- Appendix I—Water Memorandum
- Appendix J—Sewer Report
- Appendix K—Energy Memorandum and Calculation Worksheets

- Appendix L—Alternatives Trip Generation

4. Project Location and Setting

The Project Site is located at 8920 West Sunset Boulevard and 1024–1036 North Hilldale Avenue in the City of West Hollywood and is assigned Assessor's Parcel Number 4340-001-024. The Project Site is comprised of approximately 20,241 square feet and is generally bounded by Sunset Boulevard to the north, Hilldale Avenue to the west, residential development to the south, and commercial uses to the east. The Project Site is currently developed with an approximately 19,670-square-foot, two-story commercial building with surface parking in the rear of the property and two and a half levels of subterranean parking accessed from the Project Site's only driveway along Hilldale Avenue. The existing building is occupied by a retail store, café, and common area on the ground floor and office space, gym/fitness center, and common area on the second floor. A large monument sign is located directly outside the northwest corner of the existing building. Landscaping within the Project Site is limited to ornamental shrubs and small trees planted in concrete planter boxes along Sunset Boulevard and Hilldale Avenue. There are three small ornamental street trees along the northern boundary of the Project Site on Sunset Boulevard and one Canary Island date palm along the western boundary of the Project Site on Hilldale Avenue.

The Project Site currently has two General Plan land use designations and zoning designations under the West Hollywood General Plan 2035 (General Plan) and the West Hollywood Municipal Code (WHMC): (i) Sunset Specific Plan (SSP) on the northern portion of the Project Site fronting Sunset Boulevard and extending approximately 100 feet south along Hilldale Avenue; and (ii) High Density Residential (R4B) with a Parking (PK) Overlay District on the southern portion of the Project Site, which spans approximately 60 feet from the southern boundary of the Project Site along Hilldale Avenue.

The Project Site is well served by public transit with multiple public transportation opportunities located within the vicinity of the Project Site. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) provides bus transit service along Sunset Boulevard, San Vicente Boulevard, Santa Monica Boulevard, and Melrose Avenue. The nearest public transit stops from the Project Site are located approximately one block west and east at the intersections of Sunset Boulevard and Hammond Street (i.e., Metro 2/302 line) and Sunset Boulevard and San Vicente Boulevard (i.e., Metro 2/302, 30/330, and 105 lines; CityLine Blue and Orange routes), respectively.

5. Overview of the Project

The Applicant proposes to develop an approximately 132,000-square-foot, multi-use building up to 141 feet in height above Sunset Boulevard on an approximately 20,241-square-foot site located at 8920 West Sunset Boulevard and 1024–1036 North Hilldale Avenue in the City of West Hollywood. The proposed Project would serve as the U.S. West Coast home of the Arts Club, a private membership club originally founded in London in 1863 for those interested in the arts, science, and literature. The Arts Club was a hub of the arts in 19th-century London and continues to serve as a social venue and meeting place to promote art, architecture, fashion, film, literature, music, performance, photography, science, theatre, and television/media. The Arts Club would contain a mix of commercial uses accessible to members and their guests, including restaurants, lounges, bars, 15 guestrooms, screening rooms, a supper club, fitness center/spa facilities, and a rooftop deck that would include a swimming pool, changing rooms, and a bar and dining space. In addition, the first four levels of the building would be open to the public and would include ground floor retail and an art gallery with creative office space located on Levels 2 through 4.

The proposed building's façade would be comprised of vertical fins that would visually appear to undulate and rotate although fixed in position. This element of the design of the façade is intended to create subtle, wave like impressions. In addition, the building's design would reference the vintage art deco designs of historic Hollywood.

The ground level of the building would incorporate a landscaped community plaza at the northwestern corner of the Project Site, near Sunset Boulevard and Hilldale Avenue. The upper levels of the building would include outdoor terraces that would be visually interactive with the street. Vehicular access for the proposed Project would be via a single driveway on Hilldale Avenue. A partial subterranean level would contain a valet court and building loading and drop-off area (Level B1). Parking for the proposed Project would be provided through a fully-automated system. Vehicles would be dropped off with the valet service staff, who would transport cars to an automated car lift located on the partial subterranean level (Level B1) to be transferred and parked within one of the subterranean levels. The parking structure would provide for a total of approximately 354 spaces, 349 of which would be served by the automated parking system, and 21 of which would include electronic vehicle charging stations. The remaining 5 parking spaces would be on-site parking spaces located on the partial subterranean level (Level B1), which would accommodate unconventional vehicle sizes and temporary parking. No above-ground surface parking is proposed as part of the proposed Project. Bicycle parking would be provided in compliance with the requirements of the WHMC.

Proposed signage would include general ground-level wayfinding pedestrian signage, as permitted by the WHMC. Wayfinding signs would be located at subterranean parking level entrances, elevator lobby, and corridors. Exterior lighting along the public areas would include pedestrian-scale fixtures and elements. Project lighting would incorporate low-level exterior lights adjacent to buildings and along pathways for security and wayfinding purposes. In addition, low-level lighting to accent signage, architectural features, and landscaping elements would be installed throughout the Project Site. Project lighting would be energy efficient. All on-site exterior lighting would be automatically controlled to illuminate only when necessary and would be shielded or directed toward areas to be illuminated, thereby limiting spillover onto nearby residential areas, particularly the multi-family residential uses immediately to the south of the Project Site

The proposed Project proposes 24-hour daily on-site security personnel with operations based out of a central control room. The security system would be based on an Internet Protocol (IP) based surveillance system with cameras mounted throughout the Project Site. Laptops with access to some aspects of building security would be available to VIP/Dignitary security teams, as requested. Member and guest access would be controlled. Members and guests would enter on Level B1 and Level 1 through security access lobbies, where they would be required to check in with security personnel. Various points throughout the building would be access-controlled, including, but not limited to, the loading dock, elevator cabs, emergency exit doors, security room, storage areas, and other back-of-house areas, as well as the roof terrace.

The Applicant seeks to develop an energy efficient building that is comparable in terms of performance to industry benchmarks. Accordingly, the proposed Project has been designed and would be constructed to incorporate environmentally sustainable building features and construction protocols required by the West Hollywood Green Building Ordinance and the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). These standards would reduce energy and water usage and waste, and thereby reduce associated greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and help minimize the impact on natural resources and infrastructure. The proposed Project would achieve 90 points in the City's Green Points System, which exceeds the 60 points required for compliance, and would achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold certification by the U.S. Green Building Council or satisfy equivalent green building standards.

6. Project Objectives

The proposed Project's specific objectives include the following:

- Add to the diversity of visitor-serving uses available on the Sunset Strip.

- Provide a central location where creative and entrepreneurial patrons come together to meet, exchange ideas, dine, and participate in various cultural events.

- Develop a unique cultural use, which would contribute to the City's economy with an entertainment and creative arts-related venue that includes restaurants, bars, and hospitality uses.

- Enhance the pedestrian connections and activity along Sunset Boulevard through the development of an open and inviting building façade at the sidewalk level featuring a landscaped community plaza that engages the street and the neighborhood community.

- Maximize opportunities for a mix of retail, art gallery, creative offices, entertainment, hospitality, dining, bars, and guestrooms that would further the Sunset Specific Plan's goals to develop the area with a diversity of uses that support daytime and nighttime populations, along with goods and services for City residents.

- Contribute to and expand the diversity of iconic entertainment and cultural venues on the Sunset Strip.

- Support the community's vision of the Sunset Strip as a high-quality international entertainment destination.

- Add to the eclectic urban environment of the Sunset Strip by creating an iconic building design that enhances the Sunset Boulevard experience and its dynamic urban environment.

- Complement the diverse mix of architectural styles, building heights, and uses along Sunset Boulevard.

- Construct an energy-efficient and environmentally conscious building by incorporating sustainable elements of design, construction, and operation to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification by the U.S. Green Building Council.

- Provide significant new creative office space to enhance the City's supply of modern office environments that cater to and respond to the existing and future needs of businesses that will support the economic future and vitality of the City.

- Maximize the number of new permanent jobs generated by the addition of new creative offices, restaurant and retail space, arts gallery and entertainment uses, bars, guestrooms, and fitness and spa facilities, helping to secure a strong and continuous tax base and supply the region with greater employment options.

- Revitalize an under-utilized commercial property in the heart of the Sunset Strip.

7. Areas of Controversy/Issues to be Resolved

As part of the EIR scoping process, the City held a public scoping meeting the West Hollywood Elementary School on May 11, 2016. 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 10 people attended the scoping meeting. Comment letters were also received in response to the Notice of Preparation for this project. Copies of the comment letters received during the scoping process are provided in Appendix A of this Draft EIR. Based on the NOP comment letters provided in Appendix A of this Draft EIR, issues known to be of concern to public agencies included, but were not limited to, air quality, impacts on transit, and traffic.

Potential areas of controversy and issues to be resolved by the City's decision-makers may include those environmental issue areas where the potential for a significant unavoidable impact has been identified. These areas include noise and vibration (associated with human annoyance) from on-site construction activities, cumulative noise from on-site construction activities (in the event that Related Project No. 43 and the proposed Project are constructed concurrently), noise from off-site traffic during operation of the proposed Project in comparison to existing conditions, and cumulative noise from off-site traffic during operation of the proposed Project.

8. Summary of Alternatives

This Draft EIR examined four alternatives to the proposed Project, which include: No Project/No Build Alternative; Reduced Density/8-Story Alternative; Reduced Density/7-Story Alternative; Office/3-Story Alternative. A general description of these alternatives is provided below. Refer to Section V, Alternatives, of this Draft EIR for a more detailed description of these alternatives and a comparative analysis of the impacts of these alternatives with those of the proposed Project.

Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative

Alternative 1, the No Project/No Build Alternative assumes that the Project would not be approved, and no new development would occur within the Project Site. Specifically, the Project Site would continue to be occupied by a two-story commercial building and associated parking, and no new construction or building expansion would occur.

Alternative 2: Reduced Density/8-Story Alternative

The Reduced Density/8-Story Alternative would include the development of a multi-use, eight-story building on the Project Site. The new building would be placed within the

same building footprint as the proposed Project and would include the same overall design features and architecture but with a reduced height of 127 feet. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would include retail and gallery uses on the ground floor, creative office space on the second to fourth floors, Arts Club space on a total of four above-ground floors, and a rooftop pool deck terrace with an emergency helipad. Alternative 2 would remove one level of Arts Club space from the aboveground levels and relocate it to the second subterranean level providing a total of six below grade levels with a below grade mezzanine level. As a result, Alternative 2 would reduce the proposed Project's FAR of 6.5 to 5.7 but would retain essentially the same square footage as the proposed Project. The number of Arts Club members and employees is not expected to change as a result of this reconfiguration in design.

Under Alternative 2, all elements and project design features of the proposed Project, including the building design, landscaped community plaza on the ground level, site access and parking, lighting and signage, security features, and environmental sustainability features would remain the same.

Alternative 3: Reduced Density/7-Story Alternative

The Reduced Density/7-Story Alternative would include the development of a multi-use, seven-story building on the Project Site. The new building would be placed within the same building footprint as the proposed Project and would include the same overall design features and architecture but with a reduced height of 115 feet. Similar to the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would include retail and gallery use on the ground floor, creative office space on the second and third floors, Arts Club space on a total of four above-ground floors, and a rooftop pool deck terrace with an emergency helipad. Alternative 3 would remove one level of Arts Club space from the aboveground levels and relocate it to the second subterranean level providing a total of six below grade levels with a below grade mezzanine level. As a result, Alternative 3 would reduce the proposed Project's FAR of 6.5 to 4.9 and reduce the office square footage. However, the Arts Club component would retain essentially the same square footage as the proposed Project, and the number of Arts Club members and employees is not expected to change as a result of this reconfiguration in design.

Under Alternative 3, all elements and project design features of the proposed Project, including the building design, landscaped community plaza on the ground level, site access and parking, lighting and signage, security features, and environmental sustainability features would be similar. However, a vertical digital billboard would be installed to project from the northern façade near the northeastern corner on the building.

Alternative 4: Office/3-Story Alternative

The Office/3-Story Alternative would include the development of office uses and ground floor commercial/retail uses. Alternative 4 would not provide an art gallery or the Arts Club and its related uses, such as the guestrooms, supper club, private dining, bars, lounges, mid-level terraces, and the roof's pool terrace. Instead, two levels of office space over ground floor commercial and retail uses would be developed on the Project Site with a partial subterranean level that would include a gym/fitness center. Alternative 4 would also eliminate three levels of subterranean parking and the emergency helipad. Under Alternative 4, some elements of the proposed Project would be retained, such as the landscaped community plaza on the ground level, site access, lighting, and some sustainability features. In addition, a digital billboard would be installed to project from the northern façade near the northeastern corner of the building.

9. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This Draft EIR has been prepared to analyze the potentially significant effects on the environment that could result from implementation of the proposed project. For a detailed discussion of potential significant impacts, please see Section IV, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this Draft EIR. Table I-1 on page I-12 summarizes the identified environmental impacts for each issue area studied in the EIR, recommended mitigation measures (if any), and the level of significance after mitigation.

Table I-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
A. Aesthetics, Views, Light/Glare and Shading			
a. Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
b. Would the Project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, or other locally recognized desirable aesthetic natural feature within a city-designated scenic highway?	No impact.	Not applicable.	No impact.
c. Would the Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
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.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
e. Would the Project result in new shadows that extend to currently unshaded off-site, shade-sensitive uses more than four hours between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time (PDT) between early April and late October or more than three hours between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M. Pacific Standard Time (PST), between late October and early April?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Impact	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
f. Would the Project have a cumulative impact related to aesthetics, views, light and glare, and shading?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
B. Air Quality			
a. Would the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Plan or Congestion Management Plan?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
b. Would the Project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
c. Would the Project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the air basin is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
d. Would the Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
e. Would the Project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	No impact.	Not applicable.	No impact.
f. Would the Project have a cumulative air quality impact?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
C. Geology and Soils			
a. Would the Project expose people or			

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Impact	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	Potentially significant.	**Mitigation Measure C-1**: Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Applicant shall submit final design plans and a geotechnical engineering report to the Community Development Department, Building and Safety Division for review and approval. The design-level geotechnical engineering report shall be used for final design of the foundation system for the structures and shall take into consideration the engineering properties beneath the proposed structure and the projected load. The final report shall specify exact design coefficients that are needed by structural engineers to determine the type and sizing of structural building materials. The final report shall be subject to the specific performance criteria imposed by all applicable state and local codes and standards. The final geotechnical report shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer or certified engineering geologist and include appropriate measures to minimize seismic hazards and ensure structural safety of the proposed structure. The proposed structure shall be designed and constructed in accordance with all	Less than significant.

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Impact	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		applicable provisions of the applicable California Building Code and the West Hollywood Building Code. The site-specific geotechnical report shall incorporate each of the recommendations provided in the *Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Mixed-Use Development, 8920 Sunset Boulevard, West Hollywood, California*, prepared by Geocon West, Inc., (July 2, 2015) as well as the *Response to City of West Hollywood Review Comments, Proposed Mixed-Use Development, 8920 Sunset Boulevard, West Hollywood, California*, prepared by Geocon West, Inc. (May 24, 2016). Where differing information exists, the recommendations presented in the later document shall supersede the former. As such, the recommendations from the May 2016 report shall take precedence and be incorporated into the proposed building design accordingly. All recommendations contained in the final site-specific geotechnical report will be incorporated in the Project design.	
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
iv. Landslides?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
b. Would the Project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
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 potential result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	Potentially significant.	See Mitigation Measure C-1 above.	Less than significant.

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Impact	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
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?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without 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?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
f. Would the Project have a cumulative impact related to geology and soils?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
D. Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
a. Would the Project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
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.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
c. Would the Project have a cumulative impact related to greenhouse gas emissions?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
E. Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
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.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Impact	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	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.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
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?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
d. Would the Project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
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.	Not applicable.	No impact.
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for the people residing or working in the area?	No impact.	Not applicable.	No impact.
g. Would the Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Impact	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
evacuation plan?			
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?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
i. Would the Project have a cumulative impact related to hazards and hazardous materials?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
F. Hydrology and Water Quality			
a. Would the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
b Would the Project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned land uses for which permits have been granted)?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
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.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Impact	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
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 an manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
e. Would the Project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
f. Would the Project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
g. Would the Project require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
h. Would the Project place housing within a 100-year flood plain as mapped on federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	No impact.	Not applicable.	No impact.
i. Would the Project place within a 100-year flood plain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	No impact.	Not applicable.	No impact.

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Impact	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
j 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?	No impact.	Not applicable.	No impact.
k. Would the Project result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	No impact.	Not applicable.	No impact.
l. Would the Project have a cumulative impact related to hydrology and water quality?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
G. Land Use			
a. Would the Project physically divide an established community?	No impact.	Not applicable.	No impact.
b. Would the Project conflict with 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, coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
c. Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
d. Would the Project have a cumulative impact related to land use?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
H. Noise			
a. Would the Project result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise in	Potentially significant.	**Mitigation Measure H-1:** The Project shall implement the following measures during construction period:	Temporary significant and unavoidable during Project

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Impact	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
level in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		• 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. • Construction equipment shall be properly maintained per manufacturers' specifications and fitted with the best available noise suppression devices (i.e., mufflers, silencers, wraps, etc.). • All impact tools shall be shrouded or shielded, and all intake and exhaust ports on power equipment shall be muffled or shielded. • Construction operations and related activities associated with the Project shall comply with the operational hours outlined in the WHMC Noise Ordinance. • Construction equipment shall not be idled for extended periods of time in the vicinity of noise-sensitive receptors. • Fixed and/or stationary equipment shall be located as far as possible from noise-sensitive receptors (e.g., generators, compressors, cement mixers). • A temporary and impermeable sound barrier shall be erected along the Project's southern property line and along the southern portion of the eastern and western property lines. The temporary sound barrier shall have a minimum surface weight of 2 pounds per square foot or greater and be designed to provide a minimum 10-dBA noise reduction at the residential uses on Hilldale Avenue (i.e., the noise-	construction.

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Impact	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		sensitive receptor location R1) to the south and southwest and the residential uses adjacent to the Project Site to the east. • Music (i.e., workers' radios) from the construction site shall not be audible at off-site noise-sensitive receptor locations. **Mitigation Measure H-2:** The contractor shall employ the following construction methods to minimize the generation of ground-borne vibration at the commercial building adjacent to the Project Site to the east: • Prior to start of construction, the Applicant shall retain services of a qualified architect to visit the single-story commercial building adjacent to the Project Site to the east, inspect and document the apparent physical condition of the building, including, but not limited to, the building structure, interior wall, and ceiling finishes. • The Applicant shall submit a demolition vibration control plan to ensure that the demolition process shall not result in damage to the adjacent single-story commercial building to the east. In the event damage occurs to the building due to construction vibration, the noted building damage shall be repaired to the conditions before construction, as required. • The Applicant shall retain the services of a qualified vibration consultant to monitor ground-borne vibration at the exterior of the single-story commercial building immediately abutting the Project Site to the east during site excavation (when the use of heavy construction equipment, such as a large	

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Impact	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		bulldozer, drill rig, or loaded truck occurs) within 12 feet of this building. If the measured ground-borne vibration levels exceed 0.3 inch/second peak particle velocity (PPV) at the adjacent building, the Project contractor shall evaluate and employ alternative construction methods, so that the ground-borne vibration levels would be below 0.3 inch/ second PPV at the adjacent building to the east.	
b. Would the Project result in the exposure of people to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Potentially significant.	See Mitigation Measures H-1 and H-2 above.	Temporary significant and unavoidable during Project construction.
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.	None feasible.	Significant and unavoidable.
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.	See Mitigation Measures H-1 and H-2 above.	Temporary significant and unavoidable during Project construction.
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.	Not applicable.	No impact.
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project	No impact.	Not applicable.	No impact.

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Impact	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
area to excessive noise levels?			
g. Would the Project have a cumulative impact related to noise?	Potentially significant.	See Mitigation Measures H-1 and H-2 above.	Temporary significant and unavoidable during construction and permanent significant and unavoidable during operation (off-site trips under existing conditions).
I.1 Public Services—Sheriff Protection			
a. Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered Sheriff's Department facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
b. Would the Project have a cumulative impact related to police protection?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
I.2 Public Services—Fire Protection			
a. Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire department facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Impact	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
protection?			
b. Would the Project have a cumulative impact related to fire protection?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
J. Traffic, Access, and Parking			
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 system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
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.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
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?	No impact.	Not applicable.	No impact.

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Impact	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
d. Would the Project substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
e. Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without 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.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
g. Would the Project provide adequate parking to serve the proposed land uses?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
h. Would the Project have a cumulative impact related to traffic, access, and parking?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
K.1 Utilities and Service Systems—Water Supply and Infrastructure			
a. 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.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
b. Would the Project require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Impact	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
environmental effects?			
c. Would the Project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resource, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
d. Would the Project have a cumulative impact related to water supply and infrastructure?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
K.2 Utilities and Service Systems—Wastewater			
a. Would the Project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
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.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
c. 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.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
d. Would the Project have a cumulative impact related to wastewater?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.

Table I-1 (Continued)
Summary of Impacts Under the Project

Impact	Impact Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
K.3 Utilities and Service Systems—Solid Waste			
a. Would the Project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
b. Would the Project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
c. Would the Project have a cumulative impact related to wastewater?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
K.4 Utilities and Service Systems—Energy			
a. Would the Project result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
b. Would the Project conflict with existing energy standards and regulations?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.
c. Would the Project have a cumulative impact related to energy use?	Less than significant.	None required.	Less than significant without mitigation.

Source: Eyestone Environmental, 2017.