Attachment No. 2

(310) 253-5710

FAX (310) 253-5721

Culver CITY

PLANNING DIVISION

9770 CULVER BOULEVARD, CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA 90232-0507

PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project Title and File No.: Natworks Office/Laboratory and Parking Structure
Site Plan Review, P2016-0139-SPR; Administrative Use Permit, P2016-0139-AUP; Administrative Use Permit, P2016-0139-AM, and Mitigated Negative Declaration, P2016-0139-MND

Project Location: 9919 Jefferson Boulevard

Project Sponsor: Gruen Associates (Applicant)

Project Description: Site Plan Review, Administrative Use Permit, and Administrative Modification, for a proposed new 3-story, 47'-3 ½" high, 62,558 sq. ft., office/laboratory building and detached 5-level parking structure containing 294 parking spaces, including 49 tandem pairs, and related site improvements, such as landscaping, lighting, etc.

Environmental Determination:

This is to advise that the City of Culver City, acting as the lead agency, has conducted an Initial Study to determine if the project may have a significant effect on the environment and is proposing this MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION based on the following finding:

☐ The Initial Study identified that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, or

☒ The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects, but:

1. Revisions in the project plans or proposals made by, or agreed to by the applicant before this proposed MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND INITIAL STUDY was released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur, and

2. There is no substantial evidence before the agency that the project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment.

A copy of the Initial Study, and any applicable mitigation measure, and any other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City based its decision to adopt this MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION may be obtained at:

City of Culver City, Planning Division
9770 Culver Boulevard, Culver City, CA 90232

The public is invited to comment on the proposed MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION during the review period, which ends **October 26, 2016.**

gsilva

Gabriela Silva, Associate Planner October 5, 2016

Culver CITY
PLANNING DIVISION
(310) 253-5710
FAX (310) 253-5721
9770 CULVER BOULEVARD, CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA 90232-0507

INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM AND ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

Project Title:	Nantworks Office/Laboratory and Parking Structure Site Plan Review, P2016-0139-SPR; Administrative Use Permit, P2016-0139-AUP; Administrative Modification, P2016-0139-AM; Mitigated Negative Declaration, P2016-0139-MND		
Lead Agency Name & Address:	City of Culver City, Planning Division 9770 Culver Blvd., Culver City, CA 90232		
Contact Person & Phone No.:	Gabriela Silva, Associate Planner (310) 253-5736		
Project Location/Address:	9919 Jefferson Boulevard		
Nearest Cross Street:	Jefferson Boulevard between Duquesne Avenue and Leahy Street	**APN:**	4207-031-018 4207-031-019
Project Sponsor's Name & Address:	Gruen Associates c/o Lance Jacky 6330 San Vicente Boulevard, Suite 200 Los Angeles, CA 90048		
General Plan Designation:	Light Industrial	**Zoning:**	Industrial General (IG)
Former Redevelopment Project Area:	Component Area No. 4 (Exp. 11/23/2029)		
Overlay Zone/Special District:	N/A		

Project Description and Requested Action: *(Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary)*

The project involves the construction of a new three-story, 62,558 sq. ft. office, research and development, and laboratory building, and a detached five-level parking structure, containing 294 parking spaces, including 49 tandem pairs and bicycle parking, as well as related site improvements such as landscaping, lighting, etc. Both buildings will have their lowest level partially below the existing grade, with the office/lab building proposed to be a maximum of 4'-6" below grade at the deepest point and the parking structure proposed at 10'-6" at the deepest point.

Existing Conditions of the Project Site:

The project site is comprised of two (2) parcels for a total of ±84,153 square feet; the primary parcel fronts Jefferson Boulevard, while the second is at the rear, landlocked between the primary parcel and the Ballona Creek (LA County Flood Control District property). The project site is generally vacant, as it was previously cleared of all structures and paving in anticipation of a project that was entitled in September 2008. At that time a layer of gravel was added to allow use of the site for temporary parking. The site is relatively flat at the front, but does have a downward slope from the front of the site to the rear, and which becomes steeper the further it travels to the rear of the site.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: *(Briefly describe the project's surrounding)*

The following considers Jefferson Boulevard travels in an east/west direction.

Location	Zoning	Land Use
West:	IG	One- and two-story office and industrial buildings and uses
East:	IG	National Public Radio (NPR) facility
North:	OS	Ballona Creek (flood control channel), and residential neighborhood beyond
South:	IG	Multi-story office and light industrial buildings and uses (across Jefferson Boulevard)

Other public agencies whose approval is required: (*e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement)*
City of Los Angeles Public Works, Los Angeles County Flood Control Disctrict

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a 'Potentially Significant Impact' as indicated by the checklist on the following pages:

- ☐ Aesthetics
- ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Biological Resources
- ☐ Cultural Resources
- ☐ Geology /Soils
- ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- ☐ Hydrology / Water Quality
- ☐ Land Use / Planning
- ☐ Mineral Resources
- ☒ Noise
- ☐ Population / Housing
- ☐ Public Services
- ☐ Recreation
- ☒ Transportation/Traffic
- ☐ Utilities / Service Systems
- ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a 'potentially significant impact' or 'potentially significant unless mitigated' impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier **EIR** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier **EIR** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

gsilva 10/5/2016

Gabriela Silva, Associate Planner Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Responses:

a)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. The project site is located in an urbanized area along the primary artery of Jefferson Boulevard, and surrounded by commercial and light industrial uses, and the Ballona Creek flood channel. Although the project will be visible from the upper elevations of the Culver City Park, and nearby State Park due to the downward sloping condition (south to north) in the general area, the project site is not located within a scenic vista area designated by the City of Culver City. Similarly, the project will be visible from the Ballona Creek Bike path, which is at a lower elevation than the site, as well as from limited locations in the residential neighborhood beyond the Ballona Creek; however, the views from these locations are of the creek itself and of the rear of the existing non-residential properties and buildings; the project will not block view of anything other than the parcel and Jefferson Boulevard from this vantage point.
b)	*No Impact*. The project site is not located within or adjacent to a state scenic highway, and there are no identified rock outcroppings or historic buildings within a state scenic highway on or near the site. Further, the project will not result in damage to any scenic resources, including trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings.
c)	*No Impact*. The project site is currently vacant and located in an urbanized area entails the construction of a new 3-story office/laboratory building and detached 5-level parking structure. As described in response "a)" the proposed buildings will be visible from surrounding locations, but will serve to improve the visual character and quality of the site and immediate surroundings by replacing a vacant unimproved parcel, enclosed by dilapidated fencing, with a new well designed building.
d)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. The project will inevitably add necessary lighting that will increase the amount of light emanating from the site; however, the project is expected to be consistent with ambient light conditions of the existing highly urbanized area. In addition, the project is required to comply with Culver City Zoning Code Section 17.300.040, which requires that outdoor lighting be shielded, and/or recessed so that direct glare and reflections are confined to the maximum extent feasible within the boundaries of the site, and also requires outdoor lighting to be directed downward and away from adjoining properties and public rights-of way.

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Responses:

a) - e)	*No Impact*. The subject property is zoned Industrial General (IG), which is not designated for, nor allows agricultural uses, and there is no known Williamson Act contract in effect on the project site. The project site is vacant and surrounded by a variety of commercial and light industrial buildings and uses, located within an urbanized area. No forestland exists on or in the vicinity of the subject property. The Open Space (OS) zone abutting the rear of the site (Ballona Creek) is also not zoned for agricultural or forestland purposes, and will be unaffected by the project. The project will not result in the conversion or loss of farmland or forest land, therefore the project will not result in any impacts.

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Responses:

a)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. The project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which includes the non-desert portions of Los Angeles County and Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties. Air quality conditions in the Basin are under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), which along with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), are responsible for preparing and implementing an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the area. The currently applicable 2012 AQMP incorporates the latest scientific and technological information and planning assumptions, including the 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy and updated emission inventory methodologies for various source categories, and is based on growth projections reflected in local general plans. The Culver City General Plan identifies the subject property for light industrial uses, which includes office and research and development type uses as proposed by the project. Since the project is consistent with the allowable development per the current general plan, there will not be a potential for conflicts with, or obstruction to the implementation of, the applicable air quality plan.
b) – c)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. New development in Culver City has the potential to contribute to pollutant emissions over the existing non-attainment conditions as a result of construction and operation of individual projects, both at the project level and cumulatively. This project includes the construction of a new 3-story office/lab building and a detached 5-level parking structure. Emissions are expected during times of construction and during operations. Construction emission would result from the use of construction equipment and construction-related trips; however, these would not be expected to create or contribution to violations of air quality standards because the project would be subject to standard construction-related conditions of approval, including limitation on construction hours and vehicle idling. Further the proposed project will comply with standard SCAGMD-approved construction procedures and with applicable provisions of SCAGMD Rule 403. Operational emissions from the office/lab and parking structure are likely to be generated by vehicle emissions from trips to and from the project, and energy use. Based on the traffic study prepared for the project, 690 daily trips would be generated, which when considered using CalEEMod estimates results in daily emissions below applicable SCAQMD thresholds. Construction emissions would be short-term and intermittent, and, based on the size and type of use, operational emissions would be minimal; therefore, the project is not anticipated to contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment. Further, the project air quality study confirmed the impacts of the project in this regard would be less than significant with no mitigations required.
d)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. The project located along Jefferson Boulevard, considered a primary artery within the City, as well as a major corridor for commercial and light industrial uses. The surrounding area is urbanized, developed with offices, light industrial (e.g. storage), radio facility, etc. Further any sensitive receptors, such as schools, parks, or senior citizen homes, are a significant distance from the subject site. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollution concentrations. In addition to the implementation of Green Building standards, the project shall be subject to regulations and laws

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		relating to toxic air pollutants at the regional, State, and Federal level designed to protect surrounding uses, including any potential sensitive receptors, from substantial concentrations of these emissions. In addition, as an office and laboratory use, the project is not expected to have any operations-related pollutants[1]. Therefore, impacts related to this issue will be less than significant.			
	e)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. The project will be located on a site which is vacant. According to the SCAQMD CEQA guidance document[2], land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The project does not include any uses identified by the SCAQMD as being associated with odors. During construction, activities associated with the operation of construction equipment, diesel-powered equipment, the application of asphalt/concrete, the application of architectural coatings and other interior and exterior finishes, and roofing, may produce discernible odors typical of most construction sites, which may be objectionable to sensitive persons. Although these odors might have the potential to be a source of nuisance to adjacent uses, they will be temporary and intermittent in nature. Furthermore, SCAQMD Rule 1113 limits the amount of volatile organic compounds from architectural coatings and solvents to further reduce the potential for odiferous emissions, and the project is required to comply with existing AQMD regulations requiring proper maintenance of vehicle engines and exhaust systems, and by standard construction conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the creation of objectionable odors and potential odor impacts, and any such impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.			

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Responses:

a) - d)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. The project site is located in an urbanized area on vacant land, surrounded by properties with a significant amount of commercial and light industrial development. No sensitive plant or animal species are known to inhabit the site or surrounding properties. The project does not involve development in a riparian habitat or federally protected wetland or waters of the United States as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and does not involve improvements that would impair or interrupt hydrological flow into a wetland. Nor will the project interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or known wildlife species, as the project site has not been identified as part of a migratory wildlife corridor or wildlife nursery. Therefore, project impacts will be less than significant.
e)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. The project is located in an urbanized setting and lacks any known sensitive plant or animal species. The project site is vacant, with only gravel and unintended vegetation from lack of maintenance, and no trees. Further, no trees or other biological resources can be expected to be disturbed. Therefore, there is no conflict with local policies and ordinances related to biological resources; impacts will be less than significant.
f)	*No Impact*. The project site is located on vacant site within an urbanized area. The site is not located within the boundaries of any known Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or any other jurisdictional habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any such adopted plan.

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Responses:

a)	*No Impact.* The proposed project will involve the construction of a new 3-story office/lab building and detached 5-level parking structure. The project site is presently vacant, with no existing structures, as the site was cleared in 2008 in anticipation of a project entitled in September 2008. Thus, the project site does not contain any structures or features that may have any historical significance or that may be considered a historical resource as defined in 15064.5. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated related to historical resources.
b) - d)	*Less than Significant Impact.* The project site is presently vacant, with no existing structures, as the site was cleared in 2008 in anticipation of a project entitled in September 2008. The proposed project will involve the construction of a new 3-story office/lab building and detached 5-level parking structure. Both structures will have a portion of their lowest level partially below the grade level.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

	The office/lab building is proposed to reach a maximum of 4'-6" below grade at the deepest point for the portion of the ground level that will be partially below grade. The parking structure is proposed to reach a maximum of 10'-6" below grade at the deepest point for a portion of the "basement" level. The site has been significantly disturbed at below grade levels previously during removal of three underground storage tanks in 1990, 1991, and 2003. The project site does not contain any known archaeological resources, paleontological resources, or interred human remains. The project will involve construction activity below the existing grade level as described above; however, the project is required to comply with State and Federal laws regulating the unearthing of fossil resources, burial sites, and other paleontological/archaeological resources. In addition, a project condition of approval will require that a Phase 1 Archaeological/Paleontological Survey be completed and submitted to the Planning Division and Building Safety Division for review prior to building permit issuance, with procedures for monitoring and progression of excavation and construction work should the survey indicate the presence of archaeological and/or paleontological resources. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated related to cultural resources.

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i)	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv)	Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Responses:

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

a) i) and ii)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. Based on City maps, which include an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, as well the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation conducted for the site, subject site is not located in an area identified as being within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone[3]. The geotechnical study also revealed no known active or potentially active faults underlie the project site[5]. The nearest fault is the Overland Fault, located approximately one (1) mile away. While the fault does not present a potential surface fault rupture hazard, the property will be subject to ground shaking during the event of an earthquake, like all buildings in an earthquake prone area; however, the project will be required to meet current Building Code standards which are intended to withstand shaking typically produced by faults in Southern California, as well as recommendations of the geotechnical report in a manner approved or amended by the City. Thus, impacts with regard to earthquake faults and seismic ground shaking will be less than significant.
a) iii)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. Based on City maps the project site is located in an area identified as being susceptible to liquefaction[4], and as a site that is part of a potentially "liquefiable" area by the geotechnical report[5]. The report further concluded that the likelihood of surface effects of liquefaction are very low to non-existent and the potential for lateral spread is remote. The referenced report provides recommendations at the construction stage for adequate seismic safety and soils stability of the proposed the project. Compliance with the recommendations in the geotechnical report and standard building code requirements would address related issues; thus, potential impacts are less than significant and no mitigations are required.
a) iv)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. Based on City maps the project site is not located in an area identified as being susceptible to landslides[4]. The geotechnical report[5] indicates the probability of seismically-induced landslides at the site is low due to the general lack of elevation difference across or adjacent to the site. Compliance with the recommendations in the geotechnical report and standard building code requirements would further address any potential related impacts.
b)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. The project involves the construction of two multi-story structures, both of which will have a partially subterranean or partially semi-subterranean level. As a result, construction of the project will require removal of some soil for this and general grading activities. During construction, exposed soils from grading activities could be subject to erosion, particularly during a wind or precipitation event; however, construction activities are required to occur in compliance with the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). In addition, the potential for erosion will be reduced by implementation of standard erosion controls imposed during grading and construction. Upon completion of construction, due to the limited amount of exposed soil and the site topography, the potential for soil erosion and loss of topsoil is low, and the site would be subject to an ongoing Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSUMP). Runoff associated with the project would be directed to landscape areas and/or pre-manufactured stormwater quality best management practices (BMPs) for infiltration and water quality purposes or directed to an impervious drainage system. Thus, the potential impact related to potential soil erosion and loss of topsoil is less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.
c) - d)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. Based on the City's Seismic Hazards Map, the project is not located in an area identified as being susceptible to landslides, but is within an area potentially susceptible to liquefaction. As noted in response to VI.a.iii and a.iv, the geotechnical reports, concluded likelihood of surface effects of liquefaction are very low to non-existent and the potential for lateral spread is remote. In addition, the report makes recommendations pertaining to the type of construction methods, design and materials, in order to ensure the buildings meet safety standards and are built to withstand the existing soil conditions. Compliance with the recommendations in the report and standard building code requirements will address potential impacts with regard to soil instability at the project site. Therefore, potential impacts are less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.
e)	<u>*No Impact*</u>. The project does not involve the use of septic tanks, or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The project's wastewater will be accommodated and conveyed off-site via connections to the existing urban wastewater infrastructure/ public sanitary sewer system. Therefore, there are no potential impacts with regard to septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems, or the ability of site soils to support such equipment/systems.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS --Would the project:

a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Responses:

a)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. Currently, Culver City, SCAQMD, nor CARB have officially adopted a quantitative threshold value for determining the significance of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions generated by a project. CEQA Guidelines state that a threshold of significance may be a quantitative, qualitative, or based on performance level of a particular environmental effect above which impacts will normally be considered significant (CEQA Guidelines, §15064.7, subd. (a)). The Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Study prepared for the project by Terry A. Hayes Associates Inc.[1], utilized the tiered screening methodology proposed by the SCAQMD Working Group. Further the study indicates that GHG emissions for the project will primarily result from construction equipment, vehicular traffic, and utilities demand, and estimated these emissions using CalEEMod. The estimated emissions for the project are 1,587 metric tons per year, which is far less than the established significance threshold of 3,000 metric tons per year.
b)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. The City does not currently have an applicable plan or policy related to the reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions; thus the project will not be in conflict with any such local plan or policy. However, there are programs derived at the State level such as California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings (a.k.a. Title 24) and the California Green Building Code (CalGreen) with the intent of reducing GHG's, as well as local ordinances with similar effects, such as the Culver City Building Safety Division Mandatory Green Building Program, and the Culver City Building Safety Division Mandatory Solar Photovoltaic requirements. These requirements will include implementation of energy-saving strategies such as use of energy-efficient lighting, waterless urinals, and drought tolerant landscaping, etc. The project will be in conformance with these City and State guidelines for green building; thus the project will not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulations that reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and impacts related to this issue will be less than significant. In addition, the GHG study concluded that the project would not generate GHG emissions exceeding the capture rate design value within the SCAQMD jurisdiction, and therefore would not conflict with any plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS --Would the project:

a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Responses:

a)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. The project involves the construction of a new office/laboratory building for medical research and development. During demolition and construction, the project may utilize and transport potentially hazardous materials, including solvents, paints, petroleum products and pesticides. However the project will be subject to all applicable Federal, State, County, and City requirements for the handling of hazardous materials. The developer will be required to consult with the City's Fire Prevention Division regarding the handling or removal of any potentially hazardous chemicals on the subject site. Construction activities such as grading may also be a source of transporting potential hazardous materials due to previously present underground storage tanks (UST's); however, per the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I report)[6] for the project site, the site has been issued clearance letters regarding previously existing UST's, and that sampling related to said UST's, as well as a now removed clarifier and two (2) existing sumps revealed no detectable concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons of VOCs. Use of the proposed building for medical research and development laboratory may involve the transport, use, or disposal of potentially hazardous materials. Laboratory use of hazardous materials will not exceed allowable quantities listed in the 2013 California Building Code. Additionally, Fire Code will regulate the operation of the lab regarding safety and storage. Any and all potentially hazardous materials present at the site will be transported, contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and handled in compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal standards and regulations. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.
b)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact.*</u> Construction activities may use potential hazardous materials; however, these will be subject to all applicable Federal, State, County, and City requirements for the handling of hazardous materials. Grading activities may also present a source due to previously present underground storage tanks (UST's); however, per the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I report)[6] for the project site, the site has been issued clearance letters regarding previously existing UST's, and that sampling related to said UST's, as well as a now removed clarifier and two (2) existing sumps revealed no detectable concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons of VOCs. In addition, previous studies by Calvada Environmental Services concluded there was no significant threat to groundwater or threats to human health or the environment. Use

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

	of the proposed building for medical research and development laboratory may involve the presence of potentially hazardous materials. Laboratory use of hazardous materials will not exceed allowable quantities listed in the 2013 California Building Code. It is not anticipated that the project operations will result in additional hazards to the public and will be handled and stored in compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations, including those intended to prevent upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. All potentially hazardous materials, including those used for normal maintenance and landscaping, will be contained, stored and used in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations, including any applicable Culver City Fire Department requirements; thus, impacts related to this issue will be less than significant.
c)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. The project site is located within a quarter-mile of a private school facility; specifically, Eco Star Station and Star Prep Academy elementary school is located within one-quarter mile west of the project site at 10101 Jefferson Boulevard. As noted previously, the Phase I report indicates clearance letters have been issued for previously existing UST's, clarifiers, etc., and soils testing conducted concluded there were no detectable concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons of VOCs. The report also indicated that site reconnaissance revealed the absence of numerous hazardous materials, biohazards and infectious wastes, etc. In addition, any potentially hazardous materials introduced to the site as part of the medical research and development lab will be handled and stored in compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations, including those intended to prevent hazardous emissions. Thus, the impacts related to the emission of hazardous waste or materials within a quarter-mile of a school would be less than significant.
d)	*No Impact*. The project is not located on a site identified pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, and included in the State's EnviroStar Database[7]. In addition, per the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment[6] for the project site, the site has been issued clearance letters regarding previously existing underground storage tanks (UST's) and that sampling related to said UST's, as well as a now removed clarifier and two (2) existing sumps revealed no detectable concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons of VOCs. Therefore, no impact will result.
e) and f)	*No Impact*. The project site is not located with two (2) miles of any public or private airport or airstrip. The nearest airports to the project site are the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), located approximately 5 miles southwest of the project site, and the Santa Monica Municipal Airport, which is located approximately 3.5 miles northwest. Therefore, the proposed 3-story office/lab building and 5-level parking structure will not impact the flight pattern or present any other hazard to air traffic above or near the property, or any hazardous situation for people residing or working in the area. Therefore, the project will have no impacts related to these issues.
g)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. The proposed project would not have any long-term effect on any emergency response or emergency evacuation plan or procedures, as the project will not modify or block access to the subject site or surrounding streets, except for modifications required as traffic-related mitigations which will serve to improve access. Emergency evacuation routes could be affected during construction; however, any street or lane closures necessary during construction will be temporary and will be required to meet City standards, conditions, and approvals to ensure emergency access is not impacted or impeded. The project impacts related to emergency response and evacuation will be less than significant, with no mitigation measures necessary.
h)	*No Impact*. The project site consists of previously developed land that subsequently was cleared of all improvements, and is currently vacant. The site is located within an urbanized area, along a primary artery in the City, and surrounded by properties developed with various commercial and light industrial buildings and uses. To the rear is the Ballona Creek, which does not contain any wildland or vegetation. Further, the project site is not located adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, any wildland areas, thus there is no risk of wildland fires. The site is located within an area determined by the Culver City Natural Hazards Map to be a Fire Hazard Zone. However, the proposed project would adhere to applicable fire suppression regulations. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildfires, and would not result in any impact related to risk with wildland fires.

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☒	☐
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Responses:

a)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. As part of the project construction, including excavation and grading for the construction of partially subterranean levels of the project, improper construction practices could have the potential effect of creating water pollution through erosion and siltation. However standard conditions of approval for the project require the preparation of a Local Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (LSWPPP) and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) to regulate and control run-off by using Best Management Practices (BMP's) in accordance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Further, the project will conform to all requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and Culver City Municipal Code; thereby preventing any condition that could result in unpermitted discharges into the sanitary sewer and storm water systems or other violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Therefore, implementation of the project will result in less than significant impacts related to this issue.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	b)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. The project consists of construction of a multi-story office/lab building and parking structure on a ±84,153 sq. ft. site that is currently vacant, with gravel and vegetation and limited paving. The project will include the construction of new planters, throughout the site and retention of a large vegetated area at the rear of the site, abutting Ballona Creak, allowing the continuation of groundwater recharge. The project will not have a significant impact on groundwater supplies. There are no water wells within the City and the project does not require or propose the installation of wells for water service. In addition, water runoff will be directed to on-site landscape areas for capture and restoration into the ground water system. Project impacts with regard to groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge will be less than significant.				
	c) and d)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. The project site is vacant and has not been improved since 2008, at which time the site was cleared and a layer of gravel was installed; therefore, the site has both pervious and impervious surfaces. As a result, stormwater that collects on the ground surface primarily sheet-flows to Ballona Creek and some percolates into the soil. Grading and excavation will be implemented for the project, but will not result in major changes to drainage patterns; grading and building plans will be reviewed by the City's Engineering Division to ensure that grading and drainage would be done in manner that does not cause substantial erosion, siltation or flooding. As proposed, run-off associated with the project will be either directed to landscaped areas and/or pre-manufactured storm water quality best management practices (BMPs) for infiltration and water quality purposes or directed to the storm drain system, and erosion/sediment control plans such as the Local Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (LSWPPP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) will be prepared. As such, the alteration of the existing drainage pattern would not result in the alteration of the course of a stream or river, including the channelized Ballona Creek to the rear of the site, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site or substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Therefore, project impacts related to altering drainage patterns will be less than significant.				
	e)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. The project site is vacant and has not been improved since 2008, at which time the site was cleared and a layer of gravel was installed; therefore, the site has both pervious and impervious surfaces. As a result, stormwater that collects on the ground surface primarily sheet-flows to Ballona Creek and some percolates into the soil. The project will potentially increase the amount of impervious area; however, this change is expected to be minimal as the project plans reflect the incorporation of planter boxes and landscape areas to adequately address the capture and runoff of water from the site. Grading plans, Local Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (LSWPPP), and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) will be required and reviewed by the Culver City Public Works department per standard procedures and conditions of approval. Therefore, potential project impacts related to runoff water, polluted runoff, and system capacity will not be significant.				
	f)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. The project will require the preparation and implementation of a LSWPPP and SUSMP, detailing construction activities, materials, and wastes and listing BMPs to control pollutant discharge during construction, including practices that prohibit the entry of pollutants from the construction site into the public street or storm drain system, and BMPs that adequately address pollutants generated during the post-construction stage for the first ¾" of a rain event. Preparation of the LSWPPP and SUSMP and compliance with the City's Minimum Storm Water Protection Requirements would ensure that the project will not violate any water quality standards. Therefore, the project impacts related to water quality will be less than significant.				
	g)-h)	<u>*No Impact*</u>. The project consists of a new office/lab and parking structure development. There is currently no housing on the site, nor does the project include any housing component. In addition, the site is not located within a 100 year flood hazard area. Therefore, there will be no impacts.				
	i)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. The project site is located within the Mullholland Dam Inundation Zone and the Silverlake Dam Inundation Zone. The project itself will not have any components that would create an exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. For example, the project does not impede escape routes or access of emergency vehicles in the event of a major flood incident. The project will adhere to all emergency procedures to minimize impacts to building occupants. In addition, various agencies, including the State of				

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

	California Division of Safety of Dams and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, monitor this and various other dams to guard against the threat of dam failure; no information has been presented to indicate either dam is in threat of imminent failure. Design and construction practices are intended to ensure that all dams are capable of withstanding the maximum considered earthquake (MCE) for the site. Due to the distance of the project site from the Mullholland Dam and the extent of the intervening development, as well as early warning systems in place, impacts associated with exposing people or structures to significant risk as a result of dam failure are less than significant.
j)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. The project site is not located within an area subject to tsunami and seismic sea waves, and has not been identified as being within range of potentially damaging waves[9]. In addition, the geotechnical report[5] identified that no major water-retaining structures are located immediately up gradient from the project site, and that the risk of flooding from a seismically-induced seiche is remote. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

a)	Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Responses:

a)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. The project consists of the construction of a new 3-story office/laboratory building and detached 5-level parking structure on a currently vacant site. The project site is located within an urbanized area, surrounded by similar commercial and light industrial development along the primary artery of Jefferson Boulevard. The project will add visual continuity along the corridor rather than create any physical division of this community. Ballona Creek along the rear of the site is an existing physical division that will remain unchanged. Further, the project will not modify the existing configuration of the lot, surrounding streets, or overall access, such that it would divide any existing community.
b)	*Less Than Significant Impact.* The project site is located within the General Plan Land Use designation of Light Industrial, while the Zoning designation is Industrial General (IG). The project proposes a new office/laboratory project, which is consistent with the allowable uses of the subject zone, as well as the zone corresponding to this land use designation, i.e. Industrial Light. There is no applicable city coastal program, nor is there any specific plan applicable to the project site.
c)	*No Impact.* The project site is comprised of a vacant located in an urban setting, along a primary artery. Further, the project site is not located within an existing habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Therefore, there will be no impacts related to this issue.

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Responses:

a) - b)	*No Impact.* The project involves the construction of a new 3-story office/laboratory building and detached 5-level parking structure on a currently vacant site, located within an urbanized area. The surrounding properties are developed with various commercial and light industrial buildings and uses. Further, there are no known mineral resources on or within the project site, and no locally important mineral resource recovery areas located in the project area. Thus, the project will not result in any disturbance to known mineral resources in the immediate vicinity, or in any loss of locally-important mineral resource recovery.

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required.

XII. NOISE --Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Responses:

a), c), and d)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. There are two potential sources of noise generation: 1) day-to-day operations, including traffic generated by future occupants of the proposed project, and 2) construction activities. The project will involve the construction of a new 3-story office/laboratory building and detached 5-level parking structure. The project site is located in a highly urbanized area along a heavily transited primary artery (Jefferson Boulevard), developed with various commercial and light industrial uses. Properties surrounding the site are developed with Ballona Creek, multi-story office and light industrial uses, National Public Radio (NPR) facility, and one- and two-story office and industrial uses, to the north, south, east and west. As a result of existing conditions (arterial traffic and existing uses), there is a significant amount of existing ambient and operational noise levels.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
		As an office/laboratory building for medical research and development, any noise generated by the project operations will be consistent with the noise levels of the surrounding uses, with the primary source being the partially enclosed parking structure at hours of peak ingress and egress, which would coincide with the elevated levels of ambient noise from existing traffic along Jefferson Boulevard and similar activities in the surrounding properties. During the ongoing operations of the project, on-site operational noise will typically be generated by heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment. This equipment is planned to be screened per Zoning Code requirements, and must also adhere to Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, which requires interior noise levels not to exceed 45 dBA; thus, occupants of adjoining uses will not be exposed to excessive interior noise levels. There are no sensitive receptors, such as residences, in the immediate vicinity that could be impacted by this minimal potential in noise generation. Thus the impacts related to this issue will be less than significant. Table N-3 of the Noise Element of the City's General Plan, specifies there is no applicable standard or limitations on exterior noise levels and interior noise levels to 50 dB for commercial uses such as the proposed operation, except if adjacent to residential, which is not the case for this project. Therefore, no established threshold will be exceeded. During the construction phase, a variety of construction equipment will be utilized; thus, nearby commercial/industrial tenants will be exposed to increased ambient exterior noise levels typical of construction activities on nearby properties. The noise levels will vary based on the type and amount of equipment in operation at any given time and the location of each activity within the project site. However, this source of noise will be temporary and intermittent in nature, and through compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance, and standard conditions of approval, including those requiring construction equipment to be equipped with noise dampening mechanisms, equipment mufflers, sound control devices, and/or acoustical shielding, temporary noise levels associated with construction activities will be less than significant. In addition, the Culver City Noise Ordinance (Chapter 9, Section 9.07.035 "Construction") exempts noise sources associated with construction when occurring between the hours of 8:00 AM and 8:00 PM on weekdays, 9:00 AM and 7:00 PM on Saturdays, and 10:00 AM and 7:00 PM on Sundays, and construction activities will be limited to these hours. Similarly, dirt hauling and construction material deliveries or removal activities are restricted by the City's standard conditions of approval; thus, established thresholds will not be exceeded.			
	b)	<u>*Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated*</u>. The project site abuts the National Public Radio (NPR) facility, located on the east side of the site. The proposed building will be used for office purposes, medical research and development, and medical laboratory; thus operations-related noise will be minimal and consistent with the typical noise levels for general commercial development, as described above, while no operational groundborne vibration or groundborne noise is expected to be generated by the project operations. Due to the necessary excavation, shoring and similar construction activities necessitated by the design of the project buildings, some construction-related noise and vibration is anticipated during the construction phase. A noise and vibration study conducted by Veneklasen Associates in 2008, derived a series of recommendations to ensure the potential impacts to the abutting radio facility were properly mitigated to a less than significant level. The recommended mitigations are listed below and include time restrictions based on operations information for the radio facility from 2008. Therefore, as a condition of approval, the applicant is required to consult the radio facility operator and obtain updated operations information, including schedules and locations of sensitive activities (e.g. recording, broadcasting, etc.) to coordinate construction activities so as to not negatively impact the abutting operation, as intended by the mitigation measure, and submit to the Planning Division any updates/revisions. In addition, the Building and Safety Division has conditioned that any foundation piles be drilled and cast, not driven, and that a licensed surveyor shall monitor the adjacent properties for any movement on the east and west sides of the proposed project weekly and provide a weekly written report to the Building Official during the time of soils excavation, shoring, foundation construction, lower and grade level walls construction. Standard conditions of approval requiring noise dampening measures for construction equipment will also apply as noted above. Therefore, with the conditions			

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

	of approval and recommended mitigations, potential groundborne vibration or groundborne noise impacts will be less than significant.
e) - f)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. The project is not located within an adopted airport land use plan or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. The nearest airports to the project site are the Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), located approximately 5 miles southwest of the project site, and the Santa Monica Municipal Airport, which is located approximately 3.5 miles northwest. The proposed office/laboratory and parking structure project will not result in the exposure of residents or commercial tenant workers in the project area to excessive noise levels from aircraft operations or a change in flight path, therefore impacts will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required.

1. The project shall install temporary sound blankets on the windows of the wall of the NPR building adjacent to the construction site near Studio's B and C.
2. The project shall not commence drilling operations until after 2:00 pm within fifty (50) feet of the NPR buildings.
3. The project shall excavate the first slot of excavation along the easterly property line adjacent to the NPR building.
4. The project shall restrict equipment operation to the west side of the site whenever possible.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Responses:

a)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. The project involves a new 62,558 sq. ft. office/laboratory building, and will not involve the development of any residential units. Nevertheless, the project may result in a marginal increase in population because it will provide new employment opportunities that may result in new employees moving into the City. New employees will include a mix of people already living in the City, people commuting, people moving into existing local housing. Thus, the potential population increase is not expected to be significant. In addition, there are no changes proposed to road infrastructure, except as necessary to implement traffic related mitigations described below. Therefore, the project will not result in a significant impact related to potential population growth.
b)- c)	*No Impact*. The project will involve the construction of a new 3-story office/lab building and parking structure on a currently vacant site, within an urbanized area. There is no housing on the existing site; and no component of the project will involve the displacement of people or housing, therefore there will be no impact related to this issue.

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Responses:

a)	*Less Than Significant Impact.* Current fire and police facilities consists of three (3) fire stations and one (1) police station located approximately one (1) mile from the project site. During internal review of the proposed project by City staff, neither the Culver City Police Department nor the Culver City Fire Department identified impacts related to their response times or service demand. Further, neither agency identified impacts to their ability to provide adequate services to their applicable service areas. The project will be required to comply with all applicable Fire Codes, such as provision of fire sprinklers, adequate emergency access within the site, fire flows and hydrants, etc. Therefore, impacts related to fire and police protection will be less than significant. As noted above (XIII.a), the project, which consists of a 62,558 sq. ft. office/lab building, will not directly result in an increase in school age children in the community, as it is not expected to generate a substantial increase to the population. Employees of the project who do not reside in existing housing or housing currently under construction in Culver City will not impact the City's school infrastructure. Similarly, project users residing in existing housing or housing currently under construction, represent the same level of demand for parks and other public facilities as without the project. Some commuting employees may visit the nearby Culver City Park and State park, which are already a regional draw, but will likely be a limited increase in usage that will not affect or require changes to the physical characteristics of the facilities. Visitors of the project are not expected to remain in the vicinity or local parks in association with business conducted at the project site. No other facilities have not been identified that could be impacted by the project. Therefore, project impacts with regard to schools, parks, and public facilities, will be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required

XV. RECREATION --					
a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Responses:

a)- b)	*Less Than Significant Impact.* The closest and most accessible existing parks are the Culver City Park and the State park located further east along Jefferson Boulevard, which are already considered regional draws due to the sloped topography. As noted in Section XIII.a), it is expected that there will not be substantial population growth related to operation of the project. Most project users will be employees, who are not expected to use local parks regularly, and as stated above in Section XIV.a) Parks, the use of the existing neighborhood and regional parks is not expected to substantially increase as a result of the proposed office/lab project. The project will not require new construction or expansion of parks or recreational facilities. Overall, the project will not result in

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

significant adverse impacts relative to recreation because it is not expected to generate a substantial population increase. No mitigation measures are necessary.

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulating system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Responses:

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	a)- b)	<u>*Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated*</u>. As part of the application for the proposed project, the applicant submitted a *Traffic Impact Report* prepared by Crain & Associates (dated July 2016) [10]. The report was reviewed and approved by the City's traffic engineering staff. The report analyzed numerous components related to traffic and circulation, including trip generation for the project, existing (2016) and future (2020) AM and PM peak-hour traffic conditions for ten (10) critical intersections in the vicinity of the project, and stand-alone and cumulative traffic conditions. Trip generation for the project was determined to be a total of 690 new trips per day annually, including 98 AM and 93 PM peak-hour trips. The analysis concluded that the proposed project would result in a potentially significant impact to one (1) intersection under existing (2016) conditions and to two (2) intersections under future (2020) conditions, unless recommended mitigations were implemented; these mitigations are listed below. The affected intersections are Duquesne Avenue/Jefferson Boulevard, and Jefferson Boulevard/National Boulevard. The project was identified as having a standalone and cumulative impact at the Duquesne Avenue and Jefferson Boulevard intersection under future (2020) conditions. The study determined the project would have a potentially significant impact under existing (2016) and future (2020) conditions. Therefore, with implementation of the proposed mitigations, the project potentially significant impact with regard to being in concurrence with measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulating system, will be less than significant. The report found that the project would not present or result in conflicts or impacts at or above a level of significance with regard to the local Congestion Management Program (CMP), nor on freeway mainlines. However, as noted above, level of service (LOS) was identified as being potentially impacted at intersections noted above. Thus, the recommended mitigation measures will result in less than significant impacts in this regard. The project will require mitigation measures listed below to reduce potential impacts related to traffic and circulation, as noted above, to less than significant.			
	c)	<u>*No Impact*</u>. The project will result in the construction of a new 3-story office/lab building and detached 5-level parking structure, on a vacant site within an urbanized area. In addition, there are no components of the project related to air traffic. Further, as noted above in previous sections above, the project site is not near or adjacent to any airport and the project would have no effect on air traffic patterns. Therefore, as proposed, the project will not result in any impacts to air traffic patterns.			
	d)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. The project site is located along the north side of Jefferson Boulevard, and is already currently equipped with an existing driveway that provides vehicular access to and from the property. The proposed project will be designed to provide vehicular access from the same point; the driveway will be upgraded to conform to the standards of the Public Works Department, including compliance with American's with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements, and will be of sufficient with to allow ingress and egress to and from the site with normal circulation on surrounding streets. Further, no additional physical design changes are proposed by the project with regard to streets and intersections, including street configuration, nor special accommodations for incompatible operations/uses. Only the changes identified as mitigations for traffic will be implemented, and are expected to improve traffic and circulation. Impacts will be less than significant with regard to design features and compatibility of uses as they relate to traffic and transportation.			
	e)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. The project will not create impediments to emergency vehicles requiring access to the site. As part of the review by City Staff, Fire Prevention and Police Department reviewed on-site circulation to determine if the site was accessible for their emergency vehicles and equipment, and determined there would be no potential impacts to emergency access resulting from the project. The project will provide the code required parking, on-site vehicle circulation, and adequate access to the site without impeding emergency access. Standard construction related conditions of approval will ensure adequate emergency access during construction. No mitigation measures are necessary. Therefore, impacts related to this issue are less than significant.			

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

f)	*No Impact*. The proposed project will not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. During review by City Staff, the Public Works Department reviewed the project for consistency with the City's bicycle and pedestrian master plan and did not identify any conflicts with this plan. The Transportation Department also reviewed the project and did not identify conflicts with any public transit plan. Thus, there are no impacts in this regard.

Mitigation Measure(s):

1. To mitigate the impact at the intersection of Jefferson Boulevard and Duquesne Avenue, the project is required to pay $250,000, which is 50% of the cost, to widen Duquesne Avenue by eight (8) feet in order to accommodate a left, left/through, a right-turn lane and bicycle lanes in each direction.

2. To mitigate the impact at the intersection Jefferson Boulevard and National Boulevard, in the City of Los Angeles, the project is required to provide the following signal system improvements at a total cost of $104,500 ($95,000 plus 10% contingencies):
    a. Upgrade three cameras as follows:
    Camera #350 at Jefferson Boulevard and National Boulevard
    Camera #12 at Jefferson Boulevard and La Cienega Boulevard
    Camera #24 at La Cienega Boulevard and Rodeo Road
    b. Replace 2.3 miles of existing fiber and convert fiber from multi-mode to single-mode from Rodeo Road and La Cienega Boulevard to the hub (FS68).
    c. Install a new camera at Higuera Street, Jefferson Boulevard and Rodeo Road, including camera, hardware, and 0.3 miles of fiber; this camera installation shall provide visibility of traffic from Culver City.

3. The Project shall modify the traffic signal installation and signal detection, at the project driveway. The project shall provide a street-type driveway with 25' radius curb returns, pedestrian heads across driveway, 12" signal heads where 8" heads exist and bicycle/motorcycle-friendly limit line detection.

4. The project shall revise the striping on Jefferson Boulevard from east of College Boulevard to the reconstructed driveway to the satisfaction of the City.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS --Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☒	☐

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Responses:

a), b), and e)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. The City of Culver City maintains its own wastewater collection facilities and contracts with the City of Los Angeles for treatment and disposal services, at the Hyperion Treatment Plant. The project will connect to the City's existing wastewater treatment system. The proposed project is not expected to result in a substantial increase beyond the projected development potential, residential population and employment population for that area as identified by the General Plan. Therefore, the project is unlikely to result in a condition which exceeds the current wastewater treatment requirements established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. In addition the existing wastewater treatment facilities will be able to accommodate anticipated wastewater demands of the project in addition to the provider's existing commitments. The project is subject to the City's Sewer Facility Charge as required by the Public Works Department, which is utilized for infrastructure improvements related to the cumulative use of City infrastructure. Further, water treatment needs of the City are accommodated by the Metropolitan Water District's (MWD) Joseph Jensen Treatment Plant in the City of Los Angeles. The project will not necessitate the construction of new facilities. In addition, the proposed project will be required to conform to the City's Green Building Program, which includes the implementation of water saving plumbing features, including the use of waterless urinals, auto flush toilets, and hands free faucets. Through the use of these features and the payment of sewer facility fees, the project impacts on the water and wastewater system will be less than significant.
c)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. The City is primarily served by the Los Angeles County Storm Drainage System, and Culver City currently maintains some of its own storm drains that connect to the County system. The project site is currently vacant and stormwater on the site primarily sheet-flows to Ballona Creek and some percolates into the soil. The project site is located within an area that includes existing and adequate storm drainage facilities. A substantial change in surface water runoff patterns is not expected nor would any change require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, and the current multi-jurisdictional system is adequate to serve the proposed project. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.
d)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact*</u>. Water service for this project site is provided by the Golden State Water Company (GSWC) which contracts with the Metropolitan Water District for its supply. There are sufficient water supplies to the City to serve the proposed project. Expansion of the existing services is not necessary. In addition, the project will incorporate water saving features intended to reduce the impact of the project on water resources. The project will not result in the requirement for new water resources or entitlements for water resources.
f)- g)	<u>*Less Than Significant Impact.*</u> The project site will be required to provide a trash enclosure and comply with specific refuse requirements, per City requirements, and will be served by the Culver City Environmental Programs and Operations (EPO) Division with regard to solid waste. The Culver City EPO Division operates a transfer station within city limits, which receives a maximum of 500 tons of solid waste per day, with an average of 250 tons of solid waste per day. Solid waste from the transfer station is sent to Puente Hills Landfill in City of Industry, Chiquita Canyon Landfill, or the Southeast Resource Recovery Facility (SERRF). In compliance with the City's Green Building Program, and best practices, the project will incorporate recycling services to reduce the amount of solid waste produced from the site. Based on existing conditions, both landfills serving the site have adequate capacity to accommodate the disposal needs of the facilities. With implementation of waste reduction programs, identified above, impacts on the landfills will be less than significant with the project. Standard conditions of approval serve to further address removal and disposal of construction waste. As proposed, the project would be in compliance with state, federal, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts relating to solid waste will be less than significant.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ('Cumulatively considerable' means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Responses:

a)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. The project site is presently vacant, containing gravel, haphazard vegetation and limited paving, and sporadically used for temporary parking, and does not contain any fish or wildlife habitat. No known habitat of fish or wildlife species, nor any plant or animal community are located on or surrounding the site, and thus will not be impacted by the proposed project. The project would not result in any significant impacts that would result in the potential degradation of the quality of the environment; therefore, impacts will be less than significant.
b)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. The project will not result in any impacts that are cumulatively considerable. Any potential cumulative impacts will be substantially reduced to less than significance due to standard code requirements and conditions of approval.
c)	*Less Than Significant Impact*. The project will not cause substantially adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. Impacts related to the project will be less than significant, and standard City code requirements will reduce any potential impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): None Required

XVIII. EARLIER ANALYSES:

None

References Utilized:

1. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Study prepared by Terry A. Hayes Associates Inc., March 2016
2. "Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning," South Coast Air Quality Management District. PDF Document. Accessed September 27, 2016. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/planning/air-quality-guidance/complete-guidance-document.pdf?sfvrsn=4
3. City of Culver City Alquist-Priolo Fault Zones Map, City of Culver City. PDF Document. Accessed September 27, 2016. http://www.culvercity.org/home/showdocument?id=116
4. City of Culver City Seismic Hazards Map, City of Culver City. PDF Document. Accessed September 27, 2016. http://www.culvercity.org/home/showdocument?id=124
5. Geotechnical Engineering Investigation prepared by Geotechnologies, Inc., May 31, 2013 and Revised April 1, 2016
6. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for 9919 Jefferson Boulevard, prepared by BA Environmental, March 2013
7. EnviroStor Database, Department of Toxic Substance Control, State of California. Web site. Accessed September 29, 2016. http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/
8. City of Culver City Natural Hazards Fire and Flooding Map, City of Culver City. PDF Document. Accessed September 27, 2016. http://www.culvercity.org/home/showdocument?id=126
9. Culver City Tsunami Map, City of Culver City. PDF Document. Accessed September 27, 2016. http://www.culvercity.org/home/showdocument?id=160
10. Traffic Impact Report prepared by Crain & Associates, July 2016
11. 9919 Jefferson Boulevard Construction Noise Sound and Vibration Measurements, prepared by Veneklasen Associates, January 4, 2008

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

The following environmental mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the project development as conditions of approval. The project applicant shall secure a signed verification for each of the mitigation measures which indicate that mitigation measures have been complied with and implemented, and fulfills the City environmental and other requirements (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6.). Final clearance shall require all applicable verification as included in the following table. The City of Culver City will have primary responsibility for monitoring and reporting the implementation of the mitigation measures unless otherwise indicated. The mitigation measures have been identified by impact category and numbered for ease of reference.

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM
P2016-0139-SPR, P2016-0139-AUP, P2016-0139-AM, and P2016-0139-AM
October 5, 2016

MITIGATION MEASURE	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
Noise **N 1:** *The project shall install temporary sound blankets on the windows of the wall of the NPR building adjacent to the construction site near Studio's B and C. The blankets shall be installed prior to commencement of any grading, excavation, or construction activities, and shall remain as long as it is deemed necessary or until a Certificate of Occupancy is issued, whichever comes first.*	Condition of Approval	Plan Check note and Field Inspection	Prior to Commencement of Grading, Excavation, and Construction	Planning Division and Public Works
Noise **N 2:** *The project shall not commence drilling operations within fifty feet of the NPR buildings until after 2:00 pm.*	Condition of Approval	Plan Check note and Field Inspection	During Grading, Excavation, and Construction	Planning Division and Public Works
Noise **N 3:** *The project shall excavate the first slot of excavation along the easterly property line adjacent to the NPR building.*	Condition of Approval	Plan Check note and Field Inspection	During Grading, Excavation, and Construction	Planning Division and Public Works
Noise **N 4:** *The project shall restrict equipment operation to the west side of the site whenever possible.*	Condition of Approval	Plan Check note and Field Inspection	During Grading, Excavation, and Construction	Planning Division and Public Works
Transportation/Traffic **TR 1:** *To mitigate the impact at the intersection of Jefferson Boulevard and Duquesne Avenue, the project is required to pay $250,000, which is 50% of the cost, to widen Duquesne Avenue by eight (8) feet in order to accommodate a left,*	Condition of Approval	Plan Check note and Field Inspection	Prior to Certificate of Occupancy of final inspection	Public Works/ Engineering Services and Public Works Inspector

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM
P2016-0139-SPR, P2016-0139-AUP, P2016-0139-AM, and P2016-0139-AM
October 5, 2016

MITIGATION MEASURE	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
left/through, a right-turn lane and bicycle lanes in each direction.				
Transportation/Traffic **TR 2:** *To mitigate the impact at the intersection Jefferson Boulevard and National Boulevard, in the City of Los Angeles, the project is required to provide the following signal system improvements at a total cost of $104,500 ($95,000 plus 10% contingencies):* *a. Upgrade three cameras as follows:* *i. Camera #350 at Jefferson Boulevard and National Boulevard* *ii. Camera #12 at Jefferson Boulevard and La Cienega Boulevard* *iii. Camera #24 at La Cienega Boulevard and Rodeo Road* *b. Replace 2.3 miles of existing fiber and convert fiber from multi-mode to single-mode from Rodeo Road and La Cienega Boulevard to the hub (FS68).* *c. Install a new camera at Higuera Street, Jefferson Boulevard and Rodeo Road, including camera, hardware, and 0.3 miles of fiber; this camera installation shall provide visibility of traffic from Culver City.*	Condition of Approval	Plan Check note and Field Inspection	Prior to Certificate of Occupancy of final inspection	Public Works/ Engineering Services and Public Works Inspector
Transportation/Traffic **TR 3:** *The Project shall modify the traffic signal installation and signal detection, at the project driveway. The project shall provide a street-type driveway with 25' radius curb returns, pedestrian heads across driveway, 12" signal heads where 8" heads exist and bicycle/motorcycle-friendly limit line detection.*	Condition of Approval	Plan Check note and Field Inspection	Prior to Certificate of Occupancy of final inspection	Public Works/ Engineering Services and Public Works Inspector
Transportation/Traffic **TR 4:** *The project shall revise the striping on Jefferson Boulevard from east of College Boulevard to the reconstructed driveway to the satisfaction of the City.*	Condition of Approval	Plan Check note and Field Inspection	Prior to Certificate of Occupancy of final inspection	Public Works/ Engineering Services and Public Works Inspector