

RESOLUTION NO. 2017-P023

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CULVER CITY, RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL (1) CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT SCH NO. 2016111044; (2) ADOPTION OF A MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM; AND (3) ADOPTION OF A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS BASED ON AN ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT BENEFITS AGAINST THE PROJECT'S SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS, IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 7 (THE PROPOSED CULVER STUDIO INNOVATION PLAN) PROJECT

(P2016-0208-CP, P2016-0208-HPCA, P2016-0208-DA, P2016-0208-EIR)

WHEREAS, The Culver Studios Owner, LLC (the "Studio," or "Applicant") filed an application with the City of Culver City (the "City") on November 16, 2016, which was deemed complete on November 30, 2017, to develop the Culver Studios Innovation Plan – Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 7 (the "Innovation Plan Project," "CPA 7 Project," or "Project") as follows:

Project Location

The Project Site (or "Studio Campus") encompasses approximately 14 acres at 9336 Washington Boulevard in downtown Culver City. The Studio Campus is generally bounded by the vacated portion of Washington Boulevard to the north, Ince Boulevard to the east, Van Buren Place to the west, and Lucerne Avenue to the south. The City's General Plan presently designates the Studio Campus as Studio with a corresponding Zone of S-1 for office/storage/stage development. The Project Site is located within the Eastern Sub-Area of the City within the Lucerne – Higuera Neighborhood.

Project Description

The Project, would technologically update and expand facilities within the existing Studio Campus, while retaining the Studio's unique ambiance and prominent place in downtown Culver City. CPA No. 7 includes some, but not all, of the improvements approved as part of CPA No. 6 but not yet constructed, including new Building Y and the Van Buren Parking Structure near Van Buren Place. Although the historically significant bungalows have been relocated to the area south of the Mansion and are currently being rehabilitated subject to the mitigation measures required under CPA No. 6, this change to the Studio Campus is also included in CPA No. 7.

No major exterior changes are proposed to the Mansion or adjacent Buildings D, E, H, and I. Interior rehabilitation of the Mansion would be undertaken in a manner that would protect the building's eligibility as a historical resource under the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance. The four existing bungalow Buildings S, T, U, and V, previously located along the western edge of the Studio Campus, were recently relocated to a site immediately south of the Mansion as approved under CPA No. 6. Their relocation, orientation and configuration in this area retains the historic grouping of the Bungalows within the Studio Campus in keeping with their original setting. The Bungalows are now in the process of being rehabilitated for continued use as offices. The rehabilitation work is being undertaken by a team of qualified consultants and contractors in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

1 The Project proposes to modernize and expand the existing Central Area of the
2 Studio Campus south of the Mansion and the relocated bungalow area. Proposed
3 improvements include the construction of new Digital Media buildings consisting of a
4 flexible mix of creative space, production space, and digital media stages. The Digital
5 Media buildings would replace some of the existing buildings in the Central Area
6 consisting of offices, support services, and sound stages. New digital media stages
7 would be provided within the Central Area of the Studio Campus, co-located with
8 media office and support uses.
9

10 Two new parking structures are proposed as part of CPA No. 7. The proposed
11 below-grade Central Parking Structure would be located south of the Mansion and the
12 existing Rear Lawn Parking Structure, within the existing Central Area of the Studio
13 Campus. The Central Parking Structure consists of two parking levels and would
14 accommodate Studio employee, VIP, and visitor parking. The Van Buren Parking
15 Structure would be constructed on the western edge of the Studio Campus on the site
16 of an existing above-grade parking structure, existing surface parking lot, and the
17 former Bungalow Area. The Van Buren Parking Structure would include two below-
18 grade, one at-grade, and five above-grade levels.
19
20
21

22 Following public circulation of the Draft EIR and based on input received during
23 the environmental review process, particularly concerns regarding historical resources,
24 the Studio has elected to pursue adoption of Alternative 6 (Historic Preservation –
25 Retain Stages 7/8/9 as Sound Stages), as the proposed Project. As further described
26 in the Final EIR, other than retaining (rather than demolishing) Stages 7/8/9 as Sound
27 Stages, foregoing construction of Building M, and an associated reduction in the size
28
29

1 of the Central Parking Structure, the essential characteristics of the Project would not
2 change as described in the Draft EIR. The modified Project results in a 66,120 sf
3 reduction in net new development. With the Project as modified, buildings to be
4 demolished would total approximately 219,493 square feet (sf) and new construction
5 at Project buildout would total approximately 564,500 sf, for a net new square footage
6 total of approximately 345,007 sf Campus-wide.
7

8 Construction is anticipated to start in the first quarter of 2018, subject to Project
9 approval and is anticipated to be completed mid-2020; and
10

11 WHEREAS, in order to implement the proposed Project, approval of the following land
12 use permits (collectively, "Entitlements") are required:

13
14 1. Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 7 (CPA No. 7): Ensures the
15 Project is in compliance with all required standards and City ordinances and
16 establishes all onsite and offsite conditions of approval to reflect the site features and
17 compatibility of the proposed Project with the uses on adjoining properties. Approval
18 of CPA No. 7 amends and supersedes all previous Comprehensive Plan
19 Amendments; supersedes all previous amendments;

20
21 2. Certificate of Appropriateness under the City's Historic Preservation
22 Ordinance; Ensures that the Project conforms to the City's Historic Preservation
23 Ordinance with regard to historic building modifications;

24
25 3. Conveyance of Agreement: Agreement for discharge of public sewer
26 waste through Studio conveyance system; Ensures that the Project will adequately
27 discharge sewer waste;

28
29 4. Development Agreement: Provides assurance to the Applicant that the
Project, upon approval by the City Council, may proceed in accordance with existing
policies, rules and regulations, and conditions of approval; and to secure public
benefits for the community; and

WHEREAS, the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) includes the Draft EIR,
dated September 2017 and circulated for public review September 22, 2017 through

1 November 6, 2017, all comments received during the public review period, and written
2 responses to those comments and clarifications/changes to the EIR. As required by the
3 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines, the City conducted
4 an extensive environmental review of the Innovation Plan Project as follows:

5
6 1. In accordance with CEQA and the Culver City Municipal Code ("CCMC"),
7 the City of Culver City is the identified lead agency, and the City Planning Commission
8 is authorized to recommend and the City Council is authorized to approve
9 Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 7, the Certificate of Appropriateness,
10 Development Agreement, Mitigation Monitoring Program, Statement of Overriding
11 Consideration and Certification of the Final EIR. The City prepared an Initial Study for
12 the Project, which determined that the Project may have a significant effect on the
13 environment and that an environmental impact report must be prepared. The Initial
14 Study determined that the following areas must be addressed in the Project EIR:
15 aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas
16 emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use
17 and planning, noise, public services (fire and police), transportation and traffic, utilities
18 and public services (wastewater, water supply and solid waste), energy, and
19 mandatory findings of significance.

20
21 2. A Notice of Preparation ("NOP") for the EIR was circulated to affected
22 agencies, pursuant to CEQA statutes and the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Cal. Code of
23 Regs. §§ 15000 et seq.), for a 35-day review period, commencing November 17, 2016
24 and ending December 21, 2016. The NOP included notification of a Community
25 Meeting and Scoping Meeting. The Community Meeting was held on December 8,
26 2016 at 6:00 P.M. followed by the Scoping Meeting at 7:00 P.M. at the Culver City
27 Senior Center, located at 4095 Overland Avenue, Culver City, CA 90232. The Scoping
28 Meeting was held in an open house/workshop format and provided interested
29 individuals, groups, and public agencies the opportunity to view materials, ask
questions, and provide written comments to the City regarding the scope and focus of
the Draft EIR. [See Appendix A of the Draft EIR (Volume 2) for materials from the
Scoping Meeting.]

Ten written comment letters and emails responding to the NOP were submitted
to the City by public agencies, organizations, and individuals. Correspondence was
received from the State of California, Native American Heritage Commission; State of
California, Department of Transportation (Caltrans)-District 7; Southern California
Association of Governments (SCAG); South Coast Air Quality Management District
(SCAQMD); and The Los Angeles Conservancy. Also, written comments were
provided by an additional five interested organizations and/or individual parties via
mail and e-mail. Two Written Comment Forms with public responses to the NOP were

submitted at the Scoping Meeting. [See Appendix A of the Draft EIR (Volume 2) for written comments.]

3. The City of Culver City prepared a Draft EIR that addressed, *inter alia*, all issues raised by the Initial Study and by comments received on the NOP.

In accordance with the provision of Sections 15085(a) and 15087(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City: (1) published a Notice of Availability (NOA) of a Draft EIR in the Culver City News and posted the notice with the Los Angeles County Clerk; (2) provided copies of the NOA and Draft EIR to the Culver City Julian Dixon Library; (3) posted the NOA and the Draft EIR on the City's website (<http://www.culvercity.org>); (4) prepared and transmitted a Notice of Completion (NOC) as well as CD copies of the Draft EIR to the State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research for distribution to State Agencies; (5) sent a NOA to all property owners within 500 feet of the Project Site; and (6) sent a NOA to the last known name and address of all organizations and individuals who previously requested such notice in writing or attended public meetings about the Project.

The public review period commenced on September 22, 2017 and ended on November 6, 2017 for a total of 46 days. During the Draft EIR public review period the City conducted a Public Meeting on October 12, 2017, to provide an overview of findings in the Draft EIR, explain the process for providing comments on the Draft EIR, and outline the remaining process for completion of the Final EIR. [See Appendix B of the Final EIR for Public Meeting materials.] Written comments received on or prior to November 7, 2017, are included in the Final Environmental Impact Report Responses to Comments.

4. The Project was duly noticed in accordance with the noticing requirements for each of the Entitlements. The Project was advertised in the Culver City News, through on-site posting 21 days prior to the hearing, and by direct first-class mail to property owners within 500 feet of the Studio Campus. In addition, the date and time of each public hearing was on the City's website.

The Final EIR, which is incorporated by reference, includes the Draft EIR, comments on the Draft EIR, and the responses to written comments on the Draft EIR, modifications to the Draft EIR text, and the Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP"). The Final EIR was presented to the Planning Commission on December 13, 2017. On November 30, 2017, the Final EIR was sent to each agency that submitted timely comments on the Draft EIR.

5. The Final Project EIR and its Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP"), and the Statement of Overriding Considerations as set forth in Section 6 of this Resolution, and has been adopted by the Planning Commission in compliance with CEQA.

6. The Planning Commission has considered the Final EIR prepared for the Project, as well as information provided in the agenda reports, the Planning Division

1 staff reports, the amended text of the Final EIR, information presented to the Planning
2 Commission from experts, and information presented in public testimony, and other
3 matters in the public record prior to a recommendation to City Council to certify the
4 Final EIR and approve the Project.

5 7. The documents and other materials that constitute the record of the
6 proceedings upon which the decisions of the Planning Commission are based are
7 contained in the Project file located within Culver City's Planning Division and in the
8 custody of said Division and in other files of Culver City departments; and

9 WHEREAS, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; Pub. Res. Code §§
10 21000 et seq.) provides that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if
11 there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would
12 *substantially lessen* the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]" (CEQA § 21002;
13 emphasis added.) The procedures required by CEQA "are intended to assist public agencies
14 in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible
15 alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such
16 significant effects." (CEQA § 21002; emphasis added.)

17 WHEREAS, CEQA also provides that "in the event [that] specific economic, social, or
18 other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures,
19 individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects." (CEQA §
20 21002.) CEQA provides that a public agency has an obligation to balance a variety of public
21 objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors and in particular the goal of
22 providing a decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian. (CEQA
23 § 21081; CEQA Guidelines, 14 Cal. Code of Regulations, § 15021(d).) CEQA requires
24 decision-makers to balance the benefits of a proposed project against its significant
25 unavoidable adverse environmental impacts, and, if the benefits of a proposed project
26 outweigh the significant unavoidable adverse environmental impacts, the unavoidable
27
28
29

1 adverse environmental impacts may be considered “acceptable” by adopting a “Statement of
2 Overriding Considerations.” (CEQA Guidelines § 15093.) The Statement of Overriding
3 Considerations must set forth the project benefits or reasons why the Lead Agency is in favor
4 of approving the project and must weigh these benefits against the project’s adverse
5 environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-
6 significant level.
7

8 WHEREAS, CEQA’s mandates and principles are implemented, in part, through the
9 requirement that agencies adopt findings before approving projects for which EIRs are
10 required. Sections 15090, 15091, 15092, and 15093. Public Resources Code Section 21081
11 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 require that the City of Culver City, as the Lead Agency
12 for this Project, prepare written findings for any identified significant environmental effects
13 along with a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible specific findings
14 under CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a) are:
15
16

- 17 1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the
18 project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental
effects as identified in the Final EIR.
- 19 2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of
20 another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such
21 changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be
adopted by such other agency.
- 22 3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations,
23 including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers,
24 make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified
25 in the Final EIR. Public Resources Code Section 21061.1 defines
26 “feasible” to mean “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner
27 within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic,
28 environmental, social and technological factors.” CEQA Guidelines section
29 15364 adds another factor: “legal” considerations. (Citizens of Goleta
Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 565). The concept of
“feasibility” also encompasses the question of whether a particular
alternative or mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and

objectives of a project. (City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417).

WHEREAS, CEQA requires decision-makers to adopt a mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMP) for those mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR that would mitigate or avoid each significant impact identified in the EIR and to incorporate the mitigation monitoring and reporting program, including all mitigation measures, as conditions of project approval. In addition, the Project Design Features (PDFs), which are incorporated into the Project and relied on in the analyses in the EIR, are included in the MMP to ensure implementation of these measures as part of the Project.

WHEREAS, CEQA requires that the responses to comments in the Final EIR demonstrate good faith and a well-reasoned analysis, and not be overly conclusory. In response to comments received and as otherwise appropriate, portions of the Draft EIR have been revised. Although new material has been added to the Draft EIR through preparation of the Final EIR, (i) this new material provides clarification to points and information already included in the Draft EIR (ii) the new material is not considered to be significant new information or a substantial change to the Draft EIR; (iii) certain factual corrections and minor changes are set forth as additions and corrections to the Draft EIR; (iv) the new material constitutes factual corrections and minor changes to the Draft EIR and not substantial changes in the draft EIR that would deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project, a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect, or a feasible project alternative that the Applicant declines to adopt; (v) the new material added to the Draft EIR will not result in new significant environmental impacts or substantially increase the severity of the previously identified significant effects disclosed in the Draft EIR; (vi) the new material added to the

1 Draft EIR will not involve mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably
2 different from those analyzed in the Draft EIR that would substantially reduce one or more
3 significant effects on the environment; and (vii) the new material added to the Draft EIR
4 does not render the Draft EIR so fundamentally inadequate and conclusory in nature that
5 meaningful public review and comment would be precluded, and, therefore, the new
6 material added to the EIR does not necessitate recirculation of the Draft EIR.
7

8 WHEREAS, CEQA Guidelines section 15003(c) and (i) note that state courts have
9 held that the purpose of an EIR is to inform other governmental agencies and the public
10 generally of the environmental impacts of a proposed project. CEQA does not require
11 technical perfection or exhaustive treatment of issues in an EIR, but rather adequacy,
12 completeness, and a good-faith effort at full disclosure.
13
14

15 NOW, THEREFORE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CULVER
16 CITY, CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

17 **SECTION 1.** The foregoing recitals are true and correct and are a substantive part of
18 this Resolution.
19

20 **SECTION 2.** In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15090, the City, as Lead
21 Agency for the Project, certifies that: (a) the Final EIR for the Project has been completed
22 and processed in compliance with the requirements of CEQA; (b) the Final EIR was
23 presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency, who reviewed and considered the
24 information contained in the Final EIR prior to approving the Project; and (c) the Final EIR
25 reflects the City's independent judgment and analysis.
26

27 **SECTION 3. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FINDINGS REQUIRED BY CEQA.** Based
28 on the foregoing recitals and the entire record, including, without limitation, the entire EIR,
29

1 oral and written testimony and other evidence received at the public hearings held on the
2 Project and the EIR, reports and other transmittals from City staff to the Planning
3 Commission, and upon studies and investigations made by the Planning Commission, the
4 Planning Commission does hereby find that the Final EIR for the Innovation Plan Project for
5 the Comprehensive Plan and Development Agreement identifies and discloses project-
6 specific impacts and cumulative impacts. Environmental impacts, mitigation measures and
7 conclusions regarding environmental impacts after mitigation identified in the EIR, findings,
8 and facts in support of findings, all set forth in Exhibit A, attached to this Resolution, are
9 incorporated herein as "Findings Required by CEQA", and identified as follows:
10
11

- 12 1. The Final EIR identifies issue areas as "Environmental Impacts Found to Be
13 Significant," as set forth in Section 1 (significant and unavoidable) of Exhibit A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that will
14 avoid or lessen certain of the Project impacts, but that will not avoid or reduce all of
15 the potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. These remaining significant
16 impacts are balanced against Project benefits and are found to be overridden by the
17 Project benefits, as stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 6
18 of this Resolution.
- 19 2. The Final EIR identifies issue areas as "Environmental Impacts Found to Be Less
20 Than Significant After Mitigation," as set forth in Section 2 of Exhibit A. Changes or
21 alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that will avoid or
22 reduce these potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.
- 23 3. The Final EIR identifies issue areas as "Environmental Impacts Found to Be Less
24 Than Significant Prior to Mitigation," as set forth in Section 3 of Exhibit A.
- 25 4. The EIR evaluates cumulative impacts, which are included in Sections 1, 2, and 3 of
26 Exhibit A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the
27 project that will avoid or lessen certain of the cumulative impacts, but that will not
28 avoid or reduce all of the potential cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level
29 for cumulative construction related traffic congestion. These remaining significant
impacts are balanced against Project benefits and are found to be overridden by the
Project benefits, as stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 6
of this Resolution.

1 5. Pursuant to CEQA Guideline section 15088.5 and CEQA section 21092.1, on the basis
2 of its review and consideration of the Final EIR, the Planning Commission further finds
3 that:

- 4 1. The changes made and information added to the Draft EIR or incorporated into
5 the Final EIR during the public process do not constitute significant new
6 information or substantial changes that would deprive the public of a
7 meaningful opportunity to comment on a substantial adverse environmental
8 effect of the project, a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an impact that the
9 project's proponents have declined to implement, or a feasible project
10 alternative.
- 11 2. The changes made and information added to the Draft EIR or incorporated into
12 the Final EIR during the public review process will not result in new significant
13 environmental effects or substantially increase the severity of previously
14 identified significant effects disclosed in the Draft EIR.
- 15 3. The Applicant has not declined to adopt any feasible mitigation measures or
16 alternatives considerably different from those analyzed in the Draft EIR that
17 would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the Project.
18 Rather, the Applicant has elected to adopt an Alternative evaluated in the Draft
19 EIR that reduces net new development and lessens the significant
20 environmental impacts of the Project.
- 21 4. The Draft EIR was not so fundamentally inadequate and conclusory in nature
22 that meaningful public review and comment have been precluded.
- 23 6. The MMP, attached hereto as Exhibit B and incorporated herein by this reference,
24 includes mitigation measures and Project Design Features (PDFs) that are
25 required to mitigate project impacts.

26 **SECTION 4. CONSIDERATION OF A REASONABLE RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES.**

27 Based upon the above recitals and the entire record, including the Final EIR, oral and written
28 testimony and other evidence received at the public hearings held on the Project and the
29 EIR, and based upon reports and other transmittals from City staff to the Planning
Commission, the Planning Commission further finds that the Final EIR analyzes a
reasonable range of project alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the basic
objectives of the Project but would substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the

1 project, and adequately evaluates the comparative merits of each alternative. The Planning
2 Commission further finds, as follows:

3 **Project Objectives**

4 The underlying purpose and primary objective of the Project, as specified in the Final EIR, is
5 to sustain The Culver Studio's prominent role as a dynamic, independent studio in the
6 entertainment, digital media, and creative industries, through transformation and
7 technological updates to its Studio Campus that will support a wide range of related activities.
8 As further required by the State CEQA Guidelines, the specific objectives sought by the
9 Applicant for the Project are:
10
11

12 **Objective 1.** Create a state-of-the-art Studio Campus of media and digital content
13 stages, film and television production offices, and support facilities that will ensure the
14 Studio's resilience, competitiveness, and continued position at the cutting edge of
15 innovation essential to the invention and production of entertainment and digital media
16 for future generations.
17

18 **Objective 2.** Through new and upgraded facilities foster current and further content
19 creation, digital media, creative technologies, virtual reality, and related uses
20 consistent with the Studio's heritage and the history and evolution of the entertainment
21 industry.
22

23 **Objective 3.** Support the continued economic viability of the Studio and its ability to
24 respond to changing industry needs and market conditions through a plan that
25 technologically updates and expands Campus facilities while allowing flexibility in the
26 application of development standards.
27
28
29

1 **Objective 4.** Implement an innovative plan that supports development of flexible and
2 sustainable new media space, inviting/collaborative landscaped open areas, sensitive
3 treatment of neighborhood interfaces, and redesigned and improved access.

4 **Objective 5.** Upgrade and rehabilitate the Mansion in a manner that protects its
5 eligibility as a historical resource under the City's preservation ordinance while
6 allowing for interior alterations to accommodate future uses and bring the building up
7 to current standards. Upgrade the Front Lawn of the Mansion in a manner that
8 respects the original landscape design intent and scale.

9 **Objective 6.** Provide a circulation plan that: moves vehicles as efficiently as possible
10 onto the Studio Campus from the surrounding street network with a minimum of
11 queuing or delays; reduces production vehicle use of directly adjacent streets;
12 minimizes truck/passenger vehicle and truck/emergency vehicle and fire lane conflicts;
13 and frees up at-grade areas for use as attractive and usable outdoor open space.

14 **Objective 7.** Promote environmental sustainability through development of updated
15 and expanded facilities on an existing Studio Campus within convenient walking
16 distance to the nearby Metro Station and other public transit consistent with regional
17 and local mobility goals to reduce vehicle trips and infrastructure costs.

18 **Objective 8.** Update and redevelop the Studio Campus with a high quality state-of-
19 the-art design that supports environmental sustainability by: meeting or exceeding
20 Culver City Green Building Program requirements; provision of more energy efficient
21 buildings, high efficiency HVAC systems, and infrastructure; water conservation
22 features; stormwater filtration systems; photovoltaics and passive solar design; use of
23 renewable, recycled and low VOC materials; and, EV ready parking.
24
25
26
27
28
29

Alternatives Evaluated

Chapter 5, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR contains an analysis of nine alternatives to the proposed Project that were considered to reduce significant effects identified, as well as to address comments received during public scoping, and based on City staff consideration. The following provides a brief description of the alternatives and a comparative summary of the environmental impacts anticipated under each alternative to the environmental impacts associated with the Project based on the detailed evaluation of the potential impacts associated with each alternative provided in the EIR. (Draft EIR, Table 5-12, Comparison of Impacts Associated with the Project and the Alternatives.)

Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the No Project/No Build Alternative for a development project on an identifiable property consists of the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the Guidelines states that, "In certain instances, the no project alternative means 'no build' wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained." Under the No Project/No Build Alternative, the Project would not be developed and use of the entire Studio Campus would continue as under current conditions.

The No Project/No Build Alternative would avoid all of the Project's potentially significant impacts, including significant project impacts to historical resources, project construction traffic, project and cumulative operational traffic impacts. While mitigation measures would reduce Project impacts to less than significant levels in the following issue areas, the No Project/No Build Alternative would avoid these impacts: archaeological/tribal resources, paleontological resources, geology and soils,

1 construction noise and vibration, and wastewater infrastructure. Finally, the No Project
2 Alternative would also avoid the project's less than significant impacts associated with
3 air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology
4 and water quality, land use and planning, operational noise and vibration, fire
5 protection, police protection, public transit, access and circulation, wastewater
6 treatment capacity, water supply, and solid waste.
7

8 The No Project/No Build Alternative would provide no new development on the
9 Project Site. Therefore, this alternative would not meet any of the Project objectives
10 which relate to the underlying purpose of the Project to sustain The Culver Studio's
11 prominent role as a dynamic, independent studio in the entertainment, digital media,
12 and creative industries, through expansion and modernization of the Studio Campus.
13 The No Project/No Build Alternative would not create a start-of-the-art Studio Campus
14 that would ensure the Studio's competitiveness and continued position at the cutting
15 edge of innovation essential to the invention and production of entertainment as it
16 would retain existing stages and buildings that are not suited to transition to digital
17 media. It would not, through new and upgraded facilities, foster current and further
18 content creation, digital media, creating technologies, and virtual reality, would not
19 support the continued economic viability of the Studio and its ability to respond to
20 changing industry needs, nor would it technologically update the Studio Campus,
21 develop flexible and sustainable new media space or inviting/collaborative landscaped
22 open areas, and improved access. The No Project/No Build Alternative would also not
23 upgrade and rehabilitate the Mansion, reduce production vehicle use of directly
24 adjacent streets, promote environmental sustainability through updated and expanded
25
26
27
28
29

1 facilities to reduce vehicle trips, or provide a Studio Campus which meets Green
2 Building Program requirements.

3 **Alternative 2: No Project/CPA No. 6 Buildout Alternative.** Under the No
4 Project/CPA No. 6 Buildout Alternative, the Studio Campus would be built out in
5 compliance with zoning pursuant to CPA No. 6 as approved. This Alternative would
6 include the construction of Buildings O, Y, R, and the Van Buren Parking Structure,
7 and demolition of existing Buildings L, O, X, Y, Z; the Commissary, and Stage 10, for a
8 net new building square footage of approximately 138,997 sf (including 180,093 sf of
9 office/digital media, and a reduction of 3,280 sf of stage and 37,816 of support use).
10 CPA No. 6 would result in an overall reduction of 274,130 sf (including 341,539 sf of
11 digital media, and an increase of 36,600 sf of stage and 30,809 sf of support use),
12 compared to the Project. Overall, this Alternative would result in 138,997 sf of net new
13 development versus 413,127 sf under the Project.
14
15

16
17 Access and circulation improvements (with the exception of new Gate 2A),
18 relocation of the Bungalows, and landscaping of the Front Lawn, Van Buren Place,
19 and Ince Boulevard, would occur as proposed under the Project. Other proposed
20 improvements include: relocation of the existing guard shack at Gate 1; realignment of
21 existing Gate 4; upgrades to aging Studio Campus infrastructure including
22 heating/ventilation/air conditioning, electrical, and domestic and fire water systems;
23 and some off-site improvements including new curbs, gutters, sidewalks, streetlights,
24 parking meters, and street trees on Ince Boulevard and Van Buren Place.
25

26
27 Lastly, this alternative includes rehabilitation of the four historically significant
28 bungalows recently relocated near the Mansion (Buildings S, T, U and V) subject to a
29

1 required Relocation and Rehabilitation Plan and approval of a Certificate of
2 Appropriateness by the City consistent with requirements under CPA No. 6.

3 Since the No Project/CPA No. 6 Buildout Alternative would result in
4 substantially less development than the Project (e.g., 138,997 sf vs. 413,127 sf under
5 the Project, impacts compared with the Project would be less. Alternative 2 would
6 avoid the Project's potentially significant impacts to historical resources since Stages
7 2/3/4 and 7/8/9 would be retained. However, while Alternative 2 would result in less
8 traffic, as with the Project intersection level of service impacts during construction and
9 operation would be significant and unavoidable.
10

11 As with the Project Alternative 2 would reduce the mitigated impacts of the
12 Project in the following areas: archaeological/tribal resources, paleontological
13 resources, geology and soils, construction noise and vibration, and wastewater
14 infrastructure. Finally, the No Project/CPA No. 6 Buildout Alternative would also
15 reduce the Project's less than significant impacts associated with air quality,
16 greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water
17 quality, land use and planning, operational noise and vibration, fire protection, police
18 protection, public transit, access and circulation, wastewater treatment capacity, water
19 supply, and solid waste.
20
21

22 Since the No Project/CPA No. 6 Buildout Alternative would provide some new
23 development on the Project Site, it would accomplish some of the Project objectives.
24 Because the No Project/CPA No. 6 Buildout Alternative would provide some new
25 digital media/office space while removing some existing outdated stage facilities, it
26 would support the underlying purpose of the Project, although to a substantially lesser
27
28
29

1 degree than the Project. It would create some state-of-the-art studio facilities that
2 might help ensure the Studio's competitiveness and continued position at the cutting
3 edge of innovation essential to the invention and production of entertainment. It would
4 also, through some new and upgraded facilities, foster some further content creation,
5 digital media, creative technologies and virtual reality, and would promote
6 environmental sustainability in some (but not all) studio structures through updated
7 and expanded facilities to reduce vehicle trips. However, the No Project/CPA No. 6
8 Buildout Alternative would not provide sufficient changes to support the continued
9 economic viability of the Studio and its ability to respond to changing industry needs,
10 would not provide inviting/collaborative landscaped open areas, and would not
11 improve access to the same degree as the Project. All-in-all, the No Project/CPA No. 6
12 Buildout Alternative would not achieve the underlying purpose of the Project, which is
13 to sustain The Culver Studio's prominent role as a dynamic, independent studio in the
14 entertainment, digital media, and creative industries, through expansion and
15 modernization of the Studio Campus, because the changes to the Studio Campus
16 under this alternative (for example, the amount of new digital media space) would be
17 limited and incremental rather than transformative.

21 **Alternative 3: Reduced Density Alternative.** Under the Reduced Density Alternative,
22 the Project would be reduced in size by approximately 135,000 sf, or an approximately
23 33 percent reduction in net new building sf, through a reduction in digital media/office
24 use floor area. The reduction in floor area would be achieved through smaller building
25 footprints (the heights of the proposed buildings would be the same as under the
26 Project). As with the Project, this alternative would involve minor changes to the
27
28
29

1 Mansion largely focused on interior rehabilitation, a connection to the Culver/Main
2 Tunnel, relocation/ rehabilitation of the Bungalows, and construction of six new Digital
3 Media buildings which would house a flexible mix of creative space, production space,
4 and digital media stages, and would replace six existing buildings housing offices and
5 support services (Buildings L, O, X, Y, Z, and the Commissary) and four existing
6 buildings housing sound stages.
7

8 New construction would be located throughout the existing Central Area, and
9 along the eastern, western, and southern sides of the Studio Campus. As with the
10 Project, Stage 11/12/14 and Stage 15/16 would be retained. New buildings would be a
11 maximum of 56 feet in height, consistent with the height limitation of the Culver
12 Studios Comprehensive Plan as well as the Studio Zoning district in the City's Zoning
13 Code. Building exteriors would be constructed and finished in an architectural style
14 compatible with the existing historically significant buildings. As with the Project, there
15 would be a common open space area, improved Studio Campus access and internal
16 circulation with associated gate changes, and below-grade, at-grade, and above-grade
17 structured parking, including the Van Buren Parking Structure.
18
19

20 Since the Reduced Density Alternative would result in less development than
21 the Project (e.g., 278,127 sf vs. 413,127 sf under the Project, impacts compared with
22 the Project would be less. However, Alternative 3 would not avoid the Project's
23 potentially significant impacts to historical resources since Stages 2/3/4 and 7/8/9
24 would be demolished. Furthermore, while Alternative 3 would result in less traffic, as
25 with the Project intersection level of service impacts during construction and operation
26 would be significant and unavoidable. As with the Project Alternative 3 would have
27
28
29

1 equivalent impacts for the environmental issue areas of geology and soils, hazards
2 associated with risk of upset conditions, hydrology and water quality, land use and
3 planning, traffic access and parking. Furthermore, Alternative 3 would reduce the
4 mitigated impacts of the Project in the following areas: archaeological/tribal resources,
5 paleontological resources, construction noise and vibration, and wastewater
6 infrastructure. Finally, the Reduced Density Alternative would also reduce the Project's
7 less than significant impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gas emissions,
8 other hazards and hazardous materials conditions, operational noise and vibration, fire
9 protection, police protection, public transit, wastewater treatment capacity, water
10 conveyance, water supply, and solid waste.
11

12
13 The Reduced Density Alternative would provide the majority of the new and
14 renovated development proposed at the Project Site under the Project, and all of the
15 proposed circulation, landscaping, and infrastructure improvements (although the
16 number of proposed parking spaces would be revised downward to meet the reduced
17 parking demand under this alternative). The Reduced Density Alternative would also
18 achieve some of the Project objectives, including: upgrading and rehabilitating the
19 Mansion in a manner that protects its eligibility as a historical resource; reducing
20 production vehicle use of directly adjacent streets; providing improved access; and
21 providing inviting/collaborative landscaped open areas. However, because this
22 alternative would not include as much net new development as the Project (e.g.,
23 278,127 sf vs. 413,127 sf under the Project), it would be less effective than the Project
24 in achieving other Project objectives including: creating start-of-the-art studio facilities
25 to ensure the Studio's competitiveness and continued position at the cutting edge of
26
27
28
29

1 innovation essential to the invention and production of entertainment; fostering content
2 creation, digital media, creative technologies and virtual reality; promoting
3 environmental sustainability through updated and expanded facilities to reduce vehicle
4 trips; supporting the continued economic viability of the Studio and its ability to
5 respond to changing industry needs. All-in-all, the Reduced Density Alternative would
6 support the underlying purpose of the Project, which is to sustain The Culver Studio's
7 prominent role as a dynamic, independent studio in the entertainment, digital media,
8 and creative industries, through expansion and modernization of the Studio Campus,
9 but to a substantially lesser degree than the Project.
10

11 **Alternative 4: Full Historic Preservation – Retain Stages 2/3/4 and 7/8/9 as Sound**
12 **Stages Alternative.** Under Alternative 4, Stages 2/3/4 (32,400 sf) and 7/8/9 (16,800
13 sf) would be retained in their current condition for continued use as Sound Stages.
14 This would eliminate the development of Buildings K and M proposed under the
15 Project. Of the proposed new space eliminated, the majority would be digital media
16 space. This Alternative would result in net new construction of 285,912 sf of digital
17 media/office and a decrease in existing stage of 10,680 sf (although the retention of
18 the stages under this alternative would result in approximately 40,000 sf more stage
19 use than under the Project). Also compared to the Project, this Alternative would
20 reduce the overall amount of development, with most of this in digital media/office
21 square. This Alternative would result in total net new square footage of 206,607 sf
22 versus 413,127 sf under the Project. Other than these changes and a reduction in the
23 size of the Central Parking Structure, other aspects of the Alternative would be similar
24 to the Project. Most notably, the construction of new Buildings J, L, O and Y would be
25
26
27
28
29

1 retained, along with the Van Buren Parking Structure. Access/circulation
2 improvements, relocation of the Bungalows, landscape/Central Courtyard
3 improvements would occur as proposed under the Project.

4 Since the Full Historic Preservation Alternative would result in less development
5 than the Project (e.g., 206,607 sf vs. 413,127 sf under the Project, impacts compared
6 with the Project would be less. Alternative 4 would avoid the Project's potentially
7 significant impacts to historical resources since Stages 2/3/4 and 7/8/9 would be
8 retained. Furthermore, while Alternative 4 would result in less traffic, as with the
9 Project intersection level of service impacts during construction and operation would
10 be significant and unavoidable. As with the Project Alternative 4 would have equivalent
11 impacts for the environmental issue areas of geology and soils, hydrology and water
12 quality, land use and planning, traffic access and parking. Furthermore, Alternative 4
13 would reduce the mitigated impacts of the Project in the following areas:
14 archaeological/tribal resources, paleontological resources, construction noise and
15 vibration, and wastewater infrastructure. However, the Full Historic Preservation
16 Alternative would result in greater (though less than significant) impacts compared to
17 the Project regarding hazardous materials management since this alternative would
18 retain substantially more of the existing on-site studio use and activities that utilize
19 hazardous materials. Finally, the Full Preservation Alternative would also reduce the
20 Project's less than significant impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gas
21 emissions, other hazards and hazardous materials conditions, operational noise and
22 vibration, fire protection, police protection, public transit, wastewater treatment
23 capacity, water conveyance, water supply, and solid waste.
24
25
26
27
28
29

1 The Full Historic Preservation Alternative would reduce by approximately half,
2 the amount of new and renovated development at the Project Site compared to the
3 Project, while still including proposed parking, circulation, landscaping, and
4 infrastructure improvements (although the number of proposed parking spaces would
5 be revised downward to meet the reduced parking demand under this alternative).
6 However, this alternative would retain Stages 2/3/4 and 7/8/9 as sound stages instead
7 of replacing these stages with new digital media/office buildings. The Full Historic
8 Preservation Alternative would achieve the Project objectives of upgrading and
9 rehabilitating the Mansion in a manner that protects its eligibility as a historical
10 resource; reducing production vehicle use of directly adjacent streets; providing
11 improved access; and providing inviting/collaborative landscaped open areas.
12 However, because this alternative would retain some of the existing outdated stages
13 rather than replacing these stages with new digital media space, and because new
14 digital media space would be substantially reduced, it would be much less effective
15 than the Project in achieving other Project objectives including: creating start-of-the-art
16 studio facilities to ensure the Studio's competitiveness and continued position at the
17 cutting edge of innovation essential to the invention and production of entertainment;
18 fostering content creation, digital media, creative technologies and virtual reality;
19 promoting environmental sustainability through updated and expanded facilities to
20 reduce vehicle trips; supporting the continued economic viability of the Studio and its
21 ability to respond to changing industry needs; and providing a Studio Campus which
22 meets Green Building Program requirements.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Alternative 5: Historic Preservation – Retain Stages 2/3/4 as Sound Stages

Alternative. Under Alternative 5, Stages 2/3/4 (32,400 sf) would be retained in their current condition for continued use as sound stages. Proposed Building K would not be constructed. This Alternative would include 274,727 sf of net new development versus 413,127 sf under the Project (although due to the retention of Stages 2/3/4, this alternative would result in more stage use than under the Project). Other than these changes and a reduction in the size of the Central Parking Structure, other aspects of the Alternative would be similar to the proposed Project.

Since this alternative would result in less development than the Project (e.g., 274,727 sf vs. 413,127 sf under the Project, impacts compared with the Project would be less and similar to Alternative 4. However, Alternative 5 would not avoid the Project's potentially significant impacts to historical resources since Stages 7/8/9 would be demolished. Furthermore, while Alternative 5 would result in less traffic, as with the Project intersection level of service impacts during construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable. As with the Project Alternative 5 would have equivalent impacts for the environmental issue areas of geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, traffic access and parking. Furthermore, Alternative 5 would reduce the mitigated impacts of the Project in the following areas: archaeological/tribal resources, paleontological resources, construction noise and vibration, and wastewater infrastructure. However, Alternative 5 would result in greater (though less than significant) impacts compared to the Project regarding hazardous materials management since this alternative would retain more of the existing on-site studio use and activities that utilize hazardous materials. Finally, this alternative would

1 also reduce the Project's less than significant impacts associated with air quality,
2 greenhouse gas emissions, other hazards and hazardous materials conditions,
3 operational noise and vibration, fire protection, police protection, public transit,
4 wastewater treatment capacity, water conveyance, water supply, and solid waste.

5 The relationship of this alternative to the Project objectives would be similar to
6 that of Alternative 4 (Full Historic Preservation Alternative). Like the Full Preservation
7 Alternative, it would achieve the Project objectives of upgrading and rehabilitating the
8 Mansion in a manner that protects its eligibility as a historical resource; reducing
9 production vehicle use of directly adjacent streets; providing improved access; and
10 providing inviting/collaborative landscaped open areas. However, because this
11 alternative would retain some of the existing outdated stages rather than replacing
12 these stages with new digital media space, and because new digital media space
13 would be substantially reduced, it would be much less effective than the Project in
14 achieving other Project objectives including: creating start-of-the-art studio facilities to
15 ensure the Studio's competitiveness and continued position at the cutting edge of
16 innovation essential to the invention and production of entertainment; fostering content
17 creation, digital media, creative technologies and virtual reality; promoting
18 environmental sustainability through updated and expanded facilities to reduce vehicle
19 trips; supporting the continued economic viability of the Studio and its ability to
20 respond to changing industry needs; and providing a Studio Campus which meets
21 Green Building Program requirements.

22 **Alternative 6: Historic Preservation – Retain Stages 7/8/9 as Sound Stages.**

23 Under Alternative 6, Stages 7/8/9 (16,800 sf) would be retained in their current
24
25
26
27
28
29

1 condition for continued use as sound stages. Proposed Building M would not be
2 constructed. This alternative would include 345,007 sf of net new development versus
3 413,127 sf under the Project (although due to the retention of Stages 7/8/9, this
4 alternative would result in more stage use than under the Project). Other than these
5 changes and a reduction in the size of the Central Parking Structure, other aspects of
6 the Alternative would be similar to the proposed Project. Following public circulation of
7 the Draft EIR and based on input received during the environmental review process,
8 the Studio has elected to pursue adoption of Alternative 6, as evaluated in Chapter 5
9 of the Draft EIR and Topical Response TR-1: Modified Project (Alternative 6: Historic
10 Preservation – Retain Stages 7/8/9 as Sound Stages), as the Project.
11

12
13 Since this alternative would result in less development than the Project (e.g.,
14 345,007 sf vs. 413,127 sf under the Project, impacts compared with the Project would
15 be less and similar to Alternative 5. However, Alternative 6 would not avoid the
16 Project's potentially significant impacts to historical resources since Stages 2/3/4
17 would be demolished. Furthermore, while Alternative 6 would result in less traffic, as
18 with the Project intersection level of service impacts during construction and operation
19 would be significant and unavoidable. As with the Project Alternative 6 would have
20 equivalent impacts for the environmental issue areas of geology and soils, hydrology
21 and water quality, land use and planning, traffic access and parking. Furthermore,
22 Alternative 5 would reduce the mitigated impacts of the Project in the following areas:
23 archaeological/tribal resources, paleontological resources, construction noise and
24 vibration, and wastewater infrastructure. However, Alternative 6 would result in greater
25 (though less than significant) impacts compared to the Project regarding hazardous
26
27
28
29

1 materials management since this alternative would retain more of the existing on-site
2 studio use and activities that utilize hazardous materials. Finally, this alternative would
3 also reduce the Project's less than significant impacts associated with air quality,
4 greenhouse gas emissions, other hazards and hazardous materials conditions,
5 operational noise and vibration, fire protection, police protection, public transit,
6 wastewater treatment capacity, water conveyance, water supply, and solid waste.
7

8 Alternative 6 would achieve the Project objectives of upgrading and rehabilitating the
9 Mansion in a manner that protects its eligibility as a historical resource; reducing
10 production vehicle use of directly adjacent streets; providing improved access; and
11 providing inviting/collaborative landscaped open areas. However, because this
12 alternative would retain some of the existing outdated stages rather than replacing
13 these stages with new digital media space, and because new digital media space
14 would be reduced, it would be somewhat less effective than the Project evaluated in
15 the Draft EIR in achieving other Project objectives including: creating start-of-the-art
16 studio facilities to ensure the Studio's competitiveness and continued position at the
17 cutting edge of innovation essential to the invention and production of entertainment;
18 fostering content creation, digital media, creative technologies and virtual reality;
19 promoting environmental sustainability through updated and expanded facilities to
20 reduce vehicle trips; supporting the continued economic viability of the Studio and its
21 ability to respond to changing industry needs; and providing a Studio Campus which
22 meets Green Building Program requirements. All-in-all, Alternative 6 would achieve
23 the underlying purpose of the Project, which is to sustain The Culver Studio's
24 prominent role as a dynamic, independent studio in the entertainment, digital media,
25
26
27
28
29

1 and creative industries, through expansion and modernization of the Studio Campus.
2 And it would meet all of the Project objectives, although to a somewhat lesser degree
3 than the Project evaluated in the Draft EIR.

4 **Alternative 7: Full Adaptive Reuse – Retain Stages 2/3/4 and 7/8/9 for Digital**
5 **Media.** Under Alternative 7, Stages 2/3/4 (32,400 sf) and 7/8/9 (16,800 sf) would be
6 adaptively reused to balance historic preservation with the need for efficient digital
7 media production space. Proposed Building K (170,800) and M (84,920 sf) would not
8 be constructed. Overall, this alternative would result in 206,607 sf of net new
9 development versus 413,127 sf under the Project. Other than these changes and
10 associated reductions in parking spaces, other aspects of the Project would not
11 change.
12

13
14 Since this alternative would result in less development than the Project (e.g.,
15 206,607 sf vs. 413,127 sf under the Project, impacts compared with the Project would
16 be less and similar to Alternative 4 (Full Historic Preservation – Retain Stages 2/3/4
17 and 7/8/9 as Sound Stages). Alternative 7 would avoid the Project's potentially
18 significant impacts to historical resources since Stages 2/3/4 and 7/8/9 would be
19 retained and adaptively reused. Furthermore, while Alternative 7 would result in less
20 traffic, as with the Project intersection level of service impacts during construction and
21 operation would be significant and unavoidable. As with the Project Alternative 7
22 would have equivalent impacts for the environmental issue areas of geology and soils,
23 hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, traffic access and parking.
24 Furthermore, Alternative 7 would reduce the mitigated impacts of the Project in the
25 following areas: archaeological/tribal resources, paleontological resources,
26
27
28
29

1 construction noise and vibration, and wastewater infrastructure. Finally, this alternative
2 would also reduce the Project's less than significant impacts associated with air
3 quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, operational
4 noise and vibration, fire protection, police protection, public transit, wastewater
5 treatment capacity, water conveyance, water supply, and solid waste.
6

7 The Full Adaptive Reuse Alternative would retain Stages 2/3/4 and 7/8/9 for
8 digital media/office use instead of replacing these stages with a greater amount of
9 new digital media/office space as proposed under the Project. The Full Adaptive
10 Reuse Alternative would achieve some of the Project objectives, including: upgrading
11 and rehabilitating the Mansion in a manner that protects its eligibility as a historical
12 resource; reducing production vehicle use of directly adjacent streets; providing
13 improved access; and providing inviting/collaborative landscaped open areas.
14 However, because this alternative would not include nearly as much new digital
15 media/office space as the Project, it would not fully achieve other Project objectives
16 including: creating start-of-the-art studio facilities to ensure the Studio's
17 competitiveness and continued position at the cutting edge of innovation essential to
18 the invention and production of entertainment; fostering content creation, digital
19 media, creative technologies and virtual reality; promoting environmental sustainability
20 through updated and expanded facilities to reduce vehicle trips; supporting the
21 continued economic viability of the Studio and its ability to respond to changing
22 industry needs; and providing a Studio Campus which meets Green Building Program
23 requirements.
24
25
26
27
28
29

Alternative 8: Adaptive Reuse – Retain Stages 2/3/4 for Digital Media. Under Alternative 8, Stages 2/3/4 (32,400 sf) would be adaptively reused to balance historic preservation with the need for efficient digital media production space. Proposed Building K (170,800 sf), all of which would be digital media space under the Project, would not be constructed. Although Stages 2/3/4 would provide 32,400 sf of digital media space, this is a net reduction of 138,400 sf of digital media space compared to the floor area that would be provided with the development of Building K under the proposed Project. Other than these changes and associated reductions in parking spaces, other aspects of the Project would not change.

Since this alternative would result in less development than the Project (e.g., 274,727 sf vs. 413,127 sf under the Project, impacts compared with the Project would be less and similar to Alternative 5 (Historic Preservation – Retain Stages 2/3/4 as Sound Stages). However, Alternative 8 would not avoid the Project's potentially significant impacts to historical resources since Stages 7/8/9 would be demolished. Furthermore, while Alternative 8 would result in less traffic, as with the Project intersection level of service impacts during construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable. As with the Project Alternative 8 would have equivalent impacts for the environmental issue areas of geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, traffic access and parking. Furthermore, Alternative 8 would reduce the mitigated impacts of the Project in the following areas: archaeological/tribal resources, paleontological resources, construction noise and vibration, and wastewater infrastructure. Finally, this alternative would also reduce the Project's less than significant impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gas

1 emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, operational noise and vibration, fire
2 protection, police protection, public transit, wastewater treatment capacity, water
3 conveyance, water supply, and solid waste.

4 The relationship of Alternative 8 to the Project objectives would be similar to
5 that of Alternative 5 (Historic Preservation - Retain Stages 2/3/4 as Sound Stages),
6 with somewhat greater fulfillment of objectives tied to increased digital media space
7 such as the objectives focused on creating start-of-the-art studio facilities to ensure
8 the Studio's competitiveness and continued position at the cutting edge of innovation
9 essential to the invention and production of entertainment; fostering content creation,
10 digital media, creative technologies and virtual reality; promoting environmental
11 sustainability through updated and expanded facilities to reduce vehicle trips;
12 supporting the continued economic viability of the Studio and its ability to respond to
13 changing industry needs; and providing a Studio Campus which meets Green Building
14 Program requirements.

15
16
17
18 **Alternative 9: Adaptive Reuse – Retain Stages 7/8/9 for Digital Media.** Under
19 Alternative 9, Stages 7/8/9 (16,800 sf) would be adaptively reused to balance historic
20 preservation with the need for efficient digital media production space. Proposed
21 Building M (84,920 sf) would not be constructed. Overall, this alternative would result
22 in 345,007 sf of net new development versus 413,127 sf under the Project. Other than
23 these changes and associated reductions in parking spaces, other aspects of the
24 Project would not change.

25 Since this alternative would result in less development than the Project (e.g.,
26 345,007 sf vs. 413,127 sf under the Project, impacts compared with the Project would
27
28
29

1 be less and similar to Alternative 6 (Historic Preservation – Retain Stages 7/8/9 as
2 Sound Stages). However, Alternative 9 would not avoid the Project's potentially
3 significant impacts to historical resources since Stages 2/3/4 would be demolished.
4 Furthermore, while Alternative 9 would result in less traffic, as with the Project
5 intersection level of service impacts during construction and operation would be
6 significant and unavoidable. As with the Project Alternative 9 would have equivalent
7 impacts for the environmental issue areas of geology and soils, hydrology and water
8 quality, land use and planning, traffic access and parking. Furthermore, Alternative 9
9 would reduce the mitigated impacts of the Project in the following areas:
10 archaeological/tribal resources, paleontological resources, construction noise and
11 vibration, and wastewater infrastructure. Finally, this alternative would also reduce the
12 Project's less than significant impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gas
13 emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, operational noise and vibration, fire
14 protection, police protection, public transit, wastewater treatment capacity, water
15 conveyance, water supply, and solid waste.

16
17
18
19 The relationship of Alternative 9 to the Project objectives would be similar to
20 that of Alternative 6 (Historic Preservation - Retain Stages 7/8/9 as Sound Stages),
21 with somewhat greater fulfillment of objectives tied to increased digital media space
22 such as the objectives focused on creating start-of-the-art studio facilities to ensure
23 the Studio's competitiveness and continued position at the cutting edge of innovation
24 essential to the invention and production of entertainment; fostering content creation,
25 digital media, creative technologies and virtual reality; promoting environmental
26 sustainability through updated and expanded facilities to reduce vehicle trips;
27
28
29

1 supporting the continued economic viability of the Studio and its ability to respond to
2 changing industry needs; and providing a Studio Campus which meets Green Building
3 Program requirements.

4 **Environmentally Superior Alternative**

5 Based on the analysis in Chapter 5, Alternatives, of this Draft EIR, all of the Project
6 alternatives analyzed would result in less environmental impacts than the Project. The
7 number of environmental impacts associated with the respective alternative, in order from
8 least to most, are as follows: No Project/No Building Alternative (Alternative 1); No
9 Project/CPA No. 6 Buildout Alternative (Alternative 2); Adaptive Reuse Alternatives
10 (Alternatives 7-9); Historic Preservation Alternatives (Alternative 4-6); and Reduced Density
11 Alternative (Alternative 3). However, in accordance with CEQA, while the No Project/No Build
12 Alternative would be the least impacting alternative, followed by the No Project/CPA No. 6
13 Alternative, the identification of an environmentally superior alternative should be identified
14 from among the remaining alternatives. Among the remaining alternatives, the Full Historic
15 Preservation Alternative (Alternative 4) is identified as the Environmentally Superior
16 Alternative. It would be less impacting than the Project, would avoid the significant
17 unavoidable historical resource impacts on Stages 2/3/4 and 7/8/9 and half of the significant
18 unavoidable traffic (intersection level of service) impacts of the Project. While the Full Historic
19 Preservation Alternative would substantially reduce the amount of digital media space
20 proposed by the Project, which is fundamental to the objective of responding to changing
21 industry needs and market conditions through a plan that technologically updates and
22 expands Campus facilities, it would still achieve a number of the objectives of the Project
23 albeit less effectively than the Project.

1 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected.** The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c)
2 recommends that an EIR identify alternatives that were considered for analysis but rejected
3 as infeasible and briefly explain the reasons for their rejection. According to the State CEQA
4 Guidelines, the following factors may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed
5 consideration: the alternative's failure to meet most of the basic Project Objectives, the
6 alternative's infeasibility, or the alternative's inability to avoid significant environmental
7 impacts. The following Alternatives have been considered and rejected as infeasible:
8

9 **Alternative Off-Site Locations.** Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2), in
10 making the decision to include or exclude analysis of an alternative site, the "key
11 question and first step in analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the
12 project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another
13 location. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant
14 effects of the project need to be considered for inclusion in the EIR." Developing the
15 Project at an alternative site would be infeasible because a large portion of the
16 existing buildings and other structures at the Project Site would be retained and
17 continue to be utilized for studio production uses under the Project, and developing all
18 of these existing studio uses at an alternative site would be economically prohibitive.
19 In addition, developing the Project at an alternative site would not feasibly attain most
20 of the basic objectives of the Project because it would not: technologically update and
21 expand the existing Studio Campus; adaptively reuse existing buildings designated as
22 Landmark and Significant historical structures; update and rehabilitate the Mansion in
23 a manner that protects its eligibility as a historical resources; and/or update and
24 redevelop the Studio Campus with a high quality state-of-the-art design that supports
25
26
27
28
29

1 environmental sustainability. Lastly, there are no existing vacant parcels in the City of
2 approximately 14 acres or larger that are designated and zoned by the City as Studio
3 and S Zoning District (Studio), respectively, and it would be unlikely to secure a site of
4 similar size, in a location with the amenities provided at the current Studio Campus
5 location in downtown Culver City and in close proximity to the Metro Station. As such,
6 alternative off-site locations are considered infeasible.
7

8 **Alternative On-Site Uses.** The Project Site is currently designated and zoned by the
9 City as Studio and S Zoning District (Studio), and developing non-studio uses at the
10 Project Site would be inconsistent with this land use designation and zoning. In
11 addition, development on the Studio Campus is governed by a Comprehensive Plan,
12 pursuant to Section 17.250.015 of the City's Zoning Code, which specifies that the
13 Project Site shall be developed with studio uses. Alternative on-site uses would not
14 achieve the underlying purpose of the Project which is to sustain The Culver Studio's
15 prominent role as a dynamic, independent studio in the entertainment, digital media,
16 and creative industries, through transformation and technological updates to its
17 approximately 14-acre Studio Campus nor would it feasibly attain most of the basic
18 objectives of the Project. As such, alternative on-site uses are considered infeasible.
19
20
21

22 **SECTION 5. FINDINGS FOR CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL EIR.** Based
23 upon the above recitals and the entire record, including, without limitation, the CPA No. 7
24 Final EIR, oral and written testimony and other evidence received, at the public hearings held
25 on the Project and the Final EIR, the Planning Commission further finds:
26

- 27 1. That the Final EIR for the Project is adequate, complete, and has been prepared in
28 accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
29

2. That the Planning Commission has independently reviewed and considered the Final EIR in reaching its conclusions.
3. That the Final EIR was presented to the Planning Commission, as the recommending body to the City Council, and that the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to making a recommendation to approve the Project.
4. That, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093, the Final EIR includes a description of each potentially significant impact and rationale for finding that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect, as detailed in Exhibit A attached hereto. The analyses included in the Final EIR to support each conclusion and recommendation therein is hereby incorporated into these findings.
5. That, in accordance with the CEQA Section 21081, mitigation measures and other modifications have been incorporated into the Project to reduce significant effects.
6. That, in accordance with the CEQA Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, changes and alterations have been required and incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen its significant environmental effects because feasible mitigation measures, including those in the MMP, are made conditions of approval for the Project.
7. That the Statement of Overriding Considerations identifies and weighs the Project's significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to a level less than significant against the benefits from this Project, and concludes, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the Project's benefits outweigh its unavoidable significant impacts.
8. That the Final EIR reflects the decision-maker's independent judgment and analysis.
9. That a mitigation monitoring program (MMP) has been prepared and is adopted to enforce the mitigation measures required by the Final EIR and Project approvals.
10. That the documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings on which this decision is based are under the custody of the City Clerk and are located at the City of Culver City, Community Development Department Planning Division, 9770 Culver Boulevard, Culver City, California 90232.

SECTION 6. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS. Based upon the above recitals and the entire record, including the Final EIR, oral and written testimony and other evidence, received at the public hearings held on the Project EIR, the Planning Commission further finds that there is substantial evidence that supports the conclusion that

1 the Project will result in public benefits, including specific environmental, economic, legal,
2 social, technological, and other benefits, that outweigh the significant effects of the project on
3 the environment that cannot be mitigated to a level less than significant.

4 As indicated above, following public circulation of the Draft EIR and based on input
5 received during the environmental review process, particularly concerns regarding historical
6 resources, the Studio has elected to pursue adoption of Alternative 6 (Historic Preservation –
7 Retain Stages 7/8/9 as Sound Stages), as the Project. The Project, as modified, will retain
8 Stages 7/8/9 as Sound Stages and forego construction of Building M, resulting in a 66,120 sf
9 reduction in net new development. The Central Parking Structure will also be reduced in size.
10 As modified, the Project will result in the demolition of approximately 219,493 square feet (sf)
11 of floor area with new construction of approximately 564,500 sf, for a net new square footage
12 total of approximately 345,007 sf Campus-wide.
13
14

15 The Modified Project reduces the significant unavoidable impacts to historic
16 resources, which is discussed further below, through the retention of Stages 7/8/9. The
17 reduction in net new square footage and retention of existing uses associated with Stages
18 7/8/9 results in a reduction in trip generation thereby reducing overall traffic impacts and
19 eliminating the significant unavoidable impact at the intersection of Ince Blvd/Washington
20 Blvd during the AM and PM peak hours, and the AM peak hour impact at Overland
21 Ave/Culver Blvd.
22
23

24 While significant unavoidable impacts have been reduced through modifications to the
25 Project, the following significant unavoidable impacts still remain, as further described in
26 Exhibit “A” attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference:
27
28
29

1. Cultural Resources (Historic Resources): Implementation of the Project will result in the removal of Stages 2/3/4. All of the other historic resources on the Studio Campus will be retained.
2. Transportation and Circulation: Implementation of the Project will result in Project and cumulative significant and unavoidable construction transportation and circulation impacts. In addition, the Project will result in significant and unavoidable operational level of service impacts at the following seven study intersections during the AM and/or PM peak hours:
 3. Duquesne Ave/Lucerne Ave (Culver City, AM & PM peak hours)
 8. Washington Blvd/Culver Blvd (Culver City, AM peak hour)
 13. Robertson Blvd/Exposition Blvd/Venice Blvd (City of LA, AM & PM peak hours)
 14. National Blvd/Washington Blvd (Culver City, AM peak hour)
 33. Overland Ave/Venice Blvd (City of Los Angeles, AM peak hours)
 38. Robertson Blvd/National Blvd (City of Los Angeles, AM & PM peak hours)
 42. Duquesne Ave/Braddock Dr (Culver City, AM & PM peak hours)

The benefits of the Project outweigh its significant unavoidable impacts that cannot be mitigated to a level less than significant. These benefits include the following (see also Exhibit "A" hereto):

1. The Project will sustain The Culver Studio's prominent role as a dynamic, independent studio while capitalizing on and strengthening the City's historic and future identity as the "Heart of Screenland" and home to Sony Pictures, National Public Radio West, the NFL Network studios, and other entertainment uses.
2. The Project will enable a state-of-the-art Studio Campus of media and digital content stages, as well as traditional film and television production and support facilities that will ensure the Studio's resilience and continued position at the cutting edge of innovation essential to the invention and production of entertainment and digital media for future generations.
3. The Project's new and upgraded facilities will foster content creation, and support the continued economic viability of the Studio and its ability to respond to changing industry needs and market conditions. The Project will provide for technological updates and expanded Campus facilities while allowing flexibility in the application of development standards.
4. The Project will encourage by example sustainable design features and environment-friendly green building practices through high quality state-of-the-art design that will meet or exceed Culver City's Green Building Program requirements. The Project will use renewable, recycled and low VOC materials; and will incorporate high efficiency HVAC systems, water conservation features, stormwater filtration systems, photovoltaics and passive solar design, and electric vehicle (EV)-ready parking.

5. Neighborhood interfaces will be sensitively treated, and access will be redesigned and improved. The Project will promote compatible neighborhood interfaces and a high level of visual quality through new and expanded landscaping and linear open space, redesigned gate entries, articulation of building massing, privacy screening, increased setbacks, and accommodation of production vehicles within the Studio Campus rather than on surface streets.
6. The Project's circulation plan will move vehicles as efficiently as possible onto the Studio Campus from the surrounding street network with a minimum of queuing or delays. The circulation plan will reduce production vehicle use of directly adjacent streets and ensure that vehicles access buildings through below-grade loading facilities. In addition, the circulation plan will minimize truck/passenger vehicle and truck/emergency vehicle and fire lane conflicts. The circulation plan results in freeing up at-grade areas thus providing for more attractive and usable outdoor open space.
7. The Project's enhanced Studio Campus will further the pedestrian-friendly environment with direct access to downtown Culver City and clear linkages to regional and local transportation systems. Within walking distance of the Expo Station, the Project will promote alternate modes of transit, as well as implement transportation demand management measures, and promote the use of bicycles.
8. The Project will contribute to the development of the Culver City Transit Oriented Development (TOD) District and area mobility by expanding employment in proximity to mass transit.
9. The Project will involve significant tax benefits associated with business growth and high-quality employment opportunities.
10. The Final EIR has identified and discussed significant environmental effects, which would occur as a result of the Project. With implementation of the PDFs and Mitigation Measures discussed in the EIR, most of these effects can be avoided or mitigated to levels considered less than significant. The City has proposed 40 PDFs as well as mitigation measures to minimize the potential impacts of the Project on the community. The City has adopted all feasible mitigation measures and approved the PDFs in the Final EIR. As discussed above, the Applicant has elected to adopt Alternative 6 as the Project, which will reduce the significant impacts identified in the EIR.

The Planning Commission further finds, as follows:

Traffic

Although the Project will generate significant and unavoidable construction traffic impacts and long-term traffic impacts during Project operation, these impacts, remaining after imposition of all feasible mitigation measures, are outweighed by the Project's benefits.

1. The modifications to the Project now being carried forward will result in a reduction in net new square footage thereby reducing trip generation by 66 vehicles in the AM peak hour and 63 vehicles in the PM peak compared to the Project evaluated in the Draft EIR.
2. During construction, MM-TRAF-1 through MM-TRAF-5, which address construction activities such as haul truck staging, use of flagman, scheduling of deliveries and pickups, access, and scheduling of lane closures, along with implementation of PDF-TRAF-1, which requires a Construction Management Plan, significant construction-related traffic impacts will be reduced to the extent feasible. Impacts will be temporary in nature and will allow for implementation of the Innovation Plan with all the benefits described above.
3. Traffic levels on many of the streets within the Project Study Area are already high in their existing conditions. The implementation of MM-TRAF-7 and MM-TRAF-8 will improve two intersections within the City.
4. The Project represents infill development on an already urbanized site, within the existing Culver Studios Campus in an area targeted for growth by the City and SCAG and near the Culver City Station.
5. The Project Site and Study Area are well served public transit routes, including one light rail lines operated by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) and 14 rapid, regional and local bus lines operated by various operators (e.g., Metro, Culver City Bus, and LADOT, and Santa Monica Big Blue Bus).
6. The Project will implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan (MM TRAF-6) that will reduce peak hour trip generation by offering services, actions, specific facilities, incentives, and contributions aimed at encouraging use of alternative transportation modes (e.g., transit, bus, walking, bicycling, carpool, etc.). The TDM is expected to reduce project trips by at least 10 percent during peak AM and peak PM times.
7. The Project will support pedestrian access to the Culver City TOD District and downtown through the provision of a minimum 15-foot landscaped setback with pedestrian improvements along the Van Buren Parking Structure, a 30-foot landscaped setback along Building K, and additional landscaping along Van Buren Place and Ince Boulevard.

Cultural Resources/Historic Resources

1 As previously indicated, the Studio's decision to modify the Project after circulation of the
2 Draft EIR was in response to concerns regarding historical resources, particularly requests to
3 examine alternatives that would reduce impacts to National Register-eligible historical
4 resources, and to retain some conventional stages within the Studio Campus.

5 Six on-site buildings have been designated individually at the local level as Landmark and
6 Significant structures and also appear eligible for the National Register and California
7 Register. Building C and D are designated by the City of Culver City as Landmark structures.
8 Culver City has designated Building S, T, U, and V as Significant Structures. In addition,
9 Stages 2/3/4, Stages 7/8/9, Stages 11/12/14, and Stages 15/16 appear eligible individually
10 for the National Register, California Register and local listing, and Buildings E, H, and I also
11 appear individually eligible for local listing. Relocation of Bungalows S, T, U and V is currently
12 in progress under the adopted conditions of CPA No. 6. A draft HABS report for Bungalows
13 S, T, U and V has been completed and submitted to the Library of Congress and the City of
14 Culver City where it is currently under review. A Relocation and Rehabilitation Plan has been
15 prepared and submitted to the City, and monitoring of the relocation and rehabilitation
16 process is ongoing. Mitigation measures associated with the bungalows MM-HIST-5 through
17 MM-HIST-7 are being implemented.

18 The Project as modified will retain Stages 7/8/9, which appear eligible for listing in the
19 National, California, and Local Registers, and continuing their use as sound stages, thereby
20 avoiding the significant unavoidable impact associated with their demolition under the Project
21 evaluated in the Draft EIR. However, even with the modifications to the Project, the Project
22 will result in a significant and unavoidable impact to historic resources as a result of the
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

demolition of Stages 2/3/4. These impacts, remaining after imposition of all feasible mitigation measures, are outweighed by the Project's benefits.

1. The modified Project will reduce the significant impact to historic resources compared to the Project evaluated in the Draft EIR through the retention of Stages 7/8/9 thereby retaining three sound stages from the period of significance – Stage 7/8/9 (1929), Stage 11/12/14 (1927) and Stage 15/16 (1940). Stage 7/8/9 and 11/12/14 were constructed around the same time as the Stage 2/3/4 and share the same potential significance for its association with RKO Pictures and the Studio's transition into sound films.
2. The Project will upgrade and rehabilitate the Mansion to protect its eligibility as a historical resource under the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance while allowing for interior alterations to accommodate future uses and bring the building up to current standards.
3. MM-HIST-1 through MM-HIST-3 contained in the Final EIR for the Project appropriately balance the need to preserve and value the historic resources with the Project objectives and development within this area. The mitigation measures will provide for recordation of the historic structure, preparation of a Salvage Plan, and development of an Interpretive Program. Documentation as a result of this process will be provided to the Library of Congress where it will be archived and publically accessible. In addition, MM-HIST-4 requires the completion of a Studio Campus Preservation Plan for maintenance, rehabilitation, or improvement of historical resources on the Studio Campus.
4. Implementation of MM-HIST-3 will result in a better overall understanding of the Studio's historical significance and contributions to the motion picture industry through the creation of an Interpretive Program.

SECTION 7. The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the environmental information contained in the Final EIR SCH No. 2016111044 and hereby determines that it is adequate and in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.). In compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the Planning Commission has considered the Project benefits as balanced against its unavoidable adverse environmental effects and hereby determines that the benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse

environmental effects; therefore, the Planning Commission determines that the unavoidable adverse environmental effects are considered acceptable.

SECTION 8. Pursuant to the foregoing recitations and findings, the Planning Commission of the City of Culver City, California hereby recommends to the City Council (1) certification of the Final EIR and associated documents; (2) adoption of the Project MMP; and (3) adoption of the Statement of Overriding Considerations, which identifies the benefits of the Project as balanced against its unavoidable environmental risks. By the adoption of this Resolution, the Planning Commission is also recommending to the City Council approval of the Project, but has not granted any approval or entitlement on this Project.

APPROVED and ADOPTED this 13th day of December, 2017.

DANA SAYLES, CHAIRPERSON
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA

Attested by:

Susan Yun, Senior Planner

EXHIBIT A
FINDINGS REQUIRED BY CEQA

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 (Title 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15091), no public agency shall approve or carry out a project where an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out, unless the public agency makes one or more findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale of each finding. The possible findings, which must be supported by substantial evidence in the record, are:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
- (2) Changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
- (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the EIR.

These findings do not attempt to describe the full analysis contained within the Draft EIR and Final EIR (EIR). Instead, a full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the EIR, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analyses in the EIR supporting the EIR's determination regarding the Project's impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts.

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where such changes are infeasible or where the responsibility for modifying the project lies with some other agency (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091(a), (b)). With respect to a project for which significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened either through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures or feasible environmentally superior alternative, a public agency, after adopting proper findings, may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons why the agency found that the project's "benefits" rendered "acceptable" its "unavoidable adverse environmental effects." (CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15093, 15043(b); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081(b)). The California Supreme Court has stated that, "[t]he wisdom of approving any development project, a delicate task which requires a balancing of interests, is necessarily left to the sound discretion of the local officials and their constituents who are responsible for such decisions. The law as we interpret and apply it simply requires that those decisions be informed, and therefore balanced" (Goleta, supra, 52 Cal.3d 553, 576). These findings reflect the independent judgment of the City and constitute its best efforts to set forth the rationale and support for its decision under the requirements of CEQA.

All Final EIR mitigation measures, as discussed below and as set forth in the Mitigation

Monitoring Program (Exhibit B, following), are incorporated by reference into these findings. The Mitigation Monitoring Program also contains the Project Design Features (PDFs) that are incorporated into the Project. In addition, the modifications to the Project set forth in Section 1 of the Resolution, above, and the Statement of Overriding Considerations set forth in Section 8, above, are incorporated by reference into these Findings. In accordance with the provisions of CEQA (Cal. Pub. Res. Code §§ 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines, the City adopts these findings as part of its certification of the Final EIR for the Culver Studios Innovation Plan - Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 7 Project (Project).

The modifications to the Project that the Applicant has elected to undertake were represented in the Draft EIR in Chapter 5, Alternatives, specifically Alternative 6 (Historic Preservation – Retain Stages 7/8/9 as Sound Stages). As reflected in the Draft EIR, and as further described in Chapter 2, Comments and Responses, 2.1, Topical Response to Comments, TR-1 Modified Project (Historic Preservation – Retain Stages 7/8/9 as Sound Stages), and in Appendix C, Supplemental Information – Modified Project of this Final EIR, the Project as modified will not change the essential characteristics of the Innovation Plan and will have fewer overall impacts. Due to the nature of the modifications to the Project, which result in a reduction in net new development, impacts associated with all but one environmental topic (less than significant impacts associated with hazardous materials) will be reduced in magnitude. Where significant impacts identified for the Project in the Draft EIR have been avoided through the modifications to the Project, specifically impacts on Historical Resources and Transportation and Traffic, they are reflected in these Findings. The modifications to the Project do not change the Project Design Features (PDFs) or Mitigation Measures that apply to the Project as reflected in the Mitigation Monitoring Program (Exhibit B and Chapter 4 of the Final EIR).

SECTION 1

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT AFTER MITIGATION

(Significant Unavoidable Effects)

The City Council of Culver City has determined that, although the Project design including Project Design Features (PDFs), modifications to the Project as originally proposed, EIR mitigation measures, and conditions of approval imposed on the Project will either avoid or provide substantial mitigation of the Project's identified potentially significant environmental effects, the following environmental effects cannot be feasibly mitigated to a level of less than significant. Consequently, in accordance with CEQA Guideline 15093, a Statement of Overriding Considerations has been prepared to substantiate the City's decision to accept these unavoidable significant effects when balanced against the significant benefits afforded by the project.

This section sets forth the significant unavoidable effects of the Project with respect to each significant impact and states facts in support of these findings and refers to the Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC).

1.1 CULTURAL RESOURCES (HISTORIC)

SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS. The Project as modified will result in significant and unavoidable impacts to historic structures as a result of removal of Stage 2/3/4, which is recommended eligible at the national, State and local levels. Even with the implementation of mitigation measures the impact will remain significant and unavoidable. Impacts associated with relocation of the bungalows and interior rehabilitation of the Mansion will be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. The Project will not result in significant indirect effects as the Project will not reduce or materially impair the integrity or significance of important historical resources in the Project vicinity such that their eligibility for listing on a register of historical resources will be substantially changed.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS. While the Technical Report completed for the EIR identified the Studio Campus as significant under national, state and local criteria, after further research and analysis it was determined that the Studio Campus was not eligible as a historic district as it lacks integrity of design, feeling and association as an early twentieth-century motion picture studio. However, the American Colonial Revival Mansion, DeMille Theater, Building D (Selznik Wing), the iconic Front Lawn landscape, and the grouping of historic ancillary buildings (relocated) behind the Mansion (E, H, I, S, T, U, V) and several stages, 2/3/4, 7/8/9, 11/12/14, and 15/16, continue to convey their historical and architectural significance as individual resources.

The Project will retain three sound stages from the period of significance – Stage 7/8/9, Stage 11/12/14 (1927) and Stage 15/16 (1940). Stage 7/8/9 and Stage 11/12/14 were constructed around the same time as the stage being removed by the Project and share the same potential significance for their association with RKO Pictures and the Studio's transition into sound films. However, the Project will demolish Stage 2/3/4 which is considered a historical resource eligible at the national, State and local levels. Although mitigation measures are provided that include recordation, salvage and an interpretive program, impacts associated with the removal of Stage 2/3/4 will remain significant and unavoidable.

Consistent with CPA No. 6 approvals, four existing bungalows (Buildings S, T, U and V) were recently relocated in conformance with the Secretary of the Interiors Standards. After relocation and the currently underway rehabilitation, the bungalows will still retain their eligibility as National and California Register resources and as locally designated historical resources.

Minor exterior changes of the Mansion and Building D, and regrading of pathways to meet accessibility requirements for the DeMille Theater and Buildings E, H, and I, have been designed in conformance with the Standards, are compatible in design, and are fully reversible should they be removed in the future. The interior tenant improvements currently underway for Buildings C (the Mansion), D, E, H and I, are limited in nature, being carried out in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards (Standards) for rehabilitation, and being reviewed and monitored by a qualified preservation consultant and City Staff. Accordingly, impacts associated with these changes are considered less than significant.

1 The Project includes minor changes and upgrades to the Front Lawn area that will be carried
2 out in a manner that will reflect the period of historic significance for Buildings C and D and
3 the associated historic Front Lawn landscape. As the Project will enhance the appearance of
4 the landscape in a manner consistent with its historic appearance and in conformance with
5 the Standards, impacts associated with landscape changes are considered less than
6 significant.

7 In accordance with CEQA Guidelines, indirect impacts were analyzed to determine if the
8 Project will result in a substantial material change to the integrity of historic resources on the
9 Studio Campus and the immediate surroundings that would detract from their significance
10 and undermine their eligibility. The nearest buildings to Buildings C and D being removed
11 from the Studio Campus are Stage 2/3/4 and Building J (modern building). The new
12 construction proposed by the Project to replace Stage 2/3/4 and Building J will not impede
13 primary views of either Building C or Building D from the south from within the Studio
14 Campus. The upgrades and changes to the landscape will be minor and will reflect the
15 original landscaping of the Front Lawn and the formal arrangement of Buildings C and D's
16 American Colonial Revival style. The indirect impacts will be less than significant.

17 **Cumulative Impacts:** There are three (3) related projects located near the Project Site, one
18 of which will impact a historical resource. However, the rehabilitation of the building on that
19 property will adhere to the Standards, and therefore impacts will be less than significant. One
20 other related project will improve the setting by returning the property to its previous use and
21 the third is small in scale and distant enough that it will not negatively impact the setting of
22 historic resources in the area. The related projects do not contribute to the significance of the
23 historic resources on the Project Site. Thus, the Project's contribution to cumulatively
24 significant impacts on historic resources in the Project vicinity will not be cumulatively
25 considerable and cumulative impacts will be less than significant.

18 1.2 TRAFFIC

19 **SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS.** Project construction activities will not require temporary relocation
20 of existing bus stops or a substantial loss in street parking. However, construction could
21 cause temporary, substantial delays/disruptions of existing traffic flow and/or exceed the
22 operational thresholds at intersections during peak hours. Therefore, Project construction-
23 related traffic impacts will be significant, and even after implementation of mitigation
24 measures, construction impacts will be temporary, but significant and unavoidable.

25 The Project will result in significant operational level of service impacts after mitigation at
26 seven study intersections during the AM and/or PM peak hours.

27 Transit ridership generated by the Project will not exceed the capacity of the Project area's
28 transit lines. The Project will support adopted policies, plans, programs and requirements that
29 promote alternative transportation. The Project will not substantially increase conflict of
movement between vehicles and pedestrians or bicycles due to driveway design, the location
of parking facilities, or other Project characteristics affecting visibility and tuning movements.
Adequate on-site vehicle and bicycle parking will be provided to serve the Project.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS.

Although traffic impacts during construction will be temporary, it is assumed that substantial delays and disruption of existing traffic flow will occur based on the operational thresholds at intersections during peak hours. There could be some temporary incompatibilities between existing motor vehicle traffic and Project construction traffic during the construction period. MM-TRAF-1 through MM-TRAF-5, which address construction activities such as haul truck staging, use of flagman, scheduling of deliveries and pickups, access, and scheduling of lane closures, along with implementation of PDF-TRAF-1, which requires a Construction Management Plan, will reduce the significant construction-related traffic impacts. However, significant and unavoidable construction-related traffic impacts will remain and there could be some temporary incompatibilities between existing motor vehicle traffic and Project construction traffic.

The Project will result in significant operational level of service impacts at the following nine study intersections during the AM and/or PM peak hours:

3. Duquesne Ave/Lucerne Ave (Culver City, AM peak hour)
8. Washington Blvd/Culver Blvd (Culver City, AM peak hour)
10. Ince Blvd/Washington Blvd (Culver City, AM & PM peak hours)
13. Robertson Blvd/Exposition Blvd/Venice Blvd (City of LA, AM & PM peak hours)
14. National Blvd/Washington Blvd (Culver City, AM peak hour)
19. Overland Ave/Culver Blvd (Culver City, AM peak hour)
33. Overland Ave/Venice Blvd (City of Los Angeles, AM peak hours)
38. Robertson Blvd/National Blvd (City of Los Angeles, AM & PM peak hours)
42. Duquesne Ave/Braddock Dr (Culver City, AM & PM peak hours)

MM-TRAF-6 requires implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program, which will reduce net new trips during the peak hours in the AM peak period and PM peak period. MM-TRAF-7 and MM-TRAF-8 will result in improvements to Intersection 10 (Ince Blvd/Washington Blvd) and Intersection 11 (Canfield Ave/Washington Blvd/Culver Blvd). With the implementation of MM TRAF-6 through TRAF-8, significant AM and PM peak hour level of service impacts at Intersection 10 (Ince Blvd/Washington Blvd) and the significant AM peak hour level of service impact at Intersection 19 (Overland Ave/Culver Blvd) will be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Significant and unavoidable level of service impacts will remain after mitigation at seven intersections (Nos. 3, 8, 13, 14, 33, 38, and 42) during the AM and/or PM peak hour under Future (2021) plus Project Conditions.

In addition, several circulation alternatives and other mitigation measures were considered to mitigate the significant level of service impacts of the Project but were concluded to be infeasible or more impacting. These mitigation measures, and the reasons why they were concluded to be infeasible, are identified in Section 4 of the Traffic Study under "Improvements Determined to be Infeasible").

1 The Project Site and greater traffic Study Area is well served by numerous established local
2 and regional transit routes. The Project will utilize less than 2.8 percent of the combined
3 capacity of the public transit system that will serve it. Therefore, there is adequate capacity in
4 the public transit system to serve the Project. The Project will be consistent with applicable
5 policies, plans, programs and requirements that support alternative transportation. For
6 example, the Project will implement required transportation demand and trip reduction
7 measures (e.g., transit information, carpools/vanpools and associated preferential parking,
8 bicycle parking/facilities, bus stop improvements if deemed required by the City, etc.);
9 provide bicycle parking and pedestrian walkways/sidewalks linking streets and parking areas
10 to the entrances of the proposed buildings, and will concentrate employment in an area
11 directly served by public transit and within convenient walking distance to commercial and
12 entertainment uses in the area. Any travel time delays to local bus service that could occur
13 will be addressed by the service providers as part of their ongoing planning efforts.
14 Therefore, Project operational impacts on public transit will be less than significant.

15 All the proposed on- and off-site roadway, driveway, and gate improvements will be designed
16 and constructed in accordance with Culver City requirements based on City review and
17 approval during the Site Plan Review process to ensure that street cross-sections, site
18 access, visibility, and other parameters are incorporated that provide safe vehicular travel
19 and avoid vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle conflicts. The Project will provide separate truck
20 loading areas in accordance with CCMC, thereby further separating Project truck and
21 employee/visitor traffic and reducing impediments to on-site vehicular circulation. The Project
22 will not require the removal or relocation of existing transit stops. Based on a queuing
23 analysis at three of the Project driveways (gates) vehicles turning into the Project Site will not
24 cause substantial queuing spillback. The Project will not create a significant traffic impact in
25 any of the streets in the residential neighborhoods adjacent to the Project Site. The Project
26 will include improvements to the pedestrian and bicycle experience through painted striping
27 and signage and limiting vehicle access as appropriate. Bike sharrow striping along the
28 Project Site's Ince Boulevard frontage, and striped crosswalks across Studio gate driveways,
29 will be provided as required by PDW-TRAF-3 to minimize conflicts between vehicles and
bicyclists/pedestrians. In addition, Culver Studios is expected to make ongoing contributions
to the maintenance of sidewalks and pedestrian facilities along the perimeter of the Studio
under the Project. Thus, the Project will not substantially increase conflict of movement
between vehicles and pedestrians or bicycles due to driveway design, the location of parking
facilities, or other Project characteristics affecting visibility and tuning movements. Therefore,
Project operational vehicular access and circulation impacts will be less than significant.
Adequate on-site vehicle and bicycle parking will be provided to serve the Project.

With regard to CMP analysis, based on the Project trip generation estimates and trip
distribution and assignment, the Traffic Study indicates that the Project will add fewer than 50
vehicle trips at the five nearby arterial monitoring stations. Therefore, no further analysis of
CMP arterial intersections is required. With regard to freeway segments, since incremental
project-related traffic in any direction during either peak hour is projected to be less than the
minimum criteria of 150 vph, no further CMP freeway analysis is required.

Cumulative Impacts: Although the construction impacts will be temporary, even with implementation of Mitigation Measures MM-TRAF-1 through MM-TRAF-5, and Project Design Features PDF-TRAF-1 and PDF-TRAF-3, cumulative construction related traffic congestion impacts will be cumulatively significant and unavoidable.

The traffic analysis was developed to address Project impacts in the context of future (2021) conditions. The Future conditions take into account traffic caused by the related projects, as well as a growth factor to account for other ambient growth occurring in the region. Thus, the Future (2021) and Future (2021) plus Project analyses take into account the cumulative impacts associated with future growth. As indicated above, the Project will result in significant and unavoidable operational level of service impacts at seven study intersections during the AM and/or PM peak hours.

With regard to the Regional Transportation System, the Project will result in a less-than-significant impact at CMP arterial monitoring stations and CMP freeway segments. As this analysis incorporates cumulative development, cumulative impacts will also be less than significant.

Transit ridership generated by the Project will not exceed the capacity of the transit lines in the area, and given the available capacity, the Project will not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts on public transit. It is assumed that public transit providers will add additional service when required, in order to accommodate cumulative demand in the region. Therefore, cumulative impacts on public transit will be less than significant.

The Project will not contribute to a significant cumulative impact with regard to access and circulation given that each related project will be reviewed by the City to ensure the provision of safe access and circulation for vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists. With regard to vehicle and bicycle parking, the cumulative projects will be subject to City parking requirements, as applicable. Therefore, cumulative impacts on parking will be less than significant.

SECTION 2

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT AFTER MITIGATION

The City Council of Culver City has determined that, where the EIR found the Project will have potentially significant project-level effects, project revisions, mitigation measures and conditions of approval will substantially mitigate those environmental effects, and that, as a result, those effects have been mitigated to a less than significant level. Thus, CEQA Finding 1 applies to these issues. The section provides the findings and facts in support of findings for the relevant issue areas.

CULTURAL RESOURCES (Archaeological and Tribal Resources and Paleontological Resources)

FINDINGS.

Archaeological Resources: Although the Project Site has been previously disturbed through grading and development for the existing Studio Campus, Project grading and excavation may encounter buried archaeological resources and/or buried human remains. As a result, construction may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 or disturb human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

Tribal Cultural Resources: No tribal cultural resources were identified as located within the Project Site or immediately adjacent. Therefore, the Project will not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074.

Paleontological Resources: Although the Project Site has been previously disturbed through grading and development for the existing Studio Campus, Project grading and excavation may encounter native soil/sediment associated with older Quaternary Alluvium, which has high potential for containing buried paleontological resources. As a result, construction may directly or indirectly destroy unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS.

Archaeological Resources: Based on the archaeological findings identified through the record searches in the vicinity the Project Site and the Project Site's proximity to Ballona Creek (less than one-quarter mile), the potential to encounter archaeological resources during construction excavations is considered moderate to high. Therefore, MM-ARCH-1 and MM-ARCH-4 are included in the MMRP, thus ensuring proper identification, treatment and preservation of any resources. With implementation of the mitigation measures above, the Project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries.

Tribal Cultural Resources: On December 5, 2016, the City received a letter from Andrew Salas, Chairman of the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation as part of the AB 52 consultations. In the letter, Mr. Salas indicated that he had concerns for cultural resources as the "project lies in an area where the Ancestral territories of the Kizh (Kitc) Gabrieleños villages adjoined and overlapped with each other." Mr. Salas also mentioned that due to the Project's location and the "high sensitivity of the area location", that they request Native American monitoring during ground disturbing activities at the Project. Therefore, MM-ARCH-2 which includes provisions for the Applicant to retain a Native American representative to monitor construction excavations associated with implementing the Project, is incorporated into the MMP. Although the Project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074, and no impacts on such resources are expected to occur, MM-ARCH-1 through MM-ARCH-5 will help address any such resources if they were encountered.

Paleontological Resources: Excavations associated with the parking structures will reach minimum depths of ten feet to as deep as approximately 33 feet below the surface. Based on the rich paleontological findings near the Project Site and given that the proposed excavations for the subterranean parking will likely extend into fossiliferous native soils (i.e., older Quaternary sediments), the potential to encounter paleontological resources during construction excavations extending past artificial fill is considered high. However, MM-PALEO-1 through MM-PALEO-3, require construction monitoring of excavation activities, and treatment and curation of discoveries, if encountered. These mitigation measures will ensure proper identification, treatment and preservation of any resources. MM- PALEO-1 through MM-PALEO-3 will reduce significant impacts on paleontological resources to less than significant levels.

Cumulative Impacts:

Archaeological Resources: The related projects are located in developed urban areas with sites that have been previously disturbed, and the potential to encounter and cause a significant impact on surface resources is unlikely. In association with CEQA review, and depending on the depth of excavation and sensitivity of respective sites, mitigation measures will be required for related projects that have the potential to cause significant impacts to undiscovered resources. Implementation of such mitigation measures will avoid significant impacts. For those projects not subject to CEQA review, there could be some potential for impacts on archaeological resources. However, regulations contained in the California Health and Safety Code and Penal Code would apply in some instances, and circumstances involving a loss of such resources are expected to be limited. Therefore, to the extent impacts on archaeological resources and human remains from cumulative projects may occur, further contribution from the Project will not be cumulatively considerable, and the cumulative impacts of the Project will be less than significant.

Tribal Cultural Resources: No tribal cultural resources have been identified in the Project Site or vicinity. In association with CEQA review, future AB 52 consultations with Native American tribes in order to identify tribal cultural resources is required for projects that have the potential to cause significant impacts to tribal cultural resources. Therefore, to the extent impacts on tribal cultural resources from cumulative projects may occur, contribution from the Project will not be cumulatively considerable and there will be no cumulative impact.

Paleontological Resources: The related projects, like the Project, are located in developed urban areas with sites that have been previously disturbed, and the potential to encounter and cause a significant impact on surface resources is unlikely. For related projects that have the potential to encounter buried or subsurface paleontological resources during construction, these are expected to implement standard mitigation measures to reduce impacts on paleontological resources. With the incorporation of MM-PALEO-1 through MM-PALEO-3, the Project will result in less than significant impacts to paleontological resources. Therefore, to the extent impacts on paleontological resources from cumulative projects may occur, further contribution from the Project will not be cumulatively considerable, and the cumulative impacts of the Project will be less than significant.

2.1 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

FINDINGS. Section 4.4 of the EIR concludes that the Project Site is not subject to fault rupture and does not have corrosive soils. Compliance with existing regulations will avoid substantial hazards related to seismic ground shaking, subsidence and collapse and will reduce hazards associated with liquefaction, lateral spreading, and expansive soils. However, liquefaction, lateral spreading, and expansive soils are considered potentially significant impacts. With the implementation of mitigation measures the potentially significant impacts will be reduced to a level of less-than-significant. Compliance with existing grading and water quality regulations will avoid substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil during Project construction and operation. Therefore, impacts regarding soil erosion or loss of topsoil will be less than significant.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS. No known active or potentially active faults bisect the Project Site, nor is the Project Site located within a State of California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The closest known active fault to the Project Site is the Newport-Inglewood Fault located approximately 0.60 miles to the south. Therefore, the Project Site is not subject to fault rupture. A detailed geotechnical report will be prepared as required by CBC and any applicable recommendations in the report will be implemented to ensure adequate seismic safety and soils stability of Project improvements. In addition, the Project's grading plan and building plans will conform to the recommendations in the detailed geotechnical report in a manner meeting CBC requirements as amended by the City.

The Project Site is located within an area considered susceptible to liquefaction according to Seismic Hazards Zones Maps published by the State of California. While compliance with existing regulations will substantially reduce the potential liquefaction hazard at the Project Site, it is likely that compliance with these regulations will fully mitigate the potential liquefaction hazard. Therefore, MM GEO-1, which requires a detailed geotechnical evaluation, MM GEO-2, which requires subsurface exploration, and MM GEO-3, which requires dewatering if determined to be necessary, are recommended to mitigate the liquefaction hazard (including the associated dynamic settlement hazard). Implementation of the mitigation measures will reduce impacts to less than significant.

Despite the potential for liquefaction on the Project Site, due to the absence of any channel, slope, or river within or near the Project Site, the potential for on-site lateral spreading is currently negligible. The Geotechnical Report concludes that the site soils will be capable of supporting proposed structures with the recommended foundation design measures. However, the Project includes excavations of up to 45 feet bgs and new above-grade and subterranean structures, and could potentially include some slopes and/or retaining walls. Given the presence of liquefiable soil levels at the Project Site, these excavations and features could potentially lead to lateral spreading. While compliance with the CBC will substantially reduce the potential for lateral spreading, and could potentially mitigate any such potential, the potential for impacts associated with liquefaction induced lateral spreading is considered significant. Therefore, MM GEO-1 through MM GEO-3 are recommended, which will reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

1 The potential for subsidence at the Project Site is considered low. Project buildings and
2 associated footings will be designed and constructed in accordance with standard CBC
3 requirements which have formulated to provide the required amount of structural stability.
4 Therefore, potential subsidence impacts will be less than significant.

5 Based on the current and previous groundwater levels observed at the Project Site, and the
6 anticipated depth of construction activities, dewatering may not be required for the
7 subterranean parking garages during operation. Nevertheless, the analysis assumes that
8 permanent dewatering will be undertaken under proposed PDF-GEO-1 unless determined
9 not to be required in the final geotechnical report. As permanent dewatering is proposed
10 under PDF-GEO-1, if required, operational groundwater impacts will be less than significant.
11 Without dewatering during construction, if required, construction-related groundwater impacts
12 will be significant.

13 The Project Site is underlain by unconsolidated fill and alluvial material with relatively high
14 groundwater levels (approximately 35-44 feet bgs). Therefore, while the soils underlying the
15 Project Site have been compacted by previous grading activities and the presence of on-site
16 buildings, they could become collapsible if disturbed without proper re-grading and
17 compaction. Compliance with applicable requirements will ensure the proper re-grading and
18 compaction is conducted, and will avoid the potential for collapse. Therefore, the impact will
19 be less than significant.

20 The potential for expansive soils at the Project Site is considered moderate. However, the
21 Geotechnical Report concludes that the Project Site soils are capable of supporting the
22 proposed structures with the recommended foundation and footing design measure. While
23 compliance with the CBC will substantially reduce the potential for impacts associated with
24 expansive soils, the potential for impacts associated with expansive soils is considered
25 potentially significant. Therefore, MM GEO-1 through MM GEO-3 are recommended, which
26 will reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

27 Laboratory testing performed on soil samples at the Building J site indicates that soil pH is
28 relatively neutral to slightly basic. The electrical resistivity measured in the laboratory is
29 considered to have a low corrosion potential to ferrous metals, while the chloride content of
the soil sample was found to have a low corrosion potential to ferrous metals. The soil
samples indicate a low water-soluble sulfate content, indicating that the on-soils may be
considered to have a negligible potential for sulfate attack to concrete. Therefore, the existing
on-site soils will not be expected to result in damage to Project building foundations, footings
and subterranean levels. No impact regarding corrosive soils will occur.

With regard loss of topsoil, little if any native topsoil is likely to occur at the Project Site since
the site is already covered with paving and structures and will be mostly covered with paving
and impervious surfaces under the proposed Project. Therefore, the Project will not result in
the loss of topsoil.

With regard to erosion, substantial wind-born erosion during construction will be avoided
through the implementation of soil stabilization measures required by the South Coast Air

Quality Management District under Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust). Substantial water-born erosion during construction will be avoided through implementation of the City's standard erosion control practices required pursuant to the CBC, and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and associated erosion control Best Management Practices (BMPs) required by the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). After construction, erosion will be minimized through the proposed covering of most of the Project Site with impervious surfaces, and by long-term erosion management practices and drainage provisions incorporated into the design and maintenance of the Project.

Based on the above, the Project will result in a less than significant impact on geology and soils with implementation of PDF GEO-1 and MM GEO-1 through MM GEO-3.

Cumulative Impacts: Geologic and soil impacts are generally site-specific and there is little, if any, cumulative relationship between development projects. Compliance with applicable requirements and implementation of recommended mitigation measures will reduce Project impacts to less than significant levels as will occur for the related projects. Therefore, cumulative geologic and seismic impacts will be less than significant. Any project involving grading of an area greater than one acre is required to apply for a NPDES permit, which requires the use of BMPs for erosion control. As with the Project, compliance with NPDES requirements and with applicable grading requirements will minimize potential soil erosion impacts for the related projects. Therefore, cumulative erosion impacts will be less than significant.

2.2 NOISE AND VIBRATION

FINDINGS. Construction activities will increase noise levels at off-site noise-sensitive receptors in excess of ambient noise levels and the applicable thresholds. In addition, construction activities will result in sporadic, temporary vibration effects adjacent to the Project area, which will exceed the vibration significance thresholds. Implementation of PDF-NOISE-1, -2, 7, and 8 and MM-NOISE-1 through MM-NOISE-3 will reduce construction noise levels to a less significant level. Implementation of MM-NOISE-3 and MM-NOISE-4 will reduce construction vibration to less than significant.

Operation of the Project will not increase noise levels at off-site noise-sensitive receptors in the Project Area in excess of the applicable thresholds. In addition, operational activities will not substantially increase the ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project. Thus, operational noise impacts will be less than significant.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS. Construction activities will temporarily increase the existing ambient noise in close proximity of the construction site and are estimated to reach a maximum of 90 dBA at the nearest sensitive receptor (namely R3) (Table 4.9-7 of the EIR). Construction activities will comply with the City's noise standard and construction will occur during allowable hours and will be temporary in nature. Policy 2.A of the Noise Element requires noise reduction techniques to ensure that the construction noise impacts are minimized to the maximum extent feasible. Implementation of PDF-NOISE-1, -2, 7, and -8 will help reduce Project noise impacts during construction. Construction traffic noise levels

generated by truck trips will be below the threshold. Construction noise impacts are considered potentially significant and mitigation measures are included in the MMRP.

With regard to vibration during construction, residential uses are located within approximately 5 feet to 50 feet from the Project Site. On-site historic buildings are located from 15 feet to 70 feet from operation of construction equipment. Residential buildings located within 15 feet from the Project Site will experience potentially significant vibration impacts from the Project construction. In addition, historic buildings located within 20 feet from operation of heavy construction equipment will experience potentially significant vibration impacts from the Project construction. With respect to human annoyance, residential uses located within 45 feet of the Project Site will experience potentially significant vibration impacts from Project construction. As the Project, with the incorporation of PDFs, will result in potentially significant construction noise and vibration impacts, mitigation measures are included in the MMRP to reduce these impacts.

With regard to noise during operation, the EIR includes an analysis of the potential increase in noise levels resulting from Project-generated traffic as well as on-site activities. Increases in noise levels resulting from Project-related traffic will be below the 5 dBA increase threshold. The Project's combined noise levels from various operational noise sources, including, the incremental increase in traffic noise, on-site mechanical equipment, parking structure, and loading area activities will also be below the threshold given distances to the sensitive receptors and the presence of intervening structures.

During operation, vibration will occur from stationary mechanical and electrical equipment, such as air handling units, condenser units, and exhaust fans, as well as vehicles. However, vibration isolators and mount will be installed to reduce vibration velocities from typical commercial-grade station machinery. PDF-NOISE-3 through PDF-NOISE-6 will reduce noise and vibration from stationary equipment and vehicles within the parking structures. With implementation of the PDFs, Project vibration will be below the significance threshold.

Based on the analyses in the EIR, the Project will result in construction noise and vibration impacts. MM-NOISE-1, which requires the installation of a noise barrier, MM-NOISE-2, which addresses scheduling of activities, and MM-NOISE-3, which limits the use of heavy equipment within 45 feet of the neighboring residential structures, combined with PDF-NOISE-8 and PDF-AES-2, will reduce construction noise levels to a less than significant level. MM-NOISE-3 and MM-NOISE-4, which establishes procedures to protect the on-site historic structures from vibration, will reduce vibration impacts to a less than significant level. PDF-NOISE-7 will provide a Construction Rules Sign to ensure the proper implementation of PDFs and MMs. With implementation of PDFs, MMs and City requirements for Construction Management Plans, construction noise and vibration impacts will be less than significant at the off-site and on-site sensitive receptor locations.

Cumulative Impacts: Noise associated with other cumulative construction projects will be required to comply with the City's construction noise standards and Noise Element Policy 2.A, similar to the Project, and will be required under CEQA, if necessary, to reduce construction noise levels to the degree reasonably and technically feasible through proposed

mitigation measures for each individual project, including time restrictions for construction activities. PDF-TRAF-1, which requires construction management meetings, will ensure concurrent construction projects are managed in collaboration with one another. With implementation of PDFs and MMs, cumulative construction noise impacts will be less than significant.

With regard to operational noise, traffic is the greatest source in the Project area. Based on the analysis, the cumulative traffic will result in an increase below the 5 dBA threshold. As such, cumulative impacts from mobile sources will be less than significant. As with the Project, each of the related projects will need to comply with the CCMC provisions that limit stationary-source noise. In addition, on-site noise generated by each related project will be sufficiently low and limited to areas in the immediate vicinity of each related project that it will not result in an additive increase to Project-related noise levels. As the Project's composite stationary-source impacts will be less than significant, the Project's cumulative stationary-source noise impacts will be less than significant.

With regard to vibration, due to the rapid attenuation characteristics of ground-borne vibration and distance from each of the related projects to the Project Site, there is no potential for cumulative construction- or operational-period impacts with respect to ground-borne vibration. Therefore, cumulative vibration impacts will be less than significant.

2.3 WASTEWATER

FINDINGS. Section 4.12.1 of the EIR concludes that Project will result in an increase in wastewater generation but the increase will not exceed the available treatment capacity nor exceed the wastewater treatment facilities or wastewater treatment requirements of the LARWQCB. However, the increase in wastewater generation will exceed the half flow capacity of the Ince Boulevard sewer main during operation. With implementation of PDF WW-1 and MM WW-1, significant impacts to the wastewater collection system will be reduced to a less than significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS. Wastewater generation from Project construction activities will be minor and temporary and will decrease compared with existing due to the removal of buildings, will not be anticipated to cause a measurable increase in wastewater flows requiring collection. Project construction activities include abandonment of some existing on-site sewer lines and some sewer laterals connecting the Project Site to the off-site wastewater collection system, the construction of new sewer lines, connections to the Ince and Western sewer mains, and potentially the temporary shutdown of existing sewer mains.

Under the Project, sewer improvements will be implemented, including a new primary point of connection to the Ince sewer main just east of its transition from an 8- to a 10-inch line at Hubbard Street, with the Ince main to provide the majority of the wastewater collection service for the Project. The existing Project Site connection to the Western sewer main will be retained and wastewater generated by four adjacent off-site houses will be redirected eastward across the Project Site to the Ince sewer main.

During operation as shown in the EIR, the Project will result in a net increase in average wastewater flow (Table 4.12.1-4 of the EIR). The analysis quantifies the changes in wastewater discharge to the Ince and the Western sewer mains. The increase into the Ince will be below the 1.46 cfs full capacity of the Ince main, but could be above the main's half flow capacity of 0.71 cfs, resulting in a significant impact. Unless further sewer flow monitoring or analysis associated with the modifications to the Project determine to the satisfaction of the City that the Project will not trigger exceedance of the half flow capacity of the Ince sewer main, MM WW-1 will be implemented. With implementation of this mitigation measures requiring an upgrade to a segment of the Ince sewer main, the capacity will be adequate to serve the Project.

The Project will reduce the amount of wastewater discharge to the western sewer main under the Project as a result of the redirection of sewage from the southwest portion of the Project Site and the four houses immediately west of the Project Site to the Ince sewer main. The discharge to the Western sewer main will be below the 0.27 cfs half flow capacity of the Western sewer main.

Groundwater dewatering operation currently occurs on the Project Site whereby approximately 3,000 gpd (approximately 0.02 cfs) of treated dewatered groundwater, which at one time was discharged to the local sewer system under permit, is now used for landscape irrigation at the Project Site. Under the Project, there is a likelihood that additional dewatering will be required associated with the proposed subterranean parking structures. However, as required by PDF-WW-1, any additional dewatered groundwater from the Project will be treated and used as landscape irrigation rather than being discharged to the local sewer system.

Wastewater will be conveyed to the HTP for treatment. The existing treatment capacity of the HTP is 450 mgd and projected 2020 capacity is 435 mgd, leaving a remaining available treatment capacity of 15 mgd in 2020. The wastewater generated by the Project represents only about 0.6 percent of the HTP's projected remaining available treatment capacity in 2020. In addition, the Project will pay the required Sewerage Facilities Charge and Sewer User Fees to help offset the Project's contribution to City wastewater treatment demand (with payments to the LACDPW per the Amalgamated Agreement for future improvements to the HTP). The Project will not generate pollutant constituents that could potentially interfere with the HTP meeting the water quality requirements of its discharge permit.

Based on the above, the Project will result in a less than significant impact on wastewater treatment capacity. Project wastewater collection impacts will be less than significant with implementation of both PDF-WW-1 and MM WW-1.

Cumulative Impacts: The Project and the related projects will together generate an estimated 985,301 gpd ADWF of wastewater, with the Project's contribution of 93,476 gpd ADWF representing approximately 9.5 percent of the total (Table 4.12.1-7 of the EIR). Like the Project, related projects will be required to demonstrate to the City that adequate wastewater collection capacity is available to serve them. Payment of CCMC-required

Sewerage Facilities Charge and Sewer User Fees paid by each of the related projects will help pay their fair share of the any necessary improvements. In addition, Capital Improvement Plans are continually updated to keep abreast of utility infrastructure requirements, including required improvements to the wastewater collection and conveyance systems. In this way, no cumulative projects will be developed without the required wastewater collection and conveyance capacity to serve them.

With regard to wastewater treatment, with the addition of the 0.99 mgd of cumulative wastewater generated by the Project and the related projects, the projected amount of wastewater requiring treatment at the HTP in 2020 will increase to approximately 436 mgd ADWF. This is below the existing 450 mgd treatment capacity of the HTP. The HTP currently meets applicable water quality standards as set forth by the NPDES. Implementation of the IRP, upgrades in the advanced treatment processes at HTP, and continual monitoring by the EMD, ensure that HTP effluent discharged into Santa Monica Bay are within applicable limits. Thus, cumulative impacts on wastewater will be less than significant.

SECTION 3

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT PRIOR TO MITIGATION

This section sets forth the environmental impacts found to be less than significant prior to mitigation, and with respect to each impact states facts in support of these findings.

3.1 AESTHETICS

FINDINGS. As explained in the Draft EIR, Senate Bill (SB) 743, enacted in 2013, changes the way in which environmental impacts related to transportation and aesthetics are addressed in an EIR. Specifically, Section 21099(d)(1) of the Public Resources Code (PRC) states that a project's aesthetic impacts shall not be considered a significant unavoidable impact on the environment if:

1. The project is a residential, mixed-use residential or employment center project, and
2. The project is located on an infill site within a transit priority area.

Because the Project is considered an employment center project and on an infill site located within an urban transit priority area (less than 0.5 mile from a major transit station), the Project qualifies for exemption under SB 743. As such, the evaluation of the Project's aesthetic impacts in an EIR is not required pursuant to CEQA, and therefore, no findings of significance are provided in the Draft EIR.

Section 4.1 contains information relative to aesthetic effects that could result from the Project with regard to visual character, views, light and glare, and shading.

3.2 AIR QUALITY

FINDINGS. Section 4.2 of the EIR concludes that the Project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of relevant air quality policies in the adopted Air Quality Management Plan. Construction and operation of the Project will not exceed the applicable SCAQMD significance thresholds. The South Coast Air Basin is designated as non-attainment for O3, PM10, and PM2.5 under federal and/or state ambient air quality standards. Construction and operation of the Project will not exceed the applicable SCAQMD significance thresholds for ozone precursor emissions (i.e., VOCs and NOX), PM10, or PM2.5. Construction and operation of the Project will not exceed the localized significance thresholds at off-site sensitive receptors. With regard to CO hotspots impacts, the Project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of the CAAQS one-hour or eight-hour CO standards of 20 or 9.0 parts per million (ppm), respectively. Construction of the Project will not generate emissions of TACs (i.e., diesel particulate matter) that will result in a significant health impact to off-site sensitive receptors. Operation of the Project will not include permanent sources (equipment, etc.) that will generate substantial long-term TAC emissions in excess of the health risk thresholds. Based on the analyses contained in the EIR, air quality impacts will be less than significant.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS. The Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) was prepared to accommodate growth, reduce the levels of pollutants within the areas under the jurisdiction of SCAQMD, return clean air to the region, and minimize the impact on the economy. Project construction activities will not conflict with the control strategies intended to reduce emissions from construction equipment. Project construction will comply with CARB requirements to minimize short-term emissions from on-road and off-road diesel equipment. Project construction will also comply with SCAQMD regulations for controlling fugitive dust pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 403. Project construction will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMP. The Project will not generate growth beyond the range of development anticipated within the established SCAG regional forecast for Culver City nor will the Project increase or induce residential density growth not otherwise anticipated. The Project will concentrate employment growth in an area served by the Culver City Metro Station and Expo Line, regional and local bus lines, as well as bicycle and pedestrian facilities. As such, the Project will be consistent with SCAG's 2016 RTP/SCS policies for the concentration of growth in proximity to transit. The Project will not spur additional growth other than that already anticipated for Culver City and will not eliminate impediments to growth. Consequently, the Project will not foster growth inducing impacts. The Project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the AQMP.

With regard to regional air emissions, construction-related daily emissions for the criteria and precursor pollutants (VOC, NOX, CO, SO2, PM10, and PM2.5) will not exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds. These calculations include appropriate dust control measures required to be implemented during each phase of development, as required by SCAQMD Rule 403 (Control of Fugitive Dust). Operational criteria pollutant emissions were calculated for mobile, area, and stationary sources for the Project buildout year (2020). The net increase in operational-related daily emissions (Project emissions minus existing emissions) criteria and precursor pollutants (VOC, NOX, CO, SOX, PM10, and PM2.5) will be substantially below the SCAQMD thresholds of significance. Therefore, the Project will result in less than significant impacts relative to regional emissions.

1 The Air Basin is currently in non-attainment under federal or state standards for ozone,
2 PM10, and PM2.5. The emissions from construction of the Project are not predicted to
3 exceed any applicable SCAQMD regional or local impact threshold and therefore, are not
4 expected to result in ground level concentrations that exceed the NAAQS or CAAQS. Future
5 operations will generate ozone precursors (i.e., VOCs and NOX), CO, PM10, and PM2.5.
6 Operational emissions will not exceed the SCAQMD regional or local thresholds and will not
7 be expected to result in ground level concentrations that exceed the NAAQS or CAAQS.
8 Therefore, the Project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase for non-
9 attainment of criteria pollutants or ozone precursors.

10 With regard to exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, the
11 maximum localized construction emissions for sensitive receptors will not exceed the
12 localized thresholds for NOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5. Based on the analysis, the increase in
13 maximum localized operational emissions for sensitive receptors will not exceed the localized
14 thresholds for NOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5. The potential for the Project to cause or
15 contribute to CO hotspots was also evaluated. The analysis concludes that the Project will
16 not cause or contribute considerably to the formation of CO hotspots and that CO
17 concentrations at Project impacted intersections will remain well below the ambient air quality
18 standards. A Health Risk Assessment was prepared that focused on impacts of diesel
19 exhaust particulate matter (DPM) from onsite construction activities to sensitive receptors
20 which included nearby residences and a school. The cancer risk from DPM emissions from
21 construction of the Project is estimated to result in a maximum carcinogenic risk of
22 approximately 6.1 per million. The maximum impact will occur at a residential property
23 adjacent to the Project Site to the west. Cancer risk to students and staff at the Linwood E.
24 Howe Elementary School southwest of the Project site will be 0.09 per million and 0.01 per
25 million, respectively.

26 In terms of TAC emissions during operations, with implementation of the Project, truck
27 loading and unloading of media production equipment and cargo will be moved to the interior
28 of the Project Site in dedicated loading areas. This will create greater separation between
29 trucks and off-site sensitive receptors, thus reducing the impacts of TACs on sensitive
30 receptors, relative to existing conditions. Implementation of PDF-NOISE-9 prohibits truck
31 idling within the loading areas thereby eliminating emissions associated with truck idling.
32 Based on the limited activity of TAC sources and the reduction in TAC emissions and TAC
33 concentrations at off-site sensitive receptors relative to existing conditions, the Project does
34 not warrant the need for a health risk assessment associated with on-site activities, and
35 potential TAC impacts are expected to be less than significant.

36 The Project will not include any of these potential sources, although minimal emissions may
37 result from the use of consumer products (e.g., aerosol sprays). Therefore, the Project is not
38 expected to release substantial amounts of TACs.

39 Implementation of PDF-AIR-1 through PDF-AIR-3 and other PDFs that will reduce air
40 emissions (i.e., PDF-TRAF-1 and PDF-NOISE-9), and compliance with applicable
41 requirements, air quality impacts will be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts: Although the Project Site is located in a region that is in non-attainment for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5, the emissions associated with Project construction will not be cumulatively considerable, as the emissions will fall below SCAQMD daily regional significance thresholds. Collaboration with surrounding developments will be required if Project construction were to occur simultaneously with surrounding construction activities. Consistent with SCAQMD guidance for cumulative impacts, regional and localized emissions will be less than SCAQMD significance thresholds (see Table 4.2-5 and Table 4.2-7 of the EIR). As such, the Project's contribution to cumulatively significant construction impacts to air quality will not be cumulatively considerable and cumulative impacts will be less than significant for regional and localized criteria pollutants during construction.

For purposes of the cumulative air quality analysis with respect to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3), the Project's incremental contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is determined based on compliance with the SCAQMD adopted the AQMP. The Project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of AQMP and will be consistent with the growth projections in the AQMP.

Nonetheless, SCAQMD no longer recommends relying solely upon consistency with the AQMP as an appropriate methodology for assessing cumulative air quality impacts. The SCAQMD recommends that project-specific air quality impacts be used to determine the potential cumulative impacts to regional air quality. The Project's regional and localized emissions will be below SCAQMD significance thresholds (see Table 4.2-6 and Table 4.2-8 in the EIR). Therefore, the Project's incremental contribution to long-term emissions of non-attainment pollutants and ozone precursors, considered together with cumulative projects, will not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impact of the Project will be less than significant.

3.3 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

FINDINGS. Section 4.5 of the EIR concludes that the Project will generate GHG emissions due to construction and operational activities. The Project's annual direct and indirect GHG emissions will be generated from development that is located and designed to be consistent with relevant goals and actions to reduce Project emissions as much as feasibly possible, as well as consistent with the HSC Division 25.5 goals and CARB guidelines for assessing GHG emissions. Therefore, the Project's GHG emissions and associated impacts will be less than significant.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS. In accordance with SCAQMD's recommendation, the Project's estimated construction GHG emissions were amortized over a 30-year period in order to include these emissions as part of the Project's annualized lifetime total emissions, so that GHG reduction measures address construction GHG emissions as part of the operational GHG reduction strategies. The emissions of GHGs associated with operation of the Project were calculated using CalEEMod, taking into account the Project's compliance with the portions of the City's Green Building Code and mandatory Green Building Program applicable to new developments. The Project's GHG emissions represent a minimum of a

25.7 percent reduction in emissions as compared to a scenario without GHG reduction features and measures.

Emissions reductions from the Project's two highest GHG-emitting sources, mobile and electricity, will occur over the next decade, and beyond, ensuring that the Project's total GHG emissions will be further reduced. Project emissions from mobile sources will also decline in future years as older vehicles are replaced with newer vehicles resulting in a greater percentage of the vehicle fleet meeting more stringent combustion emissions standards, such as the model year 2017-2025 Pavley Phase II standards. The Project will not generate GHG emissions that may have, either directly or indirectly, a significant impact on the environment, and the impact will be less than significant.

Consistent with SCAG's 2016 RTP/SCS alignment of transportation, land use, and housing strategies, the Project will accommodate projected increases in travel demand by implementing smart land use strategies. The Project's enhanced Studio Campus will further the pedestrian-friendly environment with direct access to downtown Culver City and clear linkages to regional and local transportation systems. Within walking distance of the Culver City Station, the Project will promote alternate modes of transit, as well as implement TDM measures, promote the use of bicycles, and participate in visioning and development of the Culver City Transit Oriented Development District.

Cumulative Impacts: Given that the Project will generate GHG emissions consistent with applicable reduction plans and policies, and given that GHG emission impacts are cumulative in nature, the Project's incremental contribution to cumulatively significant GHG emissions will be less than cumulatively considerable, and impacts will be less than significant.

3.4 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

FINDINGS. Section 4.6 of the EIR concludes that the transport, use, storage and disposal of hazardous materials during Project construction and operation will occur in accordance with applicable regulations and manufacturer instructions which have been formulated to provide for safe use of these materials. In addition, with compliance with applicable regulations and PDF-HAZ-1, PDF-HAZ-2, and PDF-WW-1, the Project will not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through conditions involving the release of hazardous materials. While the Project will include the handling of hazardous materials typical of studio operations within one-quarter mile of a school, the handling of such materials already occurs on the Project Site, will be reduced under the Project, and will continue to occur in accordance with applicable regulations, and manufacturer instructions formulated for safe use of these materials. The Government Code Section 65962.5 database listings on the Project Site do not represent RECs (only one CREC and one HREC), and thus will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Finally, the Project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Accordingly, impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials will be less than significant.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS. The use of hazardous materials will occur in smaller quantities than are currently used at the Studio Campus given the modern digital age and

advent of CGI where many sets are increasingly created electronically rather than through physical manufacturing. Also, the Project will replace the aging central plant/Ice Plant/cooling tower, which currently utilizes the largest number and quantities of hazardous materials at the Project Site, with a decentralized state-of-the-art utilities and HVAC systems powered by electricity from the central grid and alternative energy sources. All hazardous materials will be transported, used, stored and disposed of in accordance with applicable laws, regulations and manufacturer instructions that have been established to provide for the safe transport, use, storage and disposal of these materials; and (2) Project construction and operational haul routes will not utilize neighborhood streets, thereby reducing the potential for the exposure of area residents to any potential accidental hazardous materials releases or spills. Thus, the Project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, storage or disposal of hazardous materials, and the impact will be less than significant.

With regard to upset and accident conditions, Project renovation and demolition activities will be required to comply with standard applicable ACM and LBP abatement regulations. PDF HAZ-1 will be implemented requiring the implementation of a vector/pest control abatement plan reviewed and approved by the City. In addition, PDF-HAZ-2 requires the installation and operation of a dewatered groundwater treatment system for these improvements similar to the system currently operating in the existing on-site subterranean parking structure, while PDF-WW-1 requires that the treated dewatered groundwater be used as landscape irrigation at the Project Site. This will avoid discharges of groundwater with concentrations of contaminants above applicable action levels. The Project will not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through conditions involving the release of hazardous materials given compliance with existing regulations and PDF-HAZ-1, PDF-HAZ-2, and PDF-WW-1. Therefore, the impact will be less than significant.

There are two schools located within a one-quarter mile radius of the Project Site: Lynwood Howe Elementary School, at 4100 Irving Place, approximately 60 feet west (across Van Buren Place); and Park Century School, at 3939 Landmark Street, approximately 0.25 miles to the northeast. Compliance with applicable construction regulations will ensure that off-site construction-related hazards will not occur. In addition, based on the air quality analysis, Project construction activities will not generate diesel particulate matter (DPM) or other TAC emissions that will result in significant health effects to nearby sensitive receptors (including to the students at the two schools). It is expected that operational stationary source emissions at the Studio Campus could decrease under the Project with the proposed removal of the central plant/Ice Plant. In addition, Project operation will not emit hazardous emissions, or non-hazardous emissions above applicable regulatory thresholds, within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

According to the GRS Phase I ESA, the CREC and HREC identified above have or are in the process of being addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory agency, and none of the identified on-site database listings (including the CREC and HREC) represent a significant ongoing hazard and hazardous materials impact at the Project Site.

With regard to impairment of an adopted emergency response plan, because of the short-term nature of the construction activities and with implementation of PDF-TRAF-1, Construction Management Plan, the Project's construction activities will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. During operation, Washington and Culver Boulevards in the Project Site vicinity will still be available for use as disaster routes in an emergency, even with the addition of Project traffic. Although significant unavoidable operational traffic impacts will occur at two study intersections along Washington and two study intersections along Culver Boulevard, the Project Site is located in an established urban area that is well served by the surrounding roadway network, and multiple routes exist in the area for emergency vehicles and evacuation. The Project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials will be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts: The related projects include residential or standard mixed use development which, like the proposed Project, will not be of a type (e.g., industrial, manufacturing, power generation facilities, etc.) typically associated with the use or emission of large quantities of hazardous materials/waste. Development located within the vicinity of the Project Site will be subject to similar local, regional, State, and Federal regulations and manufacturer instructions pertaining to hazardous materials as the Project, and like the Project, will not pose a significant hazard to the Project or other existing and planned development in the area with adherence to these regulations and instructions. Cumulative impacts related to upset and accident conditions, listed hazardous materials/waste sites, and the emission of hazardous materials (including within one-quarter mile of a school) will be less than significant. Like the proposed Project, the cumulative projects will be evaluated on a project-by-project basis to determine consistency with applicable plans. Cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials will be less than significant.

3.5 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

FINDINGS. Section 4.7 of the EIR concludes that while Project construction activities could temporarily alter the existing drainage pattern of the Project Site, grading activities will be subject to NPDES, SWPPP and City grading permit requirements which require that stormwater runoff be controlled and routed to avoid flooding. In addition, the Project will implement a SWPPP and a Wet Weather Erosion Control Plan outlining BMPs to be implemented during construction to protect water quality in accordance with the NPDES General Construction Activity Permit and to avoid substantial water-born erosion or siltation. Therefore, Project construction-related water quality impacts will be less than significant.

Project operation will not change the course of a stream or river, or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff from the Project Site in a manner that could lead to flooding. The Project will decrease peak stormwater runoff flows and on-site stormwater infrastructure meeting City standards will be constructed to safely convey stormwater runoff to the off-site storm drain system. The Project will incorporate non-structural and structural BMPs to be implemented during operation as required by the applicable NPDES MS4 Permit. These BMPs will ensure Project operational stormwater runoff discharges are protective of the

1 TMDLs and beneficial uses of the receiving waters. Therefore, Project operations-related
2 water quality impacts will be less than significant.

3 **FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS.** Project construction will temporarily reduce the amount
4 of stormwater runoff currently being discharged from the Project Site because of the removal
5 of impervious surfaces. Construction activities will be subject to the NPDES General
6 Construction Activity Permit, including the required implementation of a City-approved
7 SWPPP specifying BMPs to address both runoff conditions and potential pollution from the
8 construction site. In addition, the Project will be required to comply with the City's Grading
9 Ordinance requiring the implementation of measures necessary to prevent on- and off-site
10 flooding during construction.

11 The Project will be subject to the requirements of the General Construction Permit. Before
12 the City issues grading permits, the Applicant will be required to submit a SWPPP outlining
13 BMPs to be implemented to control common pollutants in stormwater runoff from the
14 construction site and an Erosion Control Plan with BMPs to control erosion and siltation from
15 the construction site. In addition, if grading and other earthwork were to occur during the
16 raining season, the Applicant will be required to implement a Wet Weather Erosion Control
17 Plan that outlines BMPs to be implemented to control water-born erosion, siltation and
18 sedimentation in accordance with the CCMC. Project construction-related hydrology and
19 water quality impacts will be less than significant.

20 The closest stream or river is Ballona Creek located approximately 625 feet to the southeast.
21 As no streams or rivers bisect the Project Site, the Project will not substantially alter the
22 course of a stream or river in a manner that could result in flooding.

23 The peak stormwater runoff volume from the Project Site under the Project will increase
24 slightly from 5.18 to 5.32 AF (a 0.14 AF increase) due to the small increase in on-site
25 impervious surfaces. However, as a result of proposed on-site stormwater treatment areas
26 which will retain the SWQDv through capture and reuse, the peak flow during the criteria
27 storm event will decrease from an estimated 35.53 to an estimated 17.44cfs (a 18.09 cfs
28 decrease). The Project will not result in exceedance of the capacity of the local storm drain
29 system.

30 In accordance with MS4 Permit conditioning requirements, 13 on-site EPIC stormwater
31 treatment areas totaling approximately 24,200 sf (0.56 acres) are proposed under PDF-
32 H/WQ-1 to retain the SWQDv (37,600) through capture (via ground and roof drains) and re-
33 use (via plant transpiration). In addition, non-structural BMPs will be implemented during
34 Project operation as outlined in PDF-H/WQ-2. Per PDF-H/WQ-1, trash enclosure areas will
35 have floor drains connecting to the sewer rather than the storm drain system, and on-site
36 drains, catch basins and stormwater treatment areas will be stenciled to indicate that no
37 substance other than stormwater is to be collected by the storm drain system. In accordance
38 with the CCMC, a SUSMP and LID Plan will be submitted to the City's Engineering Division
39 for review and approval prior to approval of Site Improvement Plans. Project operation-
40 related hydrology and water quality impacts will be less than significant

Implementation of PDF-H/WQ-1 and H/WQ-2 will reduce potential impacts to fire protection services to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts: The Project will not result in either substantial changes to existing drainage patterns or a net increase in peak stormwater runoff flows to the local off-site storm drainage system. Therefore, the Project will not contribute to cumulative hydrology (drainage) impacts. Like the Project, the related projects will be required to adhere to NPDES requirements during construction and operations. As these requirements have been formulated to avoid significant surface water quality impacts during construction and operation, and as the Project and the related projects will be required to comply with these requirements, the combined cumulative short- and long-term impacts on surface water quality associated with the Project and the related projects will be less than significant.

3.6 LAND USE AND PLANNING

FINDINGS. Section 4.8 of the EIR concludes that the Project, with the approval of CPA No. 7 and associated entitlements, will be substantially consistent with applicable adopted land use plans, policies, guidance, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, impacts with respect to land use plans, policies, guidelines, and regulations will be less than significant.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS. CPA No. 7, which will replace CPA No. 6 upon its approval, is consistent with the requirements for preparing a Comprehensive Plan. CPA No. 7 permits the implementation of the Project, including a flexible mix of Digital Media space within the existing Studio Campus footprint, while ensuring compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods and maintaining the integrity of historic structures

Project consistency with applicable land use plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect are addressed in detail in Section 4.8 of the EIR. Plans evaluated include the Culver City General Plan Land Use, Circulation, and Open Space Elements; Culver City Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan; Culver City Urban Forest Master Plan; Culver City Zoning Code; Visioning Study for the Culver City Transit Oriented Development; SCAG's 2016 RTP/SCS, and Metro's ATSP.

Project implementation will not remove or interfere with the existing and future designations of Van Buren Place as Class III Bicycle Friendly Street and the linear open space will be supportive of the proposed Bicycle Friendly Street. As the Project will include facilities to enhance and support bicycling and pedestrian activity, including activity in an area proximate to downtown Culver City and the Culver City Station, it will benefit and not adversely affect the existing and planned bicycle network. The Project will also be consistent with the green connections envisioned in the Culver City Urban Forest Master Plan.

The Visioning Study for the Culver City TOD District will focus on local mobility and area circulation within the TOD District, near the Project Site. The Innovation Plan will include landscaping with pedestrian amenities along the Van Buren Parking Structure, a landscaped setback along Building K, and additional landscaping along Van Buren Place and Ince

Boulevard that will enhance pedestrian circulation and access to the Downtown area and nearby public transit. Thus, the Project will be supportive of the intent of the Visioning Study for the Culver City TOD District.

The proposed Project will be consistent with applicable 2016 RTP/SCS policies. The Culver Studios Campus is located near the Culver City Station and Expo Line, regional and local bus lines, the I-10, and bicycle facilities as well as near the Downtown area. The Innovation Plan will provide pedestrian amenities that will support bicycle and pedestrian improvements identified in the BPMP. The Project will be consistent with 2016 RTP/SCS policies to improve regional economic development, maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region, ensure travel safety and reliability, preserve and ensure a sustainable regional transportation system, maximize the productivity of the transportation system, protect the environment, encourage energy efficiency and facilitate the use of alternative modes of transportation.

The Project represents infill development on an already urbanized site, within the existing Culver Studios Campus in an area targeted for growth by the City and SCAG and near the Culver City Station. The Project will be consistent with the General Plan land use and zoning designation of Studio. The Project will also be consistent with other local and regional land use plans. Therefore, land use and planning impacts will be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts: Related projects are subject to CEQA review and review by City regulatory agencies. Most notably, related projects seeking increases in permitted densities or height are subject to review by the Culver City Planning Division Commission and other City departments and divisions for consistency with plan provisions and other City requirements. The related projects represent infill development and as such are consistent with local and regional policies to concentrate development near public transit and encourage alternative transportation. Based on this and based on the determination that the Project will be consistent with the adopted land use plans and zoning, cumulative impacts regarding consistency with the land use regulatory framework will be less than significant.

3.7 FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES

FINDINGS. Section 4.10.1 of the EIR concludes that Project construction and operation will not require new or expanded fire protection facilities to maintain service due to compliance with City Fire Code requirements and proposed Project Design Features that address fire safety, emergency access, emergency response times, and fire flow. Therefore, construction and operational impacts will be less than significant.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS. Project construction activities will occur in accordance with California Division of Occupational Safety and Health Administration and Culver City Fire Code requirements, which have been formulated to avoid substantial fire risk during construction activities. Regarding emergency access and response times during construction, per PDF-TRAF-1, construction staging and construction worker parking associated with the Project will be accommodated on the Project Site, limiting potential conflicts with traffic on

1 local streets. In addition, as required by the CCFD and PDF-TRAF-1, emergency access will
2 be provided and maintained throughout construction to the Project Site, adjacent uses, and
3 fire hydrants.

4 While the Project will potentially increase the number of service calls and firefighter demand,
5 the potential calls associated with the Project will represent very small proportions
6 (approximately 3 and 1 percent, respectively) of the total number of Citywide service calls
7 and CCFD firefighters. Thus, it is anticipated that Fire Station 1 will be able to accommodate
8 the additional demand associated with the Project without the need for expansion or
9 development of a new fire station. As required by PDF-FIRE-3, plans for the proposed
10 improvements, improved fire lane, fire hydrant locations, and associated fire
11 prevention/suppression equipment will be submitted to the CCFD for review and approval at
12 the building permit and plan check phases of the Project which will ensure compliance with
13 applicable Fire Code requirements, thereby minimizing the risk of increased operational fire
14 safety hazards.

15 The existing direct emergency access to the Project Site will be maintained under the
16 Project, although several of the Studio gate locations will be adjusted slightly and their lane
17 geometrics reconfigured to meet current City lane geometric and access requirements and
18 help straighten out the on-site fire lane. Within the Project Site itself, emergency access will
19 continue to be provided by a dedicated 20-foot-wide fire lane, accessible from each of the
20 studio gates. The fire lane will be reconfigured and straightened in places to accommodate
21 the new development, provide access to the entirety of the Project Site, and provide better
22 emergency access. CCFD-accessible gates and exterior door locks will be provided as
23 required by CCMC Section 9.02.035.

24 The portion of the existing on-site fire lane, between Stage 7/8/9 and Stage 11/12/14, south
25 of Gate 3, is currently less than the required 20 feet wide due to the presence of existing on-
26 site buildings which constrain the fire lane width. The Modified Project will include the
27 provision of a hammerhead south of the bottleneck location, which will provide sufficient
28 equipment maneuvering space to allow CCFD to be satisfied with its ability to fight fires on
29 those structures.

With regard to infrastructure, the Project Site is served by a loop system that connects to two
10-inch and 6-inch laterals in Washington Boulevard and fire hydrants are located around the
Project boundary. PDF-WATER-4 requires that, prior to construction, building plans be
submitted to the CCFD to determine fire flow and time period requirements based on tenant
type, building size, and building type. If additional fire service lines and hydrants are required
to maintain adequate fire flow, the Project shall install fire service lines and hydrants as
required. With implementation of PDF-WATER-4, operational impacts to the City's domestic
and fire water service facilities and infrastructure will be less than significant.

Implementation of PDF-FIRE-1 through PDF-FIRE-3 and PDF-TRAF-1 will reduce potential impacts to fire protection services to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts: Although a cumulative demand for CCFD fire protection and EMS could occur, this demand will be reduced through regulatory compliance, similar to the Project. In addition, the CCFD's operating budget includes funds generated by property tax revenues which are supplemented by tax-base expansion. Tax-base revenue from Project development, together with revenues from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, will generate funding for fire protection services. As indicated in the EIR, the Project will not substantially contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts regarding fire protection. Therefore, cumulative impacts will be less than significant.

3.8 POLICE PROTECTION

FINDINGS. Section 4.10.1 of the EIR concludes that impacts on police protection services, access and emergency response times during Project construction will be temporary and less than significant. While Project construction will temporarily add on-site employees and off-site traffic, security features will be incorporated, and emergency access will be maintained. Impacts on police protection services related to access and emergency response times during Project operation will be less than significant. While Project operation will add on-site employees and off-site traffic, it will maintain and upgrade the strict security provisions in place at the Studio Campus and improve circulation and access in proximity to the Project Site. Overall, Project effects on police services will not require new or expanded police facilities.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS. The access to the Project Site is already controlled, the Project Site is already fully fenced, patrolled by security personnel, and monitored with CCTV, and per PDF-POL-1, each construction site within the Studio Campus will be enclosed with security fencing, lit with security lighting, and periodically patrolled by Studio security personnel. With regard to emergency access and response times, construction staging and construction worker parking will be accommodated on the Project Site, limiting potential conflicts with traffic on local streets. Also, per PDF-POL-1, emergency access on and within the vicinity of the Project Site will be maintained during construction. In addition, while the Project will generate construction traffic and potentially require temporary lane closures along one or more of the streets bordering the Project Site, with the implementation of PDF-TRAF-1 requiring the implementation of a City-approved Construction Management Plan, Project construction traffic impacts will be less than significant. Therefore, impacts during Project construction will not require new or expanded police protection facilities to maintain acceptable response times, and the impact will be less than significant.

With regard to operation, the potential for an increase in officer demand and Part I crimes will represent negligible (e.g., 0.27 and 0.25 percent, respectively) increases in the number of sworn police officers and annual Part I crimes, and it is anticipated that adequate capacity exists at the CCPD police station to accommodate the additional need for services, especially given that police response is typically provided from officers in patrol cars on standard beats rather than from a centralized facility. However, The Culver Studios will continue to implement the existing strict on-site security measures and regular coordination

of the Studio with the CCPD. In addition, site plans will be submitted to the CCPD for review and approval, to ensure that the site design incorporates required security and crime reduction features, as required by Culver City Municipal Code. Finally, the CCPD station is located within close proximity (2½ blocks) to the Project Site. During special events, The Culver Studios will provide extra Studio security personnel in addition to the level of security currently provided on the Project Site. The Culver Studios will also inform the CCPD of pending on-site special events in advance per Project Design Feature PDF-POL-2, and will comply with all City requirements applicable to special events, such as Culver City Municipal Code Section 9.07.055 regarding amplified sound. These measures will minimize the demand for police protection services from the CCPD during on-site special events.

Implementation of PDF-POL-1 and PDF-POL-2 as well as PDF-TRAF-1 will reduce potential impacts to police services to a less than significant level.

Cumulative Impacts: While the proposed Project and the related projects together could potentially and hypothetically generate a demand for approximately four additional CCPD sworn officers, this will represent only an approximately 3.7 percent increase over the existing 109 CCPD sworn officers in the City, with the Project's contribution to this demand (0.3 officer) representing only approximately 7.9 percent of the increase or 0.28 percent of the total existing CCPD sworn officer force. Hence, not only will the cumulative demand for additional CCPD sworn police officers be small, but the Project's contribution to this demand will be less than cumulatively considerable given the strict security features, Project Site controls, and security staff that will continue to be employed on the Studio Campus.

3.9 WATER SUPPLY

FINDINGS. Section 4.12.2 of the EIR concludes that with implementation of PDF-WATER-2 and PDF-WATER-3, which will prevent impacts to the public water service lines during construction, water demand during construction will be less than significant. During operation the Project's demand for water associated with potable supplies is within GSWC's water demand projections and sufficient water infrastructure to serve the Project is available. Therefore, impacts on water supply will be less than significant.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS. Non-potable water could be used for soil compacting and dust control purposes, if required, and will represent the majority of the water used during construction. It is expected that Project construction activities will generate minimal potable water demand for drinking, cleaning of brushes and other items, and lavatories. However, this demand will be offset by the temporary relocation of Studio Campus occupants during construction. The water demand could be met by existing water entitlements and resources available to the City's water purveyor and supply sources such as the WBMWD. As such, impacts related to water demand will be less than significant during construction.

As determined in the WSA, the Project will not add any increments of demand in excess of those that were anticipated at the time the 2015 UWMP was published. The Project will comply with State Title 24 and Title 20 State water efficiency standards as well as City and GSWC's water conservation requirements. With the incorporation of water conservation

measures under PDF-WATER-1, implementation of City and State conservation measures, the Project will not exceed GSWC's anticipated supply to 2040. Therefore, the Project will have a less than significant impact on water supply.

Cumulative Impacts: The WSA prepared for the Project stated that water demand in the CCSA is estimated to increase by approximately 1,032 AFY between 2015 and 2020. Because the cumulative water demand is not expected to exceed the projections of the 2015 UWMP, the water demand of related projects in combination with the Project will not result in a cumulative significant impact.

Like the Project, the larger related projects will be subject to CEQA review, and be reviewed by the City's Department of Public Works to assure that the existing public utility facilities will be adequate to meet the domestic and fire water demands of each project. All projects are required to meet City fire flow and other standards based on flow testing of facilities to verify the availability of service. In addition, Culver City's Public Works Department conducts ongoing evaluations to ensure that water infrastructure in the City is adequate, and undertakes infrastructure system improvements when required. Therefore, cumulative impacts on the water infrastructure system will be less than significant.

3.10 SOLID WASTE

FINDINGS. Section 4.12.3 of the EIR concludes that the Project will comply with the diversion requirements of AB 939 and AB 341, and adequate disposal capacity exists at the County's C&D disposal sites to accommodate this waste. Therefore, construction impacts will be less than significant. The Project will generate a net increase in Class III solid waste during operation, but will comply with applicable waste diversion requirements. There is adequate disposal capacity at the County's Class III landfills to accommodate this waste. Therefore, the impact will be less than significant. The Project will comply with all applicable regulatory requirements regarding diversion and recycling of landfill materials and efficient use of County landfill facilities. Therefore, solid waste impacts during operation will be less than significant.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS.

Cumulative Impacts: As with the Project, the related projects will be subject to C&D waste diversion and recycling requirements. In addition, all of the related projects will have the same options for disposal as the proposed Project (e.g., the County's Azusa Land Reclamation landfill or one of the State-permitted Inert Debris Engineered Fill Operation facilities in the County). The remaining disposal capacity for the Azusa Land Reclamation facility is 57.56 million tons and the Department of Public Works estimates that the remaining life span of the Azusa Land Reclamation is 189 years. Therefore, it is expected that all C&D waste from the Project and the related project will be able to be accommodated at the Azusa Land Reclamation facility, and thus the cumulative construction-related solid waste impact will be less than significant.

The estimated Class III solid waste requiring landfill disposal for the 56 related projects plus

the proposed Project, will be 5,947 tons per year. This will represent negligible amounts (approximately 0.005 percent and 0.05 percent, respectively) of the County's existing (114 million tons) and projected future 2030 (11 million tons) remaining Class III disposal capacity. Therefore, the County has sufficient existing and projected future Class III solid waste disposal capacity to serve the related projects plus the proposed Project, and the cumulative operational solid waste impact will be less than significant.

3.11 ENERGY

FINDINGS. Section 6.6 of the EIR concludes that construction of the Project will not result in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy, and will not preempt opportunities for future energy conservation. Operation of the Project will not result in the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy and will not preempt opportunities for future energy conservation.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS. Project construction will use the necessary energy for on-site construction activities and the transport of materials, soil, and debris to and from the Project Site. The amount of energy used will not represent a substantial fraction of the available energy supply in terms of equipment and transportation fuels. Furthermore, compliance with anti-idling and emissions regulations will result in a more efficient use of construction-related energy and the minimization or elimination of wasteful and unnecessary consumption of energy. Idling restrictions and diverting waste will result in less fuel combustion and energy consumption. Therefore, construction of the Project will not result in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy, and will not preempt opportunities for future energy conservation.

Upon occupancy of the Project, the studio operations will demand energy for on-site activities and off-site transportation associated with vehicles traveling to and from the Project Site. The amount of energy used will not represent a substantial percentage of the available energy supply in terms of equipment and transportation fuels. Furthermore, the Project will incorporate PDFs that promote energy efficiency, such as, green building measures, consistent with state, regional, and local energy efficiency goals. Therefore, operation of the Project will not result in the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy and will not preempt opportunities for future energy conservation.

EXHIBIT B
MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

This Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP), which is provided below, has been prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, which requires adoption of a MMP for projects where the Lead Agency has required changes or adopted mitigation to avoid significant environmental effects. The City of Culver City (City) is the Lead Agency for the Culver Studios Innovation Plan (the Project) and therefore is responsible for administering and implementing the MMP. The decision-makers must define specific reporting and/or monitoring requirements to be enforced during Project implementation prior to final approval of the proposed Project. The primary purpose of the MMP is to ensure that the mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study (for Biological Resources), Draft EIR and Final EIR (designated by the respective environmental issue within Chapter 4 of the EIR) are implemented thereby minimizing identified environmental effects. The MMP also includes Project Design Features (PDFs) identified throughout Chapter 4 the Draft EIR. The PDFs are specific design elements proposed by the Applicant that have been incorporated into the Project that serve to reduce or avoid potential environmental effects. Because PDFs have been incorporated into the Project, they do not constitute mitigation measures, as defined by Section 15126.4 of the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations). However, PDFs are included in this MMP to ensure their implementation as a part of the Project.

The following PDFs and environmental mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the Project development as conditions of approval. The Applicant shall secure a signed verification for each of the PDFs and mitigation measures which indicate that the PDFs and mitigation measures have been complied with and implemented, and fulfills the City's environmental and other requirements under Public Resources Code Section 21081.6. Final clearance shall require all applicable verification as indicated in **Table 4-1, Mitigation Monitoring Program**. The City will have primary responsibility for monitoring and reporting the implementation of the PDFs and mitigation measures unless otherwise indicated. The PDFs and mitigation measures are identified by the impact category and number that correspond with the EIR.

TABLE 4-1
MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
Aesthetics				
PDF-AES-1: Construction Fencing: Prior to	Condition of	Plan Check	Prior to issuance of	Culver City Public

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
the commencement of any excavation, the Applicant shall install a temporary construction fence with screening around the site. The height, fence, and screening materials are subject to approval by the City Engineer and the Planning Manager.	Approval	Notes and Field Inspections	a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
PDF-AES-2: Construction Staging: All staging and storage of construction equipment and materials, including the construction dumpster, shall be on-site only. The Property Owner must obtain written permission from adjacent property owners for any construction staging occurring on adjacent properties.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
PDF-AES-3: Litter and Graffiti: The property shall be maintained daily so that it is free of trash and litter and all graffiti shall be removed from the Property within 48 hours of its application.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Ongoing during Construction and Operation	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, and Planning Division
PDF-AES-4: Lighting – Residential Adjacency Guideline: All Project Site and exterior building mounted luminaires shall produce a maximum initial illuminance value no greater than 0.10 horizontal footcandles 10 feet beyond the property boundary. No more than 2 percent of the total initial designed fixture lumens (sum total of all fixtures in the areas with residential adjacencies) shall be emitted at an angle of 90 degrees or higher from nadir (straight down).	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy and Ongoing during Operation	Culver City Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
PDF-AES-5: Lighting – Pedestrian Level Guideline: The illumination guidelines for areas with residential adjacencies shall apply to the pedestrian zone. Qualitative lighting strategies for increasing comfort and safety and creating a more pedestrian-friendly zone with minimal light spill, such as low level landscape lighting, low level lighting around street furniture, and low intensity downlighting from street trees, are encouraged.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy and Ongoing during Operation	Culver City Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
PDF-AES-6: Lighting – Van Buren Parking Garage Interior. Use shielded linear small aperture luminaires with opaque sides oriented perpendicular to the façade to minimize views of light sources, reduce glare and light spill outside the garage. In addition, the garage will utilize occupancy sensors to reduce unnecessary lighting when not in use.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy and Ongoing during Operation	Culver City Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
Air Quality				
PDF-AIR-1 (Construction Features): Construction equipment operating at the Project Site would be subject to a number of requirements. These requirements shall be included in applicable bid documents and successful contractor(s) must demonstrate the ability to supply such equipment. Construction measures would include, but are not limited to the following:	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
- The Project shall require all off-road diesel equipment greater than 50 horsepower (hp) used for this Project to meet USEPA Tier 4 off-road emission standards. Welders would also meet USEPA Tier 4 off-road emission standards or will be electric-powered. All equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) devices including a California Air Resources Board (CARB)-certified Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filter or equivalent. This PDF would allow for a reduction in diesel particulate matter and NOx emissions during construction activities. - Consistent with CPA No. 6, the Project shall utilize low-VOC coatings during construction activities to avoid excessive VOC emissions. - Consistent with CPA No. 6 Condition of Approval #140, trucks and other vehicles in loading and unloading queues shall be parked with engines off to reduce vehicle emissions during construction activities.				
PDF-AIR-2 (Design Elements): In accordance with CALGreen Building Standards, the Project shall incorporate the following mandatory energy and emission saving features: - The Project shall recycle and/or salvage at least 65 percent of non-hazardous construction and demolition debris. - The Project shall use water efficient landscaping and native drought tolerant plants. - The Project shall include easily accessible recycling areas dedicated to the collection and storage of non-hazardous materials such as paper, corrugated cardboard, glass, plastics, metals, and landscaping debris (trimmings). - The Project shall include efficient heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems. - The Project shall install low-flow water fixtures that are consistent with USEPA WaterSense specifications. - The parking structures shall be designed with occupancy-sensor controlled lighting that would place lighting fixtures in a low power state in unoccupied zones.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit and Ongoing during Construction and Operation	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division
PDF-AIR-3 (Voluntary Design Elements): The Project shall incorporate the following operational energy and emission saving features: - The Project design would meet criteria for the LEED Certification level. - The Project shall install 100 bicycle parking	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and Ongoing during Operation	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
spaces. - The Project shall install infrastructure for future gray water uses. - The Project shall install a solar photovoltaic power system equivalent to at least 1 percent of the Project's electricity demand and at least 1 kW of solar photovoltaics per 10,000 sf of new development.				
Biological Resources (Initial Study)				
MM-BIO-1: The Applicant shall be responsible for the implementation of mitigation to reduce impacts to migratory and/or nesting bird species to below a level of significance through one of two ways. Vegetation removal activities shall be scheduled outside the nesting season which runs from February 15 to August 31 to avoid potential impacts to nesting birds. This would ensure that no active nests are disturbed. Any construction activities that occur during the nesting season shall require that all suitable habitat be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting birds by a qualified biologist, retained by the Applicant as approved by the City of Culver City, before commencement of clearing and prior to grading permit issuance. The survey shall be conducted within 72 hours prior to the start of construction. A copy of the pre-construction survey shall be submitted to the City. If any active nests are detected, a buffer of at least 300 feet (500 feet for raptors) shall be delineated, flagged, and avoided until the qualified biological monitor has verified that the young have fledged or the nest has otherwise become inactive. If the biologist determines that a narrower buffer between the Project activities and observed active nests is warranted, he/she should submit a written explanation as to why (e.g., species-specific information; ambient conditions and birds' habituation to them; and the terrain, vegetation, and birds' lines of sight between the Project activities and the nest and foraging areas) to the City of Culver City and, upon request, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Service. Based on the submitted information, the City of Culver City (and the Department, if the Department requests) shall determine whether to allow a narrower buffer	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, and Building Permit.	Culver City Planning Division
Historical Resources				
MM-HIST-1 (Recordation): Perform a Level II Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) documentation of The Culver Studios (interior and exterior of all structures dating from the period of significance to be removed). Documentation shall include selective laser	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Report, and Field Inspection	Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Cultural Affairs, Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
scanning, 3-D modeling, narrative text and appropriate photographs per HABS/HAER requirements describing existing conditions and summarizing the relevant construction history and use of the buildings, structures, and features. In addition to the HABS/HAER recordation, an overlay figure shall be created that depicts all major periods of studio construction in a single map, including the dates of construction for the existing buildings, so that the public can understand graphically how the studio evolved over time. Additional documentation of the property will be completed in the form of an Historic Structures Report (HSR). The HSR shall include a complete record of all existing buildings and landscapes, while identifying the historically significant features. The HSR will serve as the basic for a future interpretive program so that the public can fully understand the site and its context in the entertainment industry. Documentation shall be prepared by a qualified historic preservation consultant who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Requirements in history and/or architectural history. Documentation shall be provided to the Library of Congress where it will be appropriately archived and publically accessible. The HABS/HAER documentation shall be completed and submitted to the Library of Congress within 180 days of issuance of the first demolition permit issued by the City of Culver City for removal of a building from the Studio Campus.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
MM-HIST-2 (Salvage Plan): Applicant shall prepare a Salvage Plan that shall be filed with the City of Culver City Planning Division. Prior to demolition, key character-defining physical features of the two individually eligible sound stages (Stage 2/3/4 and Stage 7/8/9) to be demolished shall be identified and made available for use in an interpretive program to be developed for the Project or donated for curatorial and/or educational purposes to a local historical society, preservation organization, or the like. Unsound, decayed, or toxic materials (e.g. asbestos, lead paint, etc.) need not be included in the salvage process. The salvage materials which will not be reused for the Project shall be offered for donation or shall be advertised for a period of not less than thirty (30) days in historic preservation websites and the Culver City News, as well as by posting on the Project Site itself and by other means as deemed appropriate. Salvage efforts shall be conducted by the Applicant. These efforts shall be documented in writing by summarizing all measures taken to encourage receipt of salvage materials by the public. Copies of notices, evidence of publication of such notices, along with a summary of results from the publicity efforts, a list of salvage offers (if any) that were made, and an explanation of why the features were not or could not be accepted shall be included in this salvage summary document.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Notices, and Field Inspection	Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Cultural Affairs, Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
MM-HIST-3 (Interpretive Program): The Applicant shall, in consultation with an expert in museum curation and/or the history of the motion picture industry, develop a publicly accessible interpretive and commemorative program with enforceable performance standards ("Interpretive and Commemorative Program" or "Program"), commemorating and actively illustrating: - the significant creative, production, and administrative activities and events that took place and films produced during the Thomas H. Ince, Cecile B. DeMille/RKO Pictures, and David O. Selznik eras of the Studio's history, - how these activities and events were associated with the continued evolution of the motion picture industry through the pioneering era of independent studios, the emergence of The Big Eight major motion picture studios and the "studio system," and the rise of smaller independent production companies in the post-war era, - significant innovations, technical approaches, and technology developed at the Studio and how these important events contributed significantly to the physical development of the site and the evolving motion picture studio.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspection	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Cultural Affairs, Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
Program elements may be located on-site, entirely off-site or in a combination of on-site and one or more off-site locations such as new or existing museums and exhibition spaces; provided, however, that at least one publically accessible element of the Program be placed or housed on the Studio Campus property and incorporated as part of any future use and development of the property (e.g., commemorative elements incorporated as part of publically accessible open space features). Substantive Program Requirements. This Interpretative and Commemorative Program shall be based on a research phase to identify and/or determine the availability of the following resources: - An inventory of museums, exhibition spaces or other institutions (such as the Academy Museum of Motion Pictures currently under development, The Culver City Public library, or The Culver City Historical Society) that provide public programming regarding the motion picture industry, with which the Interpretative and Commemorative Program might share resources or house Program components; - An inventory of physical assets or artifacts extant in public or private collections that may be available for exhibition as part of the Interpretative and Commemorative Program; - Sources of supplementary funding, such as foundation grants. - With knowledge of such availability, the Interpretative and Commemorative Program shall contain recommendations for programming, which collectively commemorate the history of motion picture production, development, administration, and technical engineering achievements at The Culver Studios and may, by way of example, include: - exhibition locations, - artifacts for display, - thematic content, - audio presentations, - video-based interpretive virtual tour or 3-D modeling of the most significant areas of the Studio, and database accessibility. [Note: The above mitigation measure is intended to supersede and replace Mitigation Measure CR-5, Virtual Museum/Exhibition, required under CPA No. 6. In the event the proposed Project is not approved Mitigation Measure CR-5				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
would be implemented.]				
MM-HIST-4 (Studio Campus Preservation Plan): A Studio Campus Preservation Plan shall be completed by a qualified preservation consultant to govern maintenance, rehabilitation, or improvement of historical resources on the Studio Campus. The Studio Campus Preservation Plan shall comply with the methodology called for by the Standards and would specify the maintenance and treatment of character-defining features, materials and finishes and provide appropriate guidelines for future rehabilitation or improvement projects to protect the integrity of historical resources. The Studio Campus Preservation Plan shall serve as a primary planning document for long-term decision-making about treatments and improvements, and would: a) serve as a basis for design of recommended work; b) provide a summary of information known and conditions observed at the time of the survey; and c) provide a bibliography of archival documentation relevant to the structures. Furthermore, the Studio Campus Preservation Plan shall ensure conformance with the Standards as they apply to both the rehabilitation of existing structures and the construction of new infill, landscaping and alterations to streetscape patterns within the property. The Studio Campus Preservation Plan shall be reviewed by Cultural Affairs for comment prior to approval and issuance of a permit.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspection	Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy	Culver City Cultural Affairs, Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
Bungalows Relocation (Reproduced from CPA No. 6) These mitigation measures have been initiated and are currently in progress under the adopted conditions of CPA No. 6. A draft HABS report for Bungalows S, T, U and V has been completed and submitted to the Library of Congress and the City of Culver City where it is currently under review. A Relocation and Rehabilitation Plan has been prepared and submitted to the City, and monitoring of the relocation and rehabilitation process is ongoing. MM-HIST-5 (Recordation): Prior to the issuance of a relocation permit for the bungalows, a recordation document in accordance with Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Level III requirements shall be completed for the existing buildings. The HABS document shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian or historic preservation professional. This document shall include a historical narrative on the architectural and historical importance of the subject property and record the existing appearance of the four bungalows in professional large format HABS photographs. The building exteriors,	This mitigation measure has been implemented as of the date of publication of the Draft EIR.			

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
representative interior spaces, character-defining features, as well as the setting and contextual views shall be documented. All documentation components shall be completed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation (HABS standards). Original archivally-sound copies of the report shall be submitted to the HABS collection at the Library of Congress, and South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton, CA. Non-archival copies will be distributed to the City of Culver City and Public Library. In addition, any existing and available design and/or as-built drawings shall be compiled, reproduced, and incorporated into the recordation document.				
MM-HIST-6 (Relocation, Storage and Rehabilitation): Prior to relocation, the bungalows shall be recorded (see MM-HIST-5 (Recordation)) before being moved to an appropriate on-site location with compatible setting and association qualities. A Relocation and Rehabilitation Plan shall be commission by the applicant and developed by a qualified historic preservation consultant. The Plan shall include relocation methodology recommended by the National Park Service (NPS), which are outlined in the booklet entitled "Moving Historic Buildings," by John Obed Curtis (1979). The Plan shall include an assessment of the building condition by a qualified engineer, and a shoring plan for relocation and storage, and relocation to the final site. If temporary storage is required, the storage conditions should closely follow the recommendations of NPS Preservation Brief 31: Mothballing Historic Buildings with regard to recommendations for structural stabilization, pest control, protection against vandalism, fire, and moisture, adequate ventilation which should be applied to the building at the temporary storage location to ensure the safety of the building during storage. A periodic maintenance and monitoring plan shall also be included in the Plan and implemented during the storage period in accordance with the guidance outlined in NPS Preservation Brief 31. The Relocation and Rehabilitation Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Culver City prior to its implementation. Upon relocation of the structures to the new site, any maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, preservation, conservation, or reconstruction work performed in conjunction with the relocation of the building shall be undertaken in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Properties. In addition, a plaque describing the date of the move and the original location shall	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspection	Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Cultural Affairs, Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
be placed in a visible location on each of the buildings. The removal, storage, relocation and rehabilitation process shall be monitored by a qualified historic preservation consultant at key intervals to ensure conformance with the Standards and NPS guidelines. The preservation consultant shall also be available to provide technical expertise to reduce potential impacts to historical resources from unforeseen circumstances. [Note: This mitigation measure has been partially implemented as of the date of publication of this EIR. The bungalows have been relocated and rehabilitation is underway in accordance with this mitigation measure required under CPA No. 6]				
MM-HIST-7 (Interpretive Plaque/Marker): A permanent metal plaque will be affixed to the primary elevation of the relocated buildings or a marker will be imbedded in the pavement in front, which will briefly explain that the buildings were relocated and its original site.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspection	After Rehabilitation	Culver City Cultural Affairs, Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources				
MM-ARCH-1: Prior to issuance of demolition permit, the Applicant shall retain a Qualified Archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (Qualified Archaeologist) to oversee an archaeological monitor who shall be present during construction excavations such as demolition, clearing/grubbing, grading, trenching, or any other construction excavation activity associated with the Project. The frequency of monitoring shall be based on the rate of excavation and grading activities, the materials being excavated (younger alluvium vs. older alluvium), and the depth of excavation, and if found, the abundance and type of archaeological resources encountered, as determined by the Qualified Archaeologist. Full-time monitoring can be reduced to part-time inspections, or ceased entirely, if determined appropriate by the Qualified Archaeologist. Prior to commencement of excavation activities, an Archaeological and Cultural Resources Sensitivity Training shall be given for construction personnel. The training session, shall be carried out by the Qualified Archaeologist and Gabrielino Tribe and shall focus on how to identify archaeological and cultural resources that may be encountered during earthmoving activities, and the procedures to be followed in such an event.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
MM-ARCH-2: Prior to issuance of demolition permit, the Applicant shall retain a Native American tribal monitor from a Gabrielino Tribe who shall be present during construction excavations such as clearing/grubbing, grading, trenching, or any other construction excavation activity associated with the Project. The frequency of monitoring shall take into account the rate of excavation and grading activities, proximity to known archaeological resources, the materials being excavated (younger alluvium vs. older alluvium), and the depth of excavation, and if found, the abundance and type of prehistoric archaeological resources encountered. Full-time field observation can be reduced to part-time inspections or ceased entirely if determined appropriate by the Gabrielino Tribe.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
MM-ARCH-3: In the event that historic (e.g., bottles, foundations, refuse dumps/privies, etc.) or prehistoric (e.g., hearths, burials, stone tools, shell and faunal bone remains, etc.) archaeological resources are unearthed, ground-disturbing activities shall be halted or diverted away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated. An appropriate buffer area shall be established by the Qualified Archaeologist around the find where construction activities shall not be allowed to continue. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. All archaeological resources unearthed by Project construction activities shall be evaluated by the Qualified Archaeologist and the Gabrielino Tribe. If the resources are prehistoric or Native American in origin, the Gabrielino Tribe shall consult with the City Planning Division and Qualified Archaeologist regarding the treatment and curation of those resources. If a resource is determined by the Qualified Archaeologist to constitute a "historical resource" pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) or a "unique archaeological resource" pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(g), the Qualified Archaeologist shall coordinate with the Applicant and the City Planning Division to develop a formal treatment plan that would serve to reduce impacts to the resources. The treatment plan shall incorporate the Gabrielino Tribe's treatment and curation recommendations. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment. If preservation in place is not feasible, treatment may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to remove the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis. The treatment plan shall include measures regarding the curation of the recovered resources that may include curation at a public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the materials, such as the Fowler Museum, if such an institution agrees to accept the	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
material, and/or the Gabrielino Tribe. If no institution accepts the archaeological material and the Gabrielino Tribe does not accept the material, it may be donated to a local school or historical society in the area for educational purposes.				
MM-ARCH-4: Prior to the release of the grading bond, the Qualified Archaeologist shall prepare a final report and appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation Site Forms at the conclusion of archaeological monitoring. The report shall include a description of resources unearthed, if any, treatment of the resources, results of the artifact processing, analysis, and research, and evaluation of the resources with respect to the California Register of Historical Resources and CEQA. The report and the Site Forms shall be submitted by the Applicant to the City Planning Division, the South Central Coastal Information Center, and representatives of other appropriate or concerned agencies to signify the satisfactory completion of the Project and required mitigation measures.	Condition of Approval	Report	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit	Culver City Planning Division
MM-ARCH-5: If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during construction of the project, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the NAHC. The NAHC shall then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD). The MLD may, with the permission of the land owner, or his or her authorized representative, inspect the location of the discovery of the Native American remains and may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treating or disposing, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods. The MLD shall complete their inspection and make their recommendation within 48 hours of being granted access by the land owner to inspect the discovery. The recommendation may include the scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. Upon the discovery of the Native American remains, the land owner shall ensure that the immediate vicinity, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices, where the Native American human remains are located, is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the land owner has discussed and conferred, as prescribed in this mitigation measure, with the MLD regarding their recommendations, if applicable, taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains. The land owner shall	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
discuss and confer with the descendants all reasonable options regarding the descendants' preferences for treatment. Whenever the NAHC is unable to identify a MLD, or the MLD identified fails to make a recommendation, or the land owner or his or her authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendants and the mediation provided for in Subdivision (k) of Section 5097.94, if invoked, fails to provide measures acceptable to the land owner, the land owner or his or her authorized representative shall inter the human remains and items associated with Native American human remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further and future subsurface disturbance.				
Paleontological Resources				
MM-PALEO-1: A qualified Paleontologist shall be retained to monitor construction excavations that would encounter older Quaternary sediments (generally associated with sediments below six feet in the area). The Paleontologist shall attend a pre-grading/excavation meeting to discuss the paleontological monitoring requirements. A qualified paleontologist is defined as a paleontologist meeting the criteria established by the Society for Vertebrate Paleontology. The qualified Paleontologist shall supervise a paleontological monitor who shall be present at such times as required by the Paleontologist during construction excavations into older Quaternary sediments. Monitoring shall consist of visually inspecting fresh exposures of rock for larger fossil remains and, where appropriate, collecting wet or dry screened sediment samples of promising horizons for smaller fossil remains. The frequency of monitoring inspections shall be determined by the Paleontologist and shall be based on the rate of excavation and grading activities, the materials being excavated (older vs. younger alluvium), and the depth of excavation, and if found, the abundance and type of fossils encountered. Full-time monitoring can be reduced to part-time inspections, or ceased entirely, if determined adequate by the Paleontologist.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
MM-PALEO-2: If a potential fossil is found, the paleontological monitor shall be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading and excavation activities in the area of the exposed fossil to facilitate evaluation of the discovery. An appropriate buffer area shall be established around the find where construction activities shall not be allowed to continue. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area. At the Paleontologist's discretion, and to reduce any construction delay, the grading and excavation contractor shall assist in removing	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
rock/sediment samples for initial processing and evaluation. If preservation in place is not feasible, the Paleontologist shall implement a paleontological salvage program to remove the resources from the project site. Any fossils encountered and recovered shall be prepared to the point of identification and catalogued before they are submitted to their final repository. Any fossils collected shall be curated at a public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the materials, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, if such an institution agrees to accept the fossils. If no institution accepts the fossil collection, they shall be donated to a local school in the area for educational purposes. Accompanying notes, maps, and photographs shall also be filed at the repository and/or school.				
MM-PALEO-3: The Paleontologist shall prepare a report summarizing the results of the monitoring and salvaging efforts, the methodology used in these efforts, as well as a description of the fossils collected (if any) and their significance. The report shall be submitted by the project Applicant to the City Planning Division and the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, and other appropriate or concerned agencies to signify the satisfactory completion of the project monitoring and required mitigation measures.	Condition of Approval	Report	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit	Culver City Planning Division
Geology and Soils				
PDF-GEO-1: Groundwater Dewatering: Unless determined not to be required in the detailed geotechnical report for the Project dewatering systems shall be installed in the lowest levels of the proposed Central and Van Buren Parking Structures and along the underground vehicular connection between the existing on-site subterranean parking structure and Culver Boulevard. The design of the systems shall be reviewed and approved by the City, and shall be based on accepted principles of engineering that consider but are not necessarily limited to, permeability of the soil, rate at which water enters the drainage system, rated capacity of pumps, head against which pumps are to operate, and the rated capacity of the disposal area for the system. Consideration of these issues would ensure that dewatering systems are properly sized and designed to accommodate the required dewatering in accordance with CBC Section 1805.1.3. A modified discharge permit shall be obtained from the RWQCB, LADPW, or other appropriate permitting agency for the additional discharge.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and a Foundation Plan	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
MM-GEO-1: During the building permit stage, the detailed geotechnical evaluation required by CBC Section 1803 shall be prepared to further investigate and address potential constraints associated with liquefaction, lateral spreading and expansive soils hazards, as required by CBC Section 1803. Any such constraints shall be addressed to the satisfaction of a qualified geotechnical engineer and the City through such techniques as over-excavation and replacement of problematic soils with compacted soil; constructing buildings on deep foundations (drilled, not driven) mat foundations, or spread footings, and using braced shoring systems and/or tiebacks, depending on the results of the evaluation. Typical deep foundation systems include the use of cast-in-drilled hole (CIDH) piles. In addition, it shall be confirmed whether or not permanent dewatering is required during Project operation. Compliance with the geotechnical engineering recommendations in the detailed geotechnical investigation shall be monitored and shall ensure that the site-specific geotechnical and soils hazards at a Project Site are taken into account during design and construction, and are properly mitigated in accordance with ASTM standards and practices.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and a Foundation Plan	Culver City Building Safety Division and Building Safety Inspector
MM-GEO-2: Additional subsurface exploration shall be performed, as part of the detailed geotechnical evaluation required by CBC Section 1803, in areas of the Project Site not previously explored to address the site-specific conditions at the locations of the planned improvements and to provide detailed recommendations for design and construction.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and a Foundation Plan	Culver City Building Safety Division and Building Safety Inspector
MM-GEO-3: Construction dewatering shall be implemented if determined to be required either by the City or the construction engineer in accordance with applicable permit requirements.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and a Foundation Plan	Culver City Building Safety Division and Building Safety Inspector
Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
PDF-AIR-1 (Construction Features) PDF-AIR-2 (Design Elements) PDF-AIR-3 (Voluntary Design Elements)	See Air Quality.	See Air Quality.	See Air Quality.	See Air Quality.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
PDF-TRAF-1 (Construction Management Plan)	See Transportation and Traffic.	See Transportation and Traffic.	See Transportation and Traffic.	See Transportation and Traffic.
PDF-HAZ-1 (Vector/Pest Control Plan): A vector/pest control abatement plan prepared by a pest control specialist licensed or certified by the State of California shall be submitted for review and approval by the Planning Manager and the Building Official. Said plan shall outline all steps to be taken prior to the	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
commencement of demolition or construction activity in order to ensure that any and all pests (including, but not limited to, rodents, bees, ants and mosquitoes) that may populate the Property do not relocate to or impact adjoining properties.				
PDF-HAZ-2 (Groundwater Filtration System): For the permanent dewatering required at the subterranean levels of the proposed Central and Van Buren Parking Structures, and along the proposed underground vehicular connection between the existing on-site subterranean parking structure and Culver Boulevard, carbon filter tank treatment systems will be installed by the Applicant in these structures to treat the dewatered groundwater prior to discharge.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
PDF-WW-1 (Dewatering)	See Wastewater.	See Wastewater.	See Wastewater.	See Wastewater.
Hydrology and Water Quality				
PDF-H/WQ-1 (Structural BMPs): The following structural BMPs would be implemented during Project operation: 13 Environmental Passive Integrated Chamber (EPIC) stormwater treatment areas of 18-inches in depth will be developed on the Project Site totaling 24,200 sf (approximately 0.56 acres) to retain the SWQDv (37,600 cf) through capture and reuse. Pipes will channel rainwater collected from roof and area drains to the treatment areas, which will be planted with native vegetation to remove the collected rainwater over time through uptake and transpiration. Flow entering the treatment areas in excess of the SWQDv will be discharged directly to the off-site storm drain system via overflow valves. The sizes and locations of the proposed treatment areas are identified in Figure 4.7-2, Preliminary LID Plan. - Trash enclosure areas will have floor drains that connect to the sewer system rather than the storm drain system. - On-site drains, catch basins and stormwater treatment areas will be stenciled to indicate that no substance other than stormwater is to be collected by the storm drain system.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
PDF-H/WQ-2 (Non-Structural BMPs): The following non-structural BMPs will be implemented during Project operation: Open Paved Areas and Planter Areas: Maintenance records will be kept of, regular visual inspections/sweeping/removal of debris will be conducted for, and regulator disposal	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy and Ongoing during Operation	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
and replacement of the absorbent materials will be conducted in, the stormwater treatment areas. - Regular sweeping of all open hardscape areas, at a minimum, on a weekly basis in order to prevent dispersal of pollutants that may collect on those surfaces. - Regular pruning of the trees and shrubs in the planter areas to avoid formation of dried leaves and twigs, which are normally blown by the wind during windy days. These dried leaves are likely to clog the surface inlets of the drainage system when rain comes, which would result to flooding of the surrounding area due to reduced flow capacities of the inlets. - Trash and recycling containers will be used such that, if they are to be located outside or apart from the principal structure, are fully enclosed and watertight in order to prevent contact of stormwater with waste matter, which can be a potential source of bacteria and other pollutants in runoff. These containers will be emptied and the wastes disposed of properly on a regular basis. <u>Education and Training:</u> - The Operation and Management Manual will include education/training standards to ensure training of studio staff as to proper maintenance of on-site BMPs. Training will include information on proper methods of handling and disposal of wastes. - Monitoring and Maintenance: - All BMPs will be operated, monitored, and maintained for the life of the Project. At a minimum, all structural BMPs will be inspected, cleaned-out, and where necessary, repaired, at the following minimum frequencies: 1) prior to October 15th each year; 2) during each month between October 15th and April 15th of each year and, 3) at least twice during the dry season (between April 16 and October 14 of every year). - Debris and other water pollutants removed from structural BMPs during cleanout will be contained and disposed of in a proper manner. - The drainage system and BMPs will be maintained according to manufacturer's specification to ensure maximum pollutant removal efficiencies.				
Land Use and Planning				
Not Applicable.	Not Applicable.	Not Applicable.	Not Applicable.	Not Applicable.

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
Noise				
PDF-AES-2 (Construction Staging)	See Aesthetics.	See Aesthetics.	See Aesthetics.	See Aesthetics.
PDF-NOISE-1 (Project Construction Schedule): Prior to issuance of a building permit, notice of the Project construction schedule shall be provided to all abutting property owners and occupants. Evidence of such notification shall be provided to the Building Division. The notice shall identify the commencement date and proposed timing for all construction phases (demolition, grading, excavation/shoring, foundation, rough frame, plumbing, roofing, mechanical and electrical, and exterior finish).	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division
PDF-NOISE-2 (Foundation Piles): Any foundation piles shall be drilled and cast not driven.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and a Foundation Plan, Verified at Preconstruction Meeting with Culver City	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division
PDF-NOISE-3 (Parking Structure Floors): All parking structure levels in the new parking garage shall be treated with a broom finish or some other treatment that results in a no-skid surface.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and a Foundation Plan, Verified at Preconstruction Meeting with Culver City	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division
PDF-NOISE-4 (Van Buren Parking Structure – Noise Barrier): A concrete wall shall be placed along level 1 of the new Van Buren parking structure that extend from the ground up to the underside of the Level 2 slab and the concrete wall shall be free from gaps or penetrations.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and a Foundation Plan, Verified at Preconstruction Meeting with Culver City	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division
PDF-NOISE-5 (Van Buren Parking Structure – Noise Barrier): The pre-cast concrete panels at the north and south side of the parking structure shall weigh at least 4 lbs per square foot, form a continuous façade with no gaps between precast concrete panels.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and a Foundation Plan, Verified at Preconstruction Meeting with Culver City	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division
PDF-NOISE-6 (Parking Structure Noise Level): All parking structure exhaust or ventilation systems shall be designed, through the use of quiet fans and duct silencers or similar methods, to not exceed 55 dBA Leq from 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM and 50 dBA Leq from 10:00 PM to 7:00 AM at the neighboring property lines including the west property line per sound level limits of the Culver City Noise Element.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and a Foundation Plan, Verified at Preconstruction Meeting with Culver City	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division
PDF-NOISE-7 (Construction Rules Sign): During all phases of construction, a "Construction Rules Sign" that includes contact names and telephone numbers of the Applicant, Property Owner, construction contractor(s), and the City, shall be posted on	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
the Property in a location that is visible to the public. These names and telephone numbers shall also be made available to adjacent property owners and occupants to the satisfaction of the Planning Manager and Building Official.				
PDF-NOISE-8 (Compliance with Noise Element): The following noise standards from Policy 2.A of the City's General Plan Noise Element shall be complied with at all times: A. No construction equipment shall be operated without an exhaust muffler, and all such equipment shall have mufflers and sound control devices (i.e., intake silencers and noise shrouds) that are no less effective than those provided on the original equipment; B. All construction equipment shall be properly maintained to minimize noise emissions; C. If any construction vehicles are serviced at a location onsite, the vehicle(s) shall be setback from any street and other property lines so as to maintain the greatest distance from the public right-of-way and from Noise Sensitive Receptors; D. Noise impacts from stationary sources (i.e., mechanical equipment, ventilators, and air conditioning units) shall be minimized by proper selection of equipment and the installation of acoustical shielding as approved by the Planning Manager and the Building E. The Project shall not allow any delivery truck idling in the loading area. Signs shall be posted prohibiting idling.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division
PDF-NOISE-9 (Outdoor Activities): Shoots, production support film screenings, concerts, outdoor teaming space, housing of amenities, and passive recreational uses in any proposed balconies, courtyards, patios, walkways, and decks on proposed buildings, shall not occur where open to the nearby residences.	Condition of Approval	Reports and Field Inspections	Ongoing during Operation	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division
MM-NOISE-1: The Project shall provide a temporary 20-foot-tall construction fence equipped with noise blankets rated to achieve sound level reductions of at least 20 dBA between the Project Site and the surrounding residences and elementary school. Prior to the commencement of any excavation, the applicant shall install a temporary construction fence with screening around the site. The height, fence and screening materials are subject to approval by the City Engineer or his/her designee. Temporary noise barriers shall be used to block the line-of-sight between the construction equipment and the noise-sensitive receptors during early Project construction phases (up to the start of framing)	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and a Foundation Plan, Verified at Preconstruction Meeting with Culver City	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
when the use of heavy equipment is prevalent. Standard construction protective fencing with green screen or pedestrian barricades for protective walkways shall be installed along property lines facing streets or commercial buildings. All temporary barriers, fences, and walls shall have gate access as needed for construction activities, deliveries, and site access by construction personnel.				
MM-NOISE-2: Construction and demolition activities shall be scheduled so as to avoid operating several pieces of equipment simultaneously.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division
MM-NOISE-3: Heavy equipment, such as use of a large bulldozer (greater than 600 horsepower), shall not be used within 45 feet of the neighboring residential structures. If such proximate construction is required, alternative equipment and methods such as small bulldozers (less than 300 horsepower), shall be used to ensure that vibration effects on adjacent residential uses.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division
MM-NOISE-4: To avoid or minimize potential construction vibration damage to finish materials on historic buildings, the condition of such materials shall be documented by a qualified preservation consultant, prior to initiation of construction. During construction, the contractor shall install and maintain at least two continuously operational automated vibrational monitors on historic buildings. The monitors must be capable of being programmed with two predetermined vibratory velocities levels: a first-level alarm equivalent to a 0.1 inches per second at the face of the building and a regulatory alarm level equivalent to 0.12 inches per second at the face of the buildings. The monitoring system must produce real-time specific alarms (via text message and/or email to on-site personnel) when velocities exceed either of the predetermined levels. In the event of a first-level alarm, feasible steps to reduce vibratory levels shall be undertaken, including but not limited to halting/staggering concurrent activities and utilizing lower-vibratory techniques. In the event of an exceedance of the regulatory level, work in the vicinity shall be halted and the historic buildings visually inspected for damage. Results of the inspection must be logged. In the event damage occurs to historic finish materials due to construction vibration, such materials shall be repaired in consultation with a qualified preservation consultant, and if warranted, in a manner that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division
Fire Protection				
PDF-FIRE-1 (Fire Proof/Resistant Construction): All proposed new buildings will	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit	Culver City Building Safety Division,

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
include class A fire resistant roofing, 2-hour fire rated shafts and storage/electrical service/trash rooms, 2-hour fire ratings of one building to another, 100 percent non-combustible treads/risers/stair construction within common stairways, and exterior non-combustible walls where within five feet of the property line and not fronting on a street.		Inspections	and Ongoing during Construction	Building Safety Inspector, Fire Prevention, Fire Inspector, and Planning Division
PDF-FIRE-2 (Fire and Smoke Detectors/Alarms/Sprinklers and Emergency Lighting): All proposed new, renovated, and relocated buildings will be equipped with NFPA 72 fire/smoke detectors, fire alarms, NFPA 13 automatic fire sprinkler systems connected to the lot's fire monitoring system, and emergency lighting and illuminated EXIT lights with 90 minute battery back-up.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Fire Prevention, Fire Inspector, and Planning Division
PDF-FIRE-3 (Submittal of Plans to CCFD for Review/Approval): Plans for the proposed new buildings, relocated fire pump house, on-site fire lane and associated turn arounds, new fire hydrant locations, and associate fire prevention/suppression equipment, will be submitted to the CCFD for review and approval.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Fire Prevention, Fire Inspector, and Planning Division
PDF-TRAF-1 (Construction Management Plan)	See Transportation and Traffic.	See Transportation and Traffic.	See Transportation and Traffic.	See Transportation and Traffic.
PDF-WATER-4	See Water Supply.	See Water Supply.	See Water Supply.	See Water Supply.
Police Protection				
PDF-POL-1 (Project Site Security and Access During Construction): Project construction sites will be enclosed with security fencing during the construction period, lit with security lighting, and patrolled periodically by Studio security personnel, and emergency access on and within the vicinity of the Project Site will be maintained during construction.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Police Department, and Planning Division
PDF-POL-2 (Coordination with CCPD): The Culver Studios will regularly coordinate with the CCPD, including providing the CCPD with advance notice of pending on-site development activities and special events.	Condition of Approval	Reports and Field Inspections	Ongoing during Operation	Culver City Police Department and Planning Division
PDF-TRAF-1 (Construction Management Plan)	See Transportation and Traffic.	See Transportation and Traffic.	See Transportation and Traffic.	See Transportation and Traffic.
Transportation and Traffic				
PDF-TRAF-1 (Construction Management Plan): A Final Construction Management Plan (FCMP) shall be prepared by the Project contractor in consultation with the Project's traffic and/or civil engineer. The FCMP will define the scope and scheduling of construction activities as well as the Applicant's	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, and Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Public Works, Fire Department, Police Department, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
proposed construction site management responsibilities in order to ensure that disturbance of nearby land uses or interruption of pedestrian, vehicle, and alternative transportation modes and public transit are minimized to the extent feasible. The FCMP shall be subject to review and approval by Culver City's Building Official, City Engineer and/or Planning Manager, as applicable, prior to issuance of any Project demolition, grading or excavation permit. The FCMP shall also be reviewed and approved by Culver City's Fire and Police Departments. The Culver City Building Official, City Engineer and/or Planning Manager, as applicable, reserve the right to reject any engineer at any time and to require that the FCMP be prepared by a different engineer. Prior to commencement of construction, the contractor shall advise the Public Works Inspector and Building Inspector (Inspectors) of the construction schedule and shall meet with the Inspectors. Also, biweekly construction management meetings with City Staff and other representatives of surrounding developments if under construction at around the same time as the Project shall be required, as determined appropriate by City Staff, to ensure concurrent construction projects are managed in collaboration with one another. The FCMP shall assess project construction impacts and provide effective strategies to limit the use of the public right of way (streets and sidewalks) during peak traffic periods, and shall be subject to adjustment by City staff as deemed necessary and appropriate to preserve the general public safety and welfare. Prior to approval of the FCMP, the applicant shall conduct one (1) Community Meeting pursuant to the notification requirements of the City's Community Meeting guidelines, to discuss and provide the following information to the surrounding community: • Construction schedule and hours. • Framework for construction phases. • Identify traffic diversion plan by phase and activity. (The Traffic Control Plan will be submitted for review and approval by the City for each phase). • Potential location of construction parking and office trailers. • Truck hauling routes and material deliveries (i.e. identify the potential routes and restrictions. Discuss the types and number of trucks anticipated and for what construction activity). • Emergency access plan. • Demolition plan.				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
- Staging plan for the concrete pours, material loading and removal. - Crane location(s). - Accessible applicant and contractor contacts during construction activity and during off hours (relevant email address and phone numbers). - Community notification procedures. - The FCMP shall at a minimum include the following: - The name and telephone number of a contact person who can be reached 24 hours a day regarding construction or construction traffic complaints or emergency situations. - An up-to-date list of local police, fire, and emergency response organizations and procedures for the continuous coordination of construction activity, potential delays, and any alerts related to unanticipated road conditions or delays, with local police, fire, and emergency response agencies. Coordination shall include the assessment of any alternative access routes that might be required through the site, and maps showing access to and within the site and to adjacent properties. - Construction plans and procedures to address: community and City notification of key construction activities; temporary construction fencing and maintenance of construction areas within public view; noise and vibration controls; dust management and control; and worker education on required mitigation measures and best practices to reduce disturbances to adjacent and nearby land uses. - Procedures for the training and certification of flag persons. - To the extent known identification of the location, times, and estimated duration of any roadway closures; procedures for traffic detours, pedestrian protection, reducing effects on public transit and alternate transportation modes; and, plans for use of protective devices, warning signs, and staging or queuing areas. - The location of temporary power, portable toilet and trash and materials storage locations. - The timing and duration of all street and/or lane closures shall be made available to the City in digital format for				

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
posting on the City's website and distribution via email alerts on the City's "Gov Delivery" system. The Plans shall be updated weekly during the duration of project construction, as determined necessary by the City.				
8. Provisions that staging of construction equipment and materials will be accommodated within the Studio Campus and that construction worker parking will be accommodated on the Studio Campus and at off-site locations to be determined and disclosed, potentially with shuttles to and from the Studio Campus.				
PDF-TRAF-2 (Traffic Signal Optimization): Traffic signals shall be optimized (i.e., splits, offsets, and lead/lag phases) at Intersections 9 (Main St/Culver Blvd), 10 (Ince Blvd/Washington Blvd) and 11 (Canfield Ave/Washington Blvd/Culver Blvd) to account for the new south leg at Intersection 9 (Main St/Culver Blvd) under the Parcel B Project.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy and Temporary Certificate of Occupancy	Culver City Traffic Engineering, LADOT, Engineering/Public Works, and Planning Division
PDF-TRAF-3 (Bicycle Striping Along Ince Boulevard): Bike sharrow striping along the Project Site's Ince Boulevard frontage, and striped crosswalks across Studio gate driveways, will be provided to minimize conflicts between vehicles and bicyclists/pedestrians.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy and Temporary Certificate of Occupancy	Culver City Traffic Engineering, LADOT, Engineering/Public Works, and Planning Division
MM-TRAF-1: Haul Truck Staging: Any off-site haul truck staging shall be provided in a legal area furnished by the construction truck contractor. The route to and from the Project Site shall be identified in the Construction Management Plan. Trucks shall not be permitted to travel along residential streets to the south, east, and west of the Project Site.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, and Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Public Works and Planning Division
MM-TRAF-2: Flagman: Flagmen shall be placed at the truck entries and exits from the Project Site onto Ince Boulevard to control the flow of exiting trucks to coordinate the entering and exiting trucks with the traffic signal at Ince Boulevard and Washington Boulevard.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, and Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Public Works and Planning Division
MM-TRAF-3: Truck Deliveries/Pick-Ups: Deliveries and pick-ups of construction materials shall be scheduled during non-peak travel hours and coordinated to reduce the potential of trucks waiting to load or unload for protracted hours of time.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, and Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Public Works and Planning Division
MM-TRAF-4: Access: Access shall remain unobstructed for land uses in proximity to the Project Site during Project construction.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, and Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Public Works and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
MM-TRAF-5: Lane Closures: Temporary lane closures, if needed, shall be scheduled to avoid peak commute hours and peak school drop-off and pick-up hours to the extent possible. In the event of a lane closure, a worksite traffic control plan, approved by Culver City, shall be implemented to route traffic around any such lane closures.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, and Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Public Works and Planning Division
MM-TRAF-6: Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program: TCS shall require the following TDM measures to be provided by each tenant, given the term of the tenancy is long enough for the programs to be implemented (for example, tenancy longer than six months). TCS shall integrate these TDM measures into standard lease documents for each respective tenant leasing over 25,000 gross square feet: 1. <u>Site Design</u> – The site perimeter shall be designed to encourage walking, biking, and transit. Amenities include wide sidewalks and pedestrian plaza/paseo accessible to neighborhood, street trees and landscaped pathways between buildings, improved street and pedestrian lighting and improved bus shelters, lighting and landscaping on the perimeter of the Project Site. 2. <u>Rideshare Programs</u> – Rideshare programs typically include the provision of an on-site transit and rideshare information center that provides assistance to help people form carpools or access transit alternatives. Rideshare programs often also include priority parking for carpools. The research literature shows that rideshare programs can reduce commuting VMT by up to 15% (CAPCOA, 2010). 3. <u>Bicycle Parking and other Complimentary Services</u> – Culver Studios plans to provide both long-term and short-term bicycle parking. In addition, the Project will provide complementary amenities such as shower facilities, lockers, and a self-service bike repair area to encourage bicycle use. 4. <u>Contribution to Bike Share Program</u> – Bike share service, available for employees and visitors to use, will be provided off-site, adjacent to the property. 5. <u>Unbundled Parking</u> – Unbundling parking typically separates the cost of purchasing or renting parking spaces from the cost of leasing commercial space. Saving money on commercial space by forgoing a parking space acts as an incentive that minimizes auto usage. Similarly, paying for parking (by purchasing or leasing a space) acts as a disincentive that discourages auto ownership and trip-making. The research literature shows that unbundled parking costs can reduce vehicle miles traveled	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy and Temporary Certificate of Occupancy	Culver City Traffic Engineering, Public Works, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
(VMT) by up to 13%.				
6. <u>Transit Pass Discount Program</u> – Transit pass discount programs are typically negotiated with transit service providers to purchase transit passes in bulk, and therefore at a discounted rate. Discounted passes are then sold to employees, helping them to obtain price discounts through the economies of scale of bulk purchasing. The Project tenants shall participate in the B-TAP+Green transit pass discount program and work with the City to participate in the future B-TAP+Green+Bike share transit/bike share pass discount program. The research literature shows that discounted transit passes can reduce commuting VMT by up to 20%. 7. <u>Car Share Program</u> – The Project shall allow space for a car-share service within its proposed parking facilities. A car share program is a model of car rental where people rent cars for short hours of time, often by the hour. The programs are attractive to tenants who make only occasional use of a vehicle, as well as others who would like occasional access to a vehicle of a different type than they use day-to-day. 8. <u>Parking Cash-out</u> – Tenants shall provide employees a choice to keep a parking space at work, or to accept a cash payment and give up the parking space.				
MM-TRAF-7: Intersection 10 (Ince Blvd/Washington Blvd): Restripe the southbound approach from one left-only lane and one shared through/left-turn lane to two left-only turn lanes. Restripe the lane currently reserved for southbound right turns as a shared through/right-turn lane. Prohibit eastbound left-turn movement. These improvements are shown in Figure 12 of the Traffic Study. The Project shall be responsible for designing and implementation of restriping the approaches as described above. Implementation of this mitigation measure shall be required prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for the Project by the City.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy and Temporary Certificate of Occupancy	Culver City Traffic Engineering, LADOT, Engineering/Public Works, and Planning Division
MM-TRAF-8: Intersection 11 (Canfield Ave/Washington Blvd/Culver Blvd): Restripe the northbound approach from one left-turn lane, one shared through/left-turn lane, and one right-turn lane to two left-turn lanes and one shared through/right-turn lane. These improvements are shown in Figure 12 of the Traffic Study. Implementation of this mitigation measure shall be required prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for the Project by the City.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy and Temporary Certificate of Occupancy	Culver City Traffic Engineering, LADOT, Engineering/Public Works, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
Wastewater				
PDF-WW-1 (Dewatering): Similar to the existing dewatering operation at the Project Site since 2014, any additional permanent dewatering required under the Project will be treated and used for on-site landscape irrigation rather than being treated and discharged to the local sewer system.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy and Ongoing during Operation	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
MM-WW-1: Unless further sewer flow monitoring determines to the satisfaction of the City that the Project would not trigger exceedance of the half flow capacity of the Ince sewer main, the Project Applicant shall upsize the existing 10" Ince sewer main with a 12" line from Hubbard Street to Lucerne Ave. (approximately 700 linear feet) (Exhibit 4 of the Wastewater Report shows the recommended sewer line segment to be upsized). The upsizing shall occur prior to the issuance of occupancy permits for the proposed new buildings.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
Water Supply				
PDF-WATER-1 (Water Conservation): The Project shall implement conservation measures related to landscape irrigation. Conservation measures include the following: - Low water-demand and drought tolerant planting will be used on the Project Site. - Irrigation runoff on the Project Site will be collected and treated on site. - Irrigation will have weather sensor input to determine need of irrigation. - All irrigation will be drip irrigation. - Irrigation will be on timers.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy and Ongoing during Operation	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
PDF-WATER-2 (Water Lines): Rerouting and/or and potential future reconnection of the on-site 4-inch service line to the City's water main shall be coordinated with GSWC prior to construction of the proposed parking building.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
PDF-WATER-3 (Water Service): Prior to construction of additional buildings, the need for new connections to City lines or on-site service lines to maintain adequate on-site domestic water service and pressure levels shall be coordinated with GSWC.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
PDF-WATER-4 (Fire Flow): Prior to construction, building plans shall be submitted to the Culver City Fire Department (CCFD) to determine fire flow and time period requirements based on tenant type, building size, and building type. If additional fire service lines and hydrants are required to maintain adequate fire flow, the Project shall install fire service lines and hydrants as required.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Fire Prevention, Fire Inspector, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
Solid Waste				
PDF-SW-1 (Solid Waste Diversion): In accordance with Senate Bill 1374 and Assembly Bills 939 and 341, Project construction will achieve at least a 65 percent solid waste diversion rate until 2020, Project operation will achieve at least a 50 percent solid waste diversion rate until year 2020, and Project construction and operation will achieve at least a 75 percent solid waste diversion rate thereafter, through source reduction, recycling, composting and other methods. Furthermore, in accordance with Assembly Bill 1826, the Project will provide separate recycling bins for organic waste and arrange for organic waste recycling services.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Environmental Programs and Operation Division and Planning Division
PDF-SW-2 (Solid Waste Refuse Bins and Enclosed Refuse Areas): In accordance with the requirements of CCMC Chapter 5.01 and AB 1826, separate Class III solid waste, recyclable, and green waste/organics refuse bins approved by EPO for size and type of containers, and enclosed minimum 6'x 6' cement-paved refuse areas, will be provided on-site during Project operation, and Project solid and recyclable waste material handling will be in accordance with the EPO's exclusive franchise for services.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy	Culver City Environmental Programs and Operation Division and Planning Division
PDF-SW-3 (Green Building and Sustainability): The Project will be designed to meet the standards for LEED certification, which identifies and give credit for green building techniques and other sustainability features. Green building practices will be integrated into all building design, construction, and operation. This could potentially include: 1) use of post-consumer recycled materials (e.g., crushed concrete masonry from demolished buildings, fly ash, slag cement, etc.) in building construction; and 2) use of materials in construction that can later be recycled should the buildings eventually be demolished.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division
PDF-SW-4 (Demolition Debris Recycling Plan for Construction): Reasonable efforts will be used to reuse and recycle construction and demolition debris, to use environmentally friendly materials, and to provide energy efficient buildings, equipment and systems. A Demolition Debris Recycling Plan that indicates where select demolition debris is to be sent will be provided to the Culver City Building Official prior to the issuance of a demolition permit. The Plan will list the materials to be recycled and the name, address, and phone number of the facility of organization accepting the materials. As required by CCMC Section 5.01.01, EPO or its agents shall be the exclusive hauler of all demolition debris (unless an exemption is granted by EPO, in which case EPO would need to approve the processing	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
and disposal sites along with requires to show proof of disposal vs. recycling of these materials).				
PDF-SW-5 (Trash/Recycling Management Plan for Operations): The Culver Studios will submit a Trash/Recycling Management Plan (Plan) for studio operations to the City for review and approval. Elements of the Plan will include, but will not necessarily be limited to: 1) projections of Project waste generation by type; 2) calculations of the bin and bin sizes required for each type of waste given the waste generation projections and frequency of collection; 3) plans for the location(s) and type(s) of trash enclosures/trash rooms; and 4) a mechanism for demonstrating over time that the studio is diverting at least 50 percent of its solid waste until 2020 and at least 75 percent thereafter.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, and Ongoing during Operation	Culver City Environmental Programs and Operation Division and Planning Division