ATTACHMENT NO. 6

ENTRADA CREATIVE OFFICE

Addendum to the Entrada Office Tower Project Certified EIR

Prepared for
City of Culver City

November 2016

ESA PCR

ENTRADA CREATIVE OFFICE

Addendum to the Entrada Office Tower Project Certified EIR

Prepared for
City of Culver City

November 2016

233 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 150
Santa Monica, CA 90401
310.451.4488
www.esassoc..com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Addendum to the Certified EIR

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of the Addendum to the Certified EIR

The Project Applicant, Centinela Development Partners (the "Applicant") has submitted to the City of Culver City a Project Application for the Entrada Creative Office Project, (the "Modified Project") requesting approvals for: an Administrative Use Permit, a Tentative Parcel Map, Site Plan Review Modification, and an Administrative Modification. The Entrada Creative Office Project is a modified version of the Entrada Office Tower Project (the "Approved Project") that was approved, together with a Certification of an EIR (SCH No. 2007051061) on April 15, 2008 (the "Certified EIR").

Due to changed market conditions since the time of the 2008 approval, the Applicant is now seeking approval to modify the Approved Project with a smaller building and a reduced height that is in keeping with the type of creative office space being sought by tenants in this market area.

The now proposed Entrada Creative Office Project is, like the Approved Project, an office development with generally similar features. The proposed development is for a 6-story creative office building with approximately 281,209 gross square feet (270,055 leasable square feet) of building area, which is placed atop a podium parking structure. The office building, with the parking structure, would be 137.5 feet high.[1] The Project would be located on a parking lot at 6161 Centinela Avenue (the "Modified Project Site"). The Modified Project Site lies adjacent to the existing Double Tree Hotel/Conference Center complex. The Modified Project Site, which for purposes of the approvals, includes the area for the Modified Project, frontage along Centinela Avenue and other areas for access and circulation, is a total of approximately 3.7 acres. Other than the provision of replacement parking and modifications to the Project Site access, the front drive court and loading dock, the existing hotel is not being modified or redeveloped and is not a part of the Project.

The Modified Project reduces the amount of office space from the previously approved 326,974 square feet to 281,209 square feet for a reduction of 45,765 square feet or approximately 14 percent.[2] The height of the building would be reduced by 52.0 feet, from 189.5 feet to 137.5 feet, or a reduction of approximately 29 percent.

This Addendum to the Certified EIR has been prepared to document the variations in the Project as currently proposed; identify the extent of variation in Project impacts as compared to those

[1] The Approved Project also includes a 15-foot high mechanical penthouse, which is located centrally within the rooftop area and set back from building edges.

[2] The Certified EIR for the Approved Project is based on a Project Description that includes 342,409 square feet. Therefore, the square-footage related impacts of the Modified Project would be approximately 18 percent less than those evaluated in the Certified EIR.

disclosed in the Certified EIR, and determine whether further CEQA analyses are required for implementation of the Modified Project. As concluded based on the analysis provided herein, this Addendum demonstrates that no new or substantially more severe significant impacts would result under the Modified Project, and that pursuant to CEQA, and no further environmental analyses are required.

B. CEQA Authority for the Addendum Analysis Document

CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines establish the type of environmental documentation that is required when changes to a project occur or new information arises after an EIR is adopted. Section 15164 defines the appropriate use of Addendums and Section 15162 establishes criteria for determining whether more detailed information such as the preparation of Subsequent EIRs is needed.

Section 15164(a) states that:

> *"The lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred."*

Section 15164(b) states that:

> *"An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred."*

Section 15162(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

"*When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:*

> *1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;*
>
> *2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken, which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;*
>
> *3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the*

previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration,

b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR,

c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative, or

d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative."

Accordingly, this Addendum reviews the proposed changes to the Approved Project and whether implementation of the Modified Project would result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts. The Addendum consists of this Introduction and the following additional sections:

- Project Description: This section provides an overview of the plans for the Approved Project and the Modified Project and compares their variations.

- Environmental Evaluation: This section addresses three topics as follows:

  – Setting Conditions – documents the environmental setting used as the baseline for evaluating project impacts, including notable changes to baseline conditions that have occurred since the Draft EIR was prepared in 2007.

  – Environmental Impacts – identifies the effect of the Project changes on the physical environment and the extent to which environmental impacts would differ from what was described in the Certified EIR and what would occur under the Approved Project when considering changes in existing conditions and the circumstances surrounding the Project; and addresses both general effects on the physical environment and effects by environmental topic.

  – Conclusion Regarding Addendum as the Appropriate CEQA Documentation – is included pursuant to Section 15164(e) of the CEQA Guidelines. It summarizes the conclusions reached in the Environmental Analyses included herein, and provides an explanation of why preparation of an Addendum is appropriate for addressing variations in the Project design pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines.

C. Background

The potential environmental effects of the Approved Project were previously the subject of a certified Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) [SCH No. 2007051061] (Certified EIR). A

Notice of Preparation (NOP) for an EIR to notify the public and receive comments on the Approved Project was circulated on May 10, 2007. The Draft EIR for the Approved Project was then prepared and circulated for public review on November 29, 2007 for a total of 68 days, ending on February 4, 2008. The Draft EIR considered the Approved Project's potential environmental impacts to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use, Noise, Public Services, Traffic, Utilities, and Global Climate Change. During the public comment period, a Public Meeting was held on January 9, 2008 to allow the public to provide additional input in the form of verbal comments or written comment cars. In addition, three comment letters were entered into the record following the close of the public review period. In total, 171 individual comment letters and public comment cards were received. The public meeting transcript, which affected revisions to Section III.H, Transportation and Circulation, of the Draft EIR, was also reproduced in the Final EIR.

The Final EIR for the Approved Project, including responses to comments received on the Draft EIR, was certified by the City Council on April 15, 2008.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. The Approved Project

The site plan and the conceptual building design for the Approved Project are shown in **Figure 1**, Approved Project – Conceptual Site Plan and **Figure 2**, Approved Project – Conceptual Design.

As illustrated, the EIR analysis for the Approved Project was for a 13-story office tower with approximately 342,409 gross square feet (sf) of primarily office floor area to be constructed within the existing surface parking lot of the DoubleTree Hotel (previously the Radisson Hotel). The Approved Project was slightly reduced from the full building envelope analyzed in the EIR for an actual development approval of 326,974 square feet and 12 stories, with a maximum height of 189.5 feet to the top of the parapet.3 The office tower was connected to a nine-level parking structure with two levels of subterranean parking, seven levels of above-grade structured parking, and providing 1,199 parking spaces. Another 60 surface parking spaces were provided in a surface parking lot adjacent to Centinela Avenue opposite the Project Site, for a total of 1,259 parking spaces provided. The provided parking included replacing in the parking structure for the use of the hotel the 265 spaces in the existing northern on-site surface parking removed to allow for development of the office tower.

The Approved Project Site encompassed approximately 3.7 acres, including the office tower, parking structure, and areas associated with circulation and access improvements. Circulation and access improvements included relocating the existing signalized intersection on Centinela Avenue approximately 200 feet to the west, to the central integrated drive court to the hotel and office tower, where the hotel and office drop off areas, and entrance to the parking structure were to be located. The existing western and eastern driveways were to be retained. Additional circulation improvements including restriping Centinela Avenue, modifying the central medians, and restricting turning movements from the eastern and western driveways, as well as from the surface parking lot opposite the Project Site, to right-turn only. Under the Approved Project, the existing hotel use, including the hotel convention center building, was not modified or redeveloped, and was not a part of the Project.

B. Modified Project

The Site Plan and the conceptual building design for the Modified Project are shown in **Figure 3**, Modified Project – Conceptual Site Plan and **Figure 4**, Modified Project – Conceptual Design.

3 The height of the Approved Project analyzed in the EIR was 189.5 feet to the flat line of the roof and up to 220 feet to the top of a sloping parapet to screen equipment.



SOURCE: Gensler, 2007 and Psoma, 2008

Entrada Creative Office

Figure 1
Approved Project - Conceptual Site Plan

ESA PCR

Entrada Creative Office

SOURCE: KTU+A, 2008

Figure 2
Approved Project - Conceptual Design



SOURCE: Gensler, 2016

Entrada Creative Office

Figure 3
Modified Project - Conceptual Site Plan

ESA PCR

SOURCE: Gensler 2016

Entrada Creative Office

Figure 4
Modified Project - Conceptual Design

ESA PCR

As illustrated, the Modified Project is a 6-story creative office building with approximately 281,209 gross square feet (270,055 leasable square feet) of building area. The office building would be constructed above a seven-level parking structure (with five levels at or above grade and two below containing a total of 1,044 parking spaces. The total building height, inclusive of the office building atop the parking structure, would be 137 feet 6 inches high.

The new office building and parking structure would be constructed within the existing surface parking lot for the adjacent DoubleTree Hotel. Other than the provision of replacement parking and modifications to the Modified Project Site access, the front drive court and loading dock, the existing hotel is not being modified or redeveloped and is not a part of the Project. The Modified Project Site contains about 3.7 acres.

The parking structure would serve the office building and the hotel with a total of 1,044 parking spaces, inclusive of 265 replacement parking spaces that currently serve the hotel. Both tandem and self-parking spaces would be provided, and valets and/or parking attendants would ensure that vehicles parked in tandem spaces are accessible. A valet parking plan is also proposed to address occasional peak demand associated with special events. In addition, the Applicant would continue to provide 60 spaces in an off-site parking lot directly across the street on the south side of Centinela Avenue for hotel employee and overflow parking. With these additional spaces, there would be a combined total of 1,104 parking spaces available to serve the Project and hotel. A total of 42 bicycle parking spaces would be provided, which exceeds the number of spaces required by CCMC Section 17.320.045.A.3.

Site access would be via three driveways on Centinela Avenue. The existing westerly driveway would remain in approximately the same location, but would be reconfigured to better serve the internal roadway. As with the Approved Project, a new center driveway (the “Center Driveway”) would become the main Office and Hotel driveway. It would be signalized and replace most of the access functions of the existing main driveway. The Center Driveway would access the drop off areas for the new office building and the existing hotel. The existing signalized main driveway, located approximately 220 feet east of the new Center Driveway, would remain but the traffic signal control would be relocated to the new Center Driveway.

As with the Approved Project, the Modified Project would provide an easement of approximately 11 feet to allow an additional driving lane along the Centinela Avenue frontage that would become a “free right-turn” lane into the Project driveway and onto Mesmer Avenue. The raised median islands on Centinela Avenue would be modified and reconfigured with new eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes. The existing driveway for this surface lot, located opposite the existing main hotel driveway, would be closed.

The new internal roadway system would connect to the parking structure and loading dock facilities. Two entry/exit points would be provided for the parking structure. The main entry/exit point would be located on the south side of the parking structure and connect to an extension of the Center Driveway. A second entry/exit point would be on the north side of the parking structure, accessed near the westerly driveway entrance. A service/loading dock area would be provided at the southeast end of the parking structure. Trucks and delivery vehicles would access

these facilities via the internal roadway along the north and east sides of the Project Site. Emergency fire truck access would be via the main Center Driveway and westerly driveway. Fire trucks would access the Project by utilizing the internal roadway system bounding the Project. Additional fire truck access would be provided through the landscaped public area located between the Project building and the hotel.

Landscaping would include a row of trees that would be planted along the Centinela Avenue frontage. Additional landscaped areas would be provided at the main entrance to the office building, within the plaza between the Project and the existing hotel conference center, and on the building's main amenity deck and balconies. The landscaping of the front court drive is intended to create a unified appearance for the Project Site while enhancing views from Centinela Avenue.

C. Modified Project Variations

1. Similarities to the Approved Project

The Modified Project is essentially the same as that of the Approved Project. The Approved Project and Modified Project share the following characteristics:

- Both Projects consist of a new office building, with an adjacent parking structure, and enhanced Site access with surface improvements (landscaping, walkways, etc) for an improved interface with the existing hotel complex.

- Both Projects provide an office building with contemporary design on an existing parking lot in an area well suited for the use, with a blending with land use patterns adjacent to the Project Site.

- Both Projects provide required parking in a new on-site structure whose design is integrated into the overall Project design.

- Both Projects provide Site access from three driveways off of Centinela Avenue, including the Center Driveway at a signalized intersection to improve access and circulation. Both Projects would provide an easement and modified medians to accommodate better facilitate turning movements from Centinela Avenue.

- Both Projects enhance Centinela Avenue frontage with landscaping and conversion of a parking lot into an attractive developed Site.

2. Variations from the Approved Project

The Modified Project, which has been reduced in size compared to the Approved Project, has the following variations from the Approved Project:

- The Modified Project reduces the amount of office space from that previously approved from 326,974 square feet to 281,209 square feet for a reduction of 45,765 square feet or approximately 14 percent.

- The height of the building would be reduced by 52.0 feet, from 189.5 feet to 137.5 feet, or a reduction of approximately 29 percent.

- The redesigned parking structure would slightly increase the amount of excavation required for the subsurface structures from 19,285 cubic yards to 21,000 cubic yards.

- The redesign of the building provides a more horizontal appearance to the development in contrast to the relatively more angular verticality of the Proposed Project, while varying building volumes to create visual articulation on the Site.

- The on-Site access movements have been modified to accommodate the new building design, enhance site circulation and provide more complete fire truck access with a fire access roadway along the north side of the Project Site.

D. Permits/Approvals

The Certified EIR was adopted together with the following approvals:

- Certification of a Final EIR and adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program by the Planning Commission pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA);

- Approval of a Parcel Map by the Redevelopment Agency and Planning Commission, subdividing the site into two parcels divided in the middle of the driveway between the hotel and office building with reciprocal easements for vehicle and pedestrian access and parking as necessary;

- Approval of Site Plan Review by the Planning Commission for the addition of an office building and parking structure under CCMC Section 17.540;

- Approval of a Design for Development by the Redevelopment Agency, in accordance with Redevelopment Plan Component Area 1, Section 423, to allow a 190-foot-high office building, with a parapet rising to approximately 220 feet, and a 62-foot-high parking structure;

- Request for a Height Exception approval by the City Council from the 56 foot height limitation under CCMC Section 17.300.025(C)(1), to allow an approximately 220 foot high office building and 62 foot high parking structure, including exceptions for mechanical equipment, parapets, and architectural features;

- Finding by the Redevelopment Agency that the Proposed Project is consistent with the Redevelopment Plan;

- Issuance of all required ministerial permits necessary to implement the Proposed Project (e.g., grading, building, certificate of occupancy, water, sewer, storm drain, etc.) by the City of Culver City;

- Issuance of a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board; and

- Other entitlement approvals from the City and Agency, as required.

The Applicant is seeking new approvals for implementation of the Modified Project. This Addendum has been prepared to support the following further approvals:

- **Site Plan Review Modification:** Site Plan Review Modification pursuant to Chapter 17.595.035 of the Culver City Municipal Code (the "**CCMC**") for the modification of the previously approved Site Plan Review SPR P-2007196.

- **Administrative Use Permit:** Administrative Use Permit pursuant to CCMC Section 17.320.035.C.1.b.ii to permit tandem parking (up to three spaces in depth) for required parking spaces in a non-residential district.

- **Administrative Modification:** Administrative Modification pursuant to CCMC Section 17.550.010.A.5 to allow an increase of at least 2" in the width of parking spaces that are adjoined on either side of its longer dimension by a wall, column, post, or similar obstruction, in lieu of the 10" additional width provided for by Note (1) to Table 3-4 (Parking Space and Drive Aisle Dimensions) in CCMC Section 17.320.035.

- **Tentative Parcel Map:** Tentative Parcel Map (TPM No. 74287) pursuant to CCMC Section 15.10.600 et seq. to subdivide the larger 5.63 acre property into two parcels. The approximately 2.84 acre Parcel 1 would encompass the Project Site. The approximately 2.79 acre Parcel 2 would encompass the existing hotel buildings. Reciprocal easements between Parcels 1 and 2 for vehicular and pedestrian access and parking would be provided.

This page intentionally blank.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

A. Setting Conditions

The setting conditions for the Modified Project are substantially the same today as they were described in the environmental baseline for the environmental evaluations in the previously Certified EIR. The Project Site continues to be the existing parking lot adjacent to the hotel and conference center, which has not been altered. Utilities and services available to serve the Site continue to be available.

The general character and land use of the surrounding area is also similar. The Project Site is located in a generally built out urban area; and new development occurring in the area is in-fill development consistent with previous land designations. In-fill development in the area is an on-going activity anticipated and accounted for in the Certified EIR.

No new development projects are proposed adjacent to the Project Site. The nearest, largest related projects are the Playa Vista (Phase I and Village) and Howard Hughes Center developments, both of which were included in the related projects list for the Certified EIR.

B. Environmental impacts

1. Effects Regarding Topics Analyzed in the EIR

The environmental topics evaluated in the Certified EIR are listed in the following table along with a summary of the Approved Project impacts identified for each topic and a comparison of the relative impacts that would occur under the Modified Project. The listing and comparison is provided in Table 1, Comparison of Approved Project Impacts and Modified Project Impacts. The discussion therein identifies the basis for concluding that impacts due to the minor modifications in the Project design would not be substantial or significant, and would not require further CEQA documentation beyond that provided below.

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF APPROVED PROJECT IMPACTS
AND MODIFIED PROJECT IMPACTS

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
A. Aesthetics		
(1) Visual Character	Construction of the Approved Project would remove existing landscaping from the Project Site, and temporarily introduce visually incompatible construction equipment and materials. Construction impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level through the implementation of Mitigation	As with the Approved Project, construction associated with the Modified Project would temporarily eliminate landscaping and introduce incompatible construction elements, but would be required to implement Mitigation Measure A-1, similarly reducing impacts to a less than significant level.

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
	Measure A-1, which requires routine inspection and prompt removal of materials not approved by the City; and maintenance of walkways and temporary construction barriers in an attractive manner. Once operational, the Approved Project would positively contribute to the visual character of Centinela Avenue and surrounding areas, as well as to the cityscape and skyline, through the implementation of architectural features, quality design, and the implementation of additional landscaping along Centinela Avenue. Although of an inconsistent mass and scale with the residences of the nearby Westchester bluffs, the Approved Project would not directly interface with or degrade the character of these residences because the residences are well upslope and separated from the Project Site by Centinela Avenue and intervening development. Lastly, the Approved Project would comply with all applicable land use plans and regulations to maintain visual character. Therefore, operation of the Approved Project was concluded to result in a less than significant impact to visual resources.	Once operational, the Modified Project would positively contribute to the visual character of the Project Vicinity through mechanisms similar to the Approved Project, including the implementation of architectural features, quality design, and additional landscaping to the Project Site. Appendix A, Visual Analysis Supplement, included below, provides supplementary visual analysis information to the Certified EIR. The Appendix includes new photo-simulations of the Modified Project Site from four view locations of the 10 view locations that were previously analyzed in the Certified EIR. The selected view locations are considered the most representative of changes in visual conditions. They include simulations from three locations on the Westchester Bluffs on one location from the local street network. The photo-simulations illustrate views of the Project Site with implementation of the Approved Project and the Modified Project for comparative purposes. As indicated in photo-simulations, the change in the Project design has resulted in a lower building height, and reduced massing particularly as seen from Centinela Avenue and the Westchester bluffs. The height of the building directly facing Centinela Avenue would be substantially reduced, the varied shapes for the office building and parking structure would add visual interest to the Project Site, and the new building configuration that angles back from the street would reduce the perceived mass of the building compared to the Approved Project. The reduction in building height and mass when compared to the Approved Project would reduce the already less than significant impacts to the visual quality of the Project Vicinity. As a result, as with the Approved Project, the Modified Project would result in a less than significant impact to visual character. Overall, impacts would be less than under the Modified Project.
(2) View Obstruction	Views of scenic resources (skyline views across the Los Angeles Basin, Individual and clusters of high-rise buildings, Santa Monica Mountains) are available from elevated vantage points to the south and west (e.g., Westchester Bluffs). Although identified as a prominent feature on the intermediate skyline, at 13 stories and 189.5 feet above grade (220 feet to the top of the parapet), the Approved Project was ultimately concluded to not substantially obstruct views of valued scenic resources from these vantage points. The Approved Project would primarily obstruct views of the Fox Hills Mall and I-405 freeway corridor, which are not considered valued scenic resources. Therefore, the Approved Project was concluded to result in a less than significant impact with regard to view obstruction.	The Modified Project represents a reduced building height when compared to the Approved Project (i.e.,137.5 feet vs. 189.5 feet) and variations in the design, and massing of the development . As noted above, Appendix A below includes photo-simulations of the Modified Project Site from three bluff locations and one local street location. The photo-simulations from the Westchester Bluff locations include simulations of the Approved Project and the Modified Project placed into a panoramic view from the bluffs and also into a more direct view of the Project Site. The panoramic views provide a general sense of extent of view blockage against a backdrop of the long-range viewing field available to those looking out from the bluffs. The more direct views from the bluffs provide a narrower view that better represents relative building heights in the Project vicinity and how the Approved Project and the Modified Project would appear in a focused view of the Project Site. As indicated in the photo-simulations; • The reduction in building heights reduces the prominence of the building against the distant horizon. Whereas the Approved Project rose above the distant horizon, the top of the Modified Project does not notably extend

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
		above the backdrop of the distant hills. This reduces the prominence of the development within the view setting. • The Modified Project is a bit wider in appearance. The added building width has a negligible effect on the degree of view blockage; • The Modified Project presents a more horizontal building appearance in contrast to the more vertical appearance of the Approved Project. As such, the building is more akin to other larger buildings interspersed throughout the view field. As shown in Appendix A and the images from the four view locations that were analyzed in the Certified EIR, the lower building heights and revised design would be less visually prominent with a more horizontal appearance. As with the Approved Project, the extent of the visual field that would be obscured by the Modified Project would not be substantial. For the reasons stated above, the Modified Project would reduce the visual impacts from those of the Approved Project. Impacts of the Modified Project would also be less than significant.
(3) Light and Glare	With regard to light and glare, the Approved Project was concluded to result in a less than significant impact through adherence to applicable lighting regulations of Culver City Municipal Code (CCMC) Section 17.300.040A and the provision of perimeter walls on the parking structure for vehicle headlights.	The Modified Project would have similar or reduced lighting effects and would also have a less than significant impact due to the distance from light sensitive residential receptors, adherence to applicable lighting regulations of the CCMC, and the provision of perimeter walls on the parking structure which would shield vehicle headlights. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and similar to those of the Approved Project.
B. Air Quality		
a) Construction Emissions	Prior to mitigation, the Approved Project resulted in emissions levels below the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) daily regional significance thresholds for construction impacts with regard to VOC, CO, SOx, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. Impacts regarding NOx exceeded the threshold. Therefore, construction mitigation measures B-1 through B-5 were required to reduce potential construction impacts on air emissions. Incorporation of the mitigation measures for construction activities reduced the NOx impact to below the significance threshold. Localized impacts from construction activities were below the significance thresholds for all localized emissions. Thus, the Approved Project would not generate significant impacts during short term construction activities with incorporation of mitigation measures.	With a generally similar development program, the Modified Project would result in construction impacts similar to those of the Approved Project. However, the amount of excavation for the Modified Project would be increased slightly resulting in slight increases in the use of excavation equipment and the maximum number of haul trips per day. Emissions from heavy duty diesel engines, such as those installed in on- and off-road construction equipment are subject to federal standards which are generally more stringent for newer engine models than those considered in the analysis of the Approved Project. In addition, California Air Resources Board (CARB) regulations require the retrofit or retirement of older, higher polluting equipment with newer engines subject to stricter emission standards than those used to calculate emissions for the Certified EIR. Generally, the improvements in equipment emission standards in the revised construction time-frame would be expected to offset the minor increase in excavation activity. However, due to the Approved Project's exceedance of the NOx threshold, and the slight increase in construction activity with the Modified Project, the Modified Project's regional and localized construction impacts were evaluated taking into account the

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
		increase in excavation and the improvements in equipment efficiency that would occur with the completion of development in 2018 in contrast to 2009. The revised calculations are provided in Appendix C, Air Quality Analysis Supplement, below. As indicated in the supplementary air quality analysis, the regional construction emissions of the Modified Project would be less than those of the Approved Project, primarily due to the improved efficiency of construction equipment and vehicles; and less than the significance thresholds in regard to VOC, NOx, CO, Sox, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. Constituents would be reduced as follows: VOC, -8 pounds per day (ppd); NOx, -48 ppd; CO -347 ppd; PM_{10} -3 ppd; and $PM_{2.5}$ -2/5 ppd. SOx emissions would be similar. The Approved Project had impacts that were significant for NOx, (104 ppd v. a threshold of 100 ppd) but less than significant for the remaining constituents. The Approved Project was therefore assigned mitigation measures that reduced the NOx to 99 ppd, making the impact less than significant. The NOx emissions for the Modified Project would be less than the significance threshold, and less than those of the Approved Project, both prior to and after Mitigation. The Approved Project included five mitigation measures to reduce the significant impact. While the mitigation measures would no longer be required, they consist of best management practices under current sustainability policies for reducing air quality emissions and energy consumption and are still recommended to further reduce air quality impacts.
b. Operations Emissions	The Approved Project would not result in a 1- or 8-hour CO hot spot. As such, sensitive receptors would not be exposed to significant pollutant emissions during operational activities. The Approved Project would result in less than significant impacts on sensitive receptors. However, the Approved Project would exceed the SCAQMD regional significance threshold for nitrogen oxide (NOx), even with incorporation of mitigation measures. As such, operational impacts to regional air quality for the Approved Project would be significant and unavoidable with respect to NOx. By applying SCAQMD's cumulative air quality impact methodology, it was assumed that because peak daily emissions of operation-related pollutants would exceed regional NOx significance thresholds, implementation of the Approved Project would result in an addition of criteria pollutants such that cumulative impacts, in conjunction with related projects in the region, would occur. Therefore, the emissions of NOx generated by operation of the	The Modified Project would result in decreased office space; and therefore area and mobile source emissions would be less than those of the Approved Project. The net trip generation is expected to decrease from 3,442 daily trips under the Approved Project to 2,880 daily trips under the Modified Project, or an approximately 16 percent reduction. With the retirement of older cars in the private-owned State-wide fleet and introduction of more energy efficient, lower emitting cars, mobile emissions at build out would be further decreased from those analyzed in the Certified EIR. Impacts of the Modified Project would be further reduced from those identified for the Certified EIR through improvements in energy efficiency associated with building features/fixtures. Subsequent to preparation of the Certified EIR numerous regulatory provisions and improvements in standard building practices have been implemented that reduce air quality emissions (e.g. the City Water Conservation and Water Supply Shortage Program and Mandatory Green Building Program; and the State's California Green Building Standards Code. The levels of regional pollutant emission identified

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
	Approved Project would result in a cumulatively significant and unavoidable impact. All other non-attainment criteria pollutants would not contribute to a cumulative impact.	for the Approved Project are substantially less than the significance threshold levels for all contaminates except for NOx. The Approved Project was calculated to produce 20 ppd less than the threshold for VOC, 154 ppd less for CO, 148 ppd less for Sox, 89 ppd less for PM_{10} and 43 ppd less for $PM_{2.5}$. The Approved Project's regionally significant impact for NOx emissions was 65 ppd, or 10 ppd more than the significance threshold of 55 ppd. Of the 65 ppd total for the Approved Project, 49 ppd were due to mobile emissions. The Modified Project's reduction in the number of trips alone would eliminate 14% of the NOx emissions, or seven of the 10 ppd of the threshold exceedance. The improved energy efficiencies noted above would further reduce the impact, thus nearing if not falling below the significance threshold. Therefore, for Modified Project would provide a larger contribution to avoiding the significant NOx impact of the Approved Project. The levels of CO concentration identified in the localized analysis in the Certified EIR were all substantially below the significance thresholds. The reduction in trips associated with the Modified Project result even less CO emissions than the Approved Project and remain less than significant.
c) Toxic Air Contaminants	Construction-related toxic air contaminant (TAC) emissions from heavy-duty equipment operations would be of limited short-term nature, without residual effects. The proposed office use does not generate industrial manufacturing contaminants and does not require extensive use of idling diesel trucks. On-Site stationary source equipment would be required to comply with SCAQMD rules and regulation that control toxic air emissions. Impacts of the Approved Project would be less than significant.	Construction duration and intensity under the modified Project would remain generally unchanged, and impacts would be similar. As stated above, emission standards for new and/or retrofitted construction equipment results in lower diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions than considered in the Certified EIR. As the Modified Project would develop similar types of land uses as the Approved Project, operational impacts would remain less than significant under the Modified Project and similar to those of the Approved Project.
d) Objectionable odors	The Approved Project does not include any uses identified by the SCAQMD as being associated with odors. Impacts with regard to objectionable odors would be less than significant.	As with the Approved Project, the Modified Project would not include uses identified by the SCAQMD as sources of substantial odors. Thus, impacts with regard to objectionable odors would be less than significant, and similar to the Approved Project.
e) SCAQMD Air Quality Policy Analysis	Operation of the Approved Project is consistent with applicable air quality plans including the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), as the Approved Project would not delay the attainment of an air quality standard as it would fall within and not conflict with the AQMP's growth projections, implements feasible air quality mitigation measures, and is consistent with the AQMP's land use policies. As noted below, Project impacts on air quality during both construction and operations phases would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures.	The Modified Project is largely the same as the Approved Project in terms of location, and land use. The number of jobs would be slightly reduced. As described below, its construction and operations impacts would be less than significant, prior to mitigation and would be less than those of the Proposed Project. The Modified Project would also remain within and not conflict with AQMP's land use policy and growth projections.

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
C. Cultural Resources		
a) Archaeological resource	A relatively dense population of archeological resources was previously identified in the Project vicinity. The Approved Project would require excavation to a depth of approximately 20 feet below ground surface to accommodate two levels of subterranean parking. As a result, the Certified EIR recommended Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-9, which require that a Native American monitor and qualified archeologist and monitor ground-disturbing activities, redirecting construction and recording any discovered materials in accordance with an approved treatment plan and data recovery plan, and the application of state and federal regulations should human remains be discovered. With the implementation of identified mitigation measures, the Approved Project would have a less than significant impact on archaeological resources. However, in light of potentially significant impacts associated with related projects, the Approved Project's contribution to impacts on cultural resources was concluded to be cumulatively considerable and a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.	The Modified Project would require similar excavation to that of the Approved Project, with two below ground parking levels of approximately the same depth. The overall volume of excavation would be increased slightly. Since the Modified Project proposes two levels of subterranean parking similar to the Approved Project, the implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-9, would reduce direct impacts to a less than significant level. However, as with the Approved Project, impacts in association with related projects would be cumulatively considerable, and a significant and unavoidable impact would result. As a result, impacts under the Modified Project would be similar to the Approved Project.
b) Paleontological resources	A relatively dense population of paleontological resources was previously identified in the Project vicinity. The Approved Project would require excavation to a depth of approximately 20 feet below ground surface. As a result, the Certified EIR recommended Mitigation Measures C-10 through C-15, which require that a qualified paleontologist perform inspections of excavation greater than 5 feet in depth. These measures also require that the paleontologist temporarily divert construction activities if a fossil is found, and that any fossils encountered and recovered shall be prepared to the point of identification and catalogued before they are donated to their final repository. With the implementation of identified mitigation measures, the Approved Project was concluded to have a less than significant impact on paleontological resources. That said, in light of potentially significant impacts associated with related projects, the Proposed Project's contribution to impacts on cultural resources is considered to be cumulatively considerable and a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact	The Modified Project would require similar excavation to that of the Approved Project, with two below ground parking levels of approximately the same depth. The overall volume of excavation would be increased slightly. As with the Approved Project, the implementation of Mitigation Measures C-10 through C-15, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. However, as with the Approved Project, impacts in association with related projects would be cumulatively considerable, and a significant and unavoidable impact would result. As a result, impacts under the Modified Project would be similar to the Approved Project.

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
D. Greenhouse Gas Emissions		
a) Contributions to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and consistency with Plans/Policies for reducing such emissions.	Chapter III.J, Global Climate Change, of the Certified EIR evaluated the Approved Project's contributions to GHG emissions. The Certified EIR indicated that the Approved Project would emit 9,169 MTCO2e per year of greenhouse gas emissions. The analysis documented numerous Project Design Features that would reduce potential emissions of greenhouse gases and provided cross-references to Mitigation Measures presented in other sections of the EIR that would further reduce greenhouse gas emissions. These include Mitigation Measures B-7 regarding the use of energy efficient light and devices in outdoor areas; H-7 regarding implementation of a Transportation Demand Management Plan; I.1-1 regarding water efficient irrigation and I.1-2 regarding the use of drought-tolerant vegetation. The analysis concluded that the Project would have a negligible contribution to statewide emissions, levels that would be lower than business as usual; and that the Approved Project would be consistent with California Action Team Report Strategies for reducing emissions and reaching reduction targets established by the State.	The Modified Project would result in decreased office space; and therefore area and mobile source emissions would be less than the Approved Project. The net trip generation, the greatest contributor to GHG, is expected to decrease from 3,442 daily trips under the Approved Project to 2,880 daily trips under the Modified Project. Of the 9,169 MTCO2e generated by the Approved Project 7,214 MTCO2e or approximately 79 percent is associated with mobile sources and that would be reduced proportionately by the reduction in daily trips. The Modified Project's reduction in the number of trips alone would eliminate 14% of the GHG emissions, or 1,009 MTCO2e for mobile sources alone. Further, impacts of the Modified Project would be further reduced from those identified for the Certified EIR through improvements in energy efficiency associated with automobiles and building features/fixtures. Subsequent to preparation of the Certified EIR numerous State, regional (SCAG) and local Culver City initiatives have been established to reduce GHG emissions. In particular, the City enacted the Water Conservation and Water Supply Shortage Program (CCMC, Chapter 2.03 in 2009) and Mandatory Green Building Program in June 2009. Further, the State has enacted and updated the California Green Building Standards Code, which establishes mandatory measures for energy efficiency, water conservation, material conservation, planning and design and overall environmental quality. Furthermore, State mandated Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) require that set percentages of energy produced or imported into California (based on the year) come from non-fossil fueled sources, thereby reducing the GHG-intensity of energy consumed by the Project. Also, SCAG has integrated the Regional Transportation Plan with their Sustainable Communities Strategy to provide an integrated approach for protecting, expanding and maximizing the productivity of the region's transportation system through implementation of a "Smart Land Use" strategy focusing new growth in High Quality Transit Areas, and implementation of policies that further reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
E. Hydrology/Water Quality		
a) Stormwater flows	The Approved Project was anticipated to increase impervious surface area on the Project Site; however, 95 percent of the ¾-inch stormwater flows were proposed to be directed to structural best-management practices (BMPs) facilities (i.e., bioretention areas) in accordance with Chapter 5.05 of the Culver City Municipal Code (CCMC). Specifically, the Approved Project proposed to direct all stormwater flow to two existing drainage channels located at the northwest and northeast corners of the Project Site. The structural BMPs were concluded to maintain existing flow rates and the remaining capacity of	The Modified Project has a similar Site Plan to the Approved Project with a similar distribution of hardscaped and landscaped areas. The drainage patterns under the Modified Project would be similar to the Approved Project, with all drainage continuing to ultimately flow to the Centinela Drain and Ballona Creek. Further, the Modified Project would be required to implement BMPs in accordance with applicable water quality regulations, including a Site-specific SUSMP and Chapter 5.05 of the CCMC, both of which require excess stormwater flows to be retained on-Site. Implementation of structural BMPs and regulatory approval to discharge to the Centinela Drain would ensure impacts from

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
	the 84-inch Centinela Drain ultimately receiving runoff from the Project Site. Therefore, additional detention was not recommended and impacts were concluded to be less than significant.	stormwater flows are less than significant, and similar to those of the Approved Project.
b) Stormwater Quality	No on- or off-site water quality treatment systems are in place to treat runoff from the Project Site. Construction and operation of the Approved Project would occur in accordance with applicable regulations pertaining to water quality, including preparation and implementation of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit (NPDES) Stormwater Pollutant Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and Wet Weather Erosion Control Plan (WWECP) is during the rainy season, during construction. The SWPPP would outline temporary BMPs to maintain water quality in runoff flows. Operation of the Approved Project was concluded to increase the amount of impervious surface area on the Project Site. To negate any increase in pollutants, structural (e.g., bioretention basins) and non-structural (e.g., stenciling drain inlets) BMPs were proposed in accordance with Chapter 5.05 of the CCMC and the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements of the NPDES. These structural BMPs were concluded to maintain design flows and protect water quality reduce pollutants in the stormwater discharges from the Proposed Project Site to the maximum extent practicable to avoid, if not eliminate, a net increase in polluted runoff. Therefore, the Approved Project was concluded to result in a less than significant impact to stormwater quality.	Construction of the Modified Project would be required to implement temporary BMPs in accordance with applicable regulations, including preparation of a SWPPP. Implementation of BMPs in accordance with the SWPPP would ensure construction impacts to stormwater quality are less than significant. Like the Approved Project, operation of the Modified Project would increase the impervious surface area on the Project Site. Sources of pollutants would be essentially the same as under the Approved Project since the proposed uses (office building rooftops, access surface areas) would not materially change. Structural and non-structural BMPs would be required in accordance with Site-specific SUSMP, as approved by applicable regulatory agencies. The SUSMP would demonstrate BMPs capable of maintaining runoff flows and reducing the potential for new sources of pollutants to be introduced to stormwater flows. The implementation of BMPs could possibly result in benefits to stormwater quality as none are currently in place on portions of the Project Site. Therefore, impacts to stormwater quality would be less than significant and similar to the Approved Project.
F. Land Use/Planning		
a) Land Use Compatibility	The Approved Project would not cause significant physical impacts on any of the surrounding commercial and industrial land uses within the small outlying portion of Culver City in which the Project Site is located, due to the commercial and industrial nature of these uses (i.e., adjacent 12-story Radisson Hotel and nearby 3-story office building). However, because of the unique location of the Project Site with respect to the I-405 Freeway, the City of Los Angeles is located to the northwest, south, southeast, and west of the Project Site. The Approved Project would be compatible and consistent with the adjacent retail/commercial uses to the north, the light industrial uses west of the Project Site across Centinela Avenue, and the Howard Hughes Regional Center to the	The Modified Project proposes similar land use as the Approved Project. It includes an office building and parking structure with generally similar Site design. However, the office building would have reduced height and massing. The office building would be six stories atop 5 stories of structured parking, with a height of 137.5 feet height as compared to 12 stories and 189.5 feet under the Approved Project. By reducing the building's overall height and providing a design with varied horizontal volumes (i.e. the office building and parking structure, respectively) the Modified Project would improve compatibility with surrounding uses. By developing an office building, the Modified Project would continue to contribute to commercial and industrial development representing the regional node around the Sepulveda Boulevard and Centinela Avenue intersection, including similar commercial uses permitted in the Project vicinity by the City of Los

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
	south. It was also concluded that the Approved Project would not be an incompatible use to the single-family residences along the top of the Westchester Bluff because of the elevated position of the residences, distance to the Project Site (550 feet at their closest point), and the lack of shared street access between the Project Site and residences that could result in cut-through traffic. Further, the Approved Project would be consistent with the commercial and industrial development representing the regional node around the Sepulveda Boulevard and Centinela Avenue intersection, including similar commercial uses permitted in the Project vicinity by the City of Los Angeles, such as the Howard Hughes Center. Therefore, the Approved Project would result in a less than significant impact to land use compatibility.	Angeles, such as the Howard Hughes Center. Development would not divide an established community as it would be infill development that would be consistent with and would support the surrounding residential, commercial, and low-rise industrial uses. Therefore, as with the Approved Project, the Modified Project would not result in substantial conflicts with surrounding uses due to an incompatible interface, and a less than significant impact would result. Due to the Modified Project's reduced height and mass, impacts associated with land use compatibility would be less than under the Approved Project.
b) Land Use Plans	The Approved Project would be consistent with the commercial uses set forth in the Commercial-Regional Center designation in the Land Use Element of the Culver City General Plan. The Commercial-Regional Center designation is applied to existing retail, office, and business park uses, and could be applied to entertainment, hotel, retail and office uses of similar scale. The Approved Project would be compatible in scale with the adjacent Radisson Hotel, and similar in scale with office uses in Howard Hughes Center and Corporate Pointe, and with the regional commercial office and mixed-use center in the Sepulveda Boulevard/Centinela Avenue node. The Approved Project would also be consistent with the CCMC and the Commercial Regional Business Park (CRB) zoning designation in the City's Zoning Map. At 189.5 feet, the Approved Project would exceed the 56 foot height which characterizes the Commercial-Regional Center designation and is also applicable in the City's CRB Zone. The Project Site, however, is substantially separated from the main body of Culver City's designated Commercial-Regional Center by Sepulveda Boulevard and the I-405 freeway. As such, the high-rise nature of the Approved Project would be more in keeping with the adjacent regional commercial center located within the City of Los Angeles and would be similar in scale to Howard Hughes Center and the existing 12-story Radisson Hotel. With approval of a height exception pursuant to CCMC Section 17.300.025.C.1, in accordance	The Modified Project would be consistent with the commercial uses set forth in the Commercial-Regional Center designation in the Land Use Element of the Culver City General Plan. The Commercial-Regional Center designation is applied to existing retail, office, and business park uses, and could be applied to entertainment, hotel, retail and office uses of similar scale. As under the Approved Project, the Project Site is substantially separated from the main body of Culver City's and the high-rise nature of the Modified Project would be more in keeping with the adjacent regional commercial center located within the City of Los Angeles and would be similar in scale to Howard Hughes Center and the existing 12-story DoubleTree Hotel. As with the Approved Project, the Modified Project would be consistent with the CCMC by placing an office uses in the CRB Zone, which permits office uses by right. With a height of 137.5 feet the Modified Project would exceed the 56 foot height limit permitted by right in the CRB Zone, however the Modified Project height would be lower than that of the Approved Project. With the previous approval of a height exception pursuant to CCMC Section 17.300.025.C.1 and the Design for Development, both of which remain in effect, the proposed height of the Modified Project would be consistent with the City's Zoning Code. As with the Approved Project, the Modified Project would be consistent with the General Plan designations, as well as General Plan goals to contribute to the economic health of the City. As discussed above, the Modified Project would be compatible with adjacent uses. With regard to the Circulation Element, the Modified Project would be similar to the Approved Project, in regards to objectives to reduce traffic congestion. Even with implementation all feasible mitigation measures to reduce traffic congestion, an increase in traffic flow with significant unavoidable traffic

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
	with a Design for Development approved by the Redevelopment Agency, the Approved Project would be substantially consistent with the land use, setbacks, pedestrian access, outdoor lighting, landscaping, and parking requirements of the CMCC. As the General Plan's Commercial-Regional Center designation reflects the Project Site's current CRB Zone, approval of the height exception would resolve any height inconsistencies between the Approved Project, the Zoning Code, and the goals and objectives of the General Plan. The Approved Project is also consistent with the applicable policies of the General Plan Land Use Element related to economic diversity and the development of regional commercial centers to that contribute to the economic health of the City and adequately mitigating impacts to nearby residential neighborhoods. The Approved Project is also consistent with goals and polices to allow regional and community centers to upgrade and expand in response to market demand, as well as with the goals and policies of the Noise, Open Space, and Public Safety Elements. With regard to the Circulation Element, even with the implementation all feasible mitigation measures to reduce traffic congestion, the Approved Project would not meet objectives to reduce traffic congestion due to an increase in traffic flow and a significant and unavoidable traffic impact at the intersection of Howard Hughes Parkway and Sepulveda Boulevard. The Project Site is located within the designated Slauson Sepulveda Component Area No. 1 of the now-expired Culver City Redevelopment Plan. The Approved Project would be consistent with the primary goals of the Redevelopment Plan to eliminate blight and revitalize designated redevelopment areas. The approval of a Design for Development Plan by the (now-dissolved) Redevelopment Agency would ensure that building height, parking, design, and setbacks, among other design criteria are consistent with the Redevelopment Plan. The Approved Project would be consistent with the applicable goals and policies of the Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG)	impacts would occur. However, under the Modified Project, Project traffic volumes and impacts would be reduced. Subsequent to the Certification of the EIR, SCAG updated the then-current 2004 RTP and CGV to the 2016 Regional Transportation Plan-Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 RTP/SCS). The goals and policies of the 2016 RTP/SCS are similar to the previous planning documents, presenting the transportation vision for the Los Angeles region through the year 2040. With the same office uses, the Modified Project would not add residential or housing growth, and would add a number of jobs to the City and the region. Using the methodology provided in the Certified EIR (i.e., one employee per 250 square feet of floor area), the Modified Project would generate an estimated 1,125 employees (compared to 1,370 employees under the Approved Project). As such, the Modified Project would contribute a slightly reduced level of employment growth, continuing to be within the growth projections evaluated in the Certified EIR. As a previously approved project, the previously identified employment would be accounted for in RTP/SCS updates. (It may be noted that the 2016 RTP/SCS anticipates continued employment growth within Culver City, with an estimated 2012 employment of 44,100 increase to 53,000 by 2040).[4] Further, the City's General Plan 2013–2021 Housing Element indicates that the City has sufficient land capacity to build new housing that may be needed in the future to accommodate new residents as a result of increased employment opportunities; not requiring conversion of land to meet housing needs. The Modified Project would also be consistent with the general land use and growth principles established in the 2004 RTP (which are still relevant in the 2016 RTP/SCS). As with the Approved Project, the Modified Project would contribute to the fulfillment of policies to: maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region; preserve and ensure a sustainable regional transportation system; protect the environment and health of our residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation, among other goals and policies. Where the CGV established 2% Growth Areas, the 2016 RTP/SCS establishes High-Quality Transit Areas (HQTA), which are intended for the majority of new housing and job growth to maintain the jobs-housing balance and provide more opportunity for transit-oriented development. This overall land use development pattern supports and complements a proposed transportation network that emphasizes system preservation, active transportation, and transportation demand management measures. The HQTA takes into account a slightly larger geography, inclusive of the former 2% Growth Area and the Project Site.

4 SCAG, 2016/2014 Demographics & Growth Forecast, Current Context, Table 11, Jurisdictional Forecast 2040.)

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
	Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG), Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and Compass Growth Vision (CGV), many of which were adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Specifically, the Approved Project would be consistent with population and employment forecasts, policies to balance housing and employment opportunities, policies to encourage a pattern of uses which reduce infrastructure costs and encourage the use of transit through infill development in proximity to transit options, and policies to preserve aesthetic, archeological, biological, and paleontological resources, and policies that seek to minimize air quality and noise impacts. The Project Site is also located within a designated 2% Strategy Opportunity Area. Therefore, impacts on land use consistency would be less than significant.	Therefore, the Modified Project would be consistent with applicable land use polices and Zoning code, and a less than significant would result. Therefore, impacts under the Modified Project would be similar to the Approved Project.
c) Land Use Plans With the Purpose of Avoiding or Mitigating an Environmental Effect	As discussed above, the Approved Project would be consistent with SCAG's RTP and CGV, regional plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding and mitigating environmental effects to air quality, land use planning, and transportation.	As discussed above, the Modified Project would also be consistent with SCAG's 2004 RTP (and it may be noted, also consistent with the 2016 RTP/SCS), a regional plan adopted for the purpose of avoiding and mitigating environmental effects to air quality, land use planning, and transportation.
G. Noise		
a) Short-Term Construction Noise	Even with incorporation of identified mitigation measures, construction activities associated with the Approved Project were concluded to result in a temporary significant and unavoidable increase in noise levels at one sensitive receptor, Receptor R1 (i.e. residences west of the Project Site on the Westchester Bluffs) during the site demolition stage and initial stages of site grading/excavation activities. Construction noise levels at Receptor R2 (nearest residential uses east of the Project Site, across the I-405), Receptor R3 (the DoubleTree Hotel), and Receptor R4 (nearest school, located 900 feet south of the Project Site) were concluded to be less than significant. Mitigation Measure F-1 would preclude construction during noise-sensitive time periods, consistent with both Culver City and City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinances. Noise level reductions attributable to Mitigation Measures F-2 to F-4 would reduce noise impacts to the extent practicable. In the unlikely event pile driving is used, Mitigation Measure F-5 would provide a minimum 10 dBA noise reduction (a substantial reduction). However, even with mitigation, temporary noise impacts associated with on-site construction were considered significant	The analysis of construction noise is based on the greatest level of noise that could occur under maximum construction activity. The analysis is based on the mix of construction equipment, the logistics of operating the equipment on a constrained construction site and the maximum amount of construction activity that could occur along the edges of the construction area. These conditions would be generally similar between the Approved Project and the Modified Project. Both would use similar equipment mixes with similar on-Site equipment activity. The additional excavation may require a few more hours of equipment use on a small number of construction days, but the added use of equipment would occur at varied locations within the Site and varied times of the day, thus not exceeding the maximum noise levels identified in the Certified EIR. While the total amount of building volume would be reduced, thus reducing the amount of construction activity over the duration of construction time, the maximum daily noise levels would be similar. Mitigation Measures F-1 through F-5 would continue to be applicable to the Modified Project**.** Impacts of the Modified Project due to construction noise would be similar to those of the Approved Project and, as was the case with the Approved Project, could potentially be significant at Receptor R1. The Modified Project would also result in noise impacts from off-site construction related traffic, including haul trucks, delivery trucks, and

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
	and unavoidable, at both the project- and cumulative-level. In addition to the on-site construction noise, haul trucks, delivery trucks, and construction workers would require access to the Project Site throughout the Approved Project's construction period. Estimated noise levels due to haul truck movements fell well below and did not exceed significance thresholds. Therefore, noise impacts to off-site sensitive receptors from off-site construction traffic would be less than significant.	construction workers vehicles. The small increase in haul trips (20 inbound and 20 outbound trips) would amount to a small increase in traffic at any one location and time with the trips distributed over the work day. Therefore, potential increases in noise due to the added trips would be negligible. Further the noise levels associated with the Approved Project's off-site construction traffic were substantially below significance thresholds. Therefore, off-Site noise levels due to construction of the Modified Project would be similar to those of the Approved Project and less than significant.
b) Long-Term Operational Noise	The Approved Project resulted in a less than significant impact with regard to operational noise. Project operational traffic would increase noise levels at off-site noise-sensitive uses in the Project area. However, increases in ambient noise levels due to operational traffic would not exceed the established thresholds. Operational traffic-related noise impacts would be less than significant. Project operational activities such as mechanical equipment, loading dock and refuse collection areas, parking structure, landscape maintenance equipment and domestic power tools, and emergency rooftop helipad would increase noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive receptors in the Project vicinity; however, the noise generation would not exceed established thresholds. Therefore, the Project's noise impacts on existing development from operational on-site noise sources would be less than significant. The Project was determined to result in a less than significant impact with regard to consistency with local general plan or noise ordinances, or applicable standards of other agencies with regard to operational noise.	The Modified Project would be reduced in size and activity from the Approved Project. The net Project-generated traffic would be reduced from 3,442 daily trips to 2,880 daily trips (an approximate 14-percent reduction). Thus, the Modified Project would result in less noise from vehicles than the Approved Project. Noise impacts from on-site noise sources would be similar to the Approved Project. Noise associated with mechanical equipment, loading dock and refuse collection areas, parking structure, landscape maintenance equipment and domestic power tools, would be less than significant. Therefore, operational noise impacts under the Modified Project would be less than significant, and similar to the Approved Project.
c) Site Compatibility	The project site is exposed to noise levels of 70 dBA, CNEL, and would be located within Noise Zone B "Compatible with Mitigation." Mitigation Measure F-6 is required to ensure that building construction achieves an interior noise environment of no greater than 50 dBA, CNEL. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.	It is assumed that office workers might be exposed to similar or greater than those identified in the Certified EIR. Similar to the Approved Project, Mitigation Measure F-6 would be needed to ensure that building construction achieves an interior noise environment of 50 dBA, CNEL. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and similar to the Approved Project.
H. Public Services		
a) Fire protection	The Project Site is approximately 0.92 mile west of the closest Culver City Fire Department (CCFD) fire station: Fire Station 3 at 6030 Bristol Parkway. Thus, the Approved Project would meet the minimum fire company response distance criteria of five minutes. In addition, a number of traffic mitigation	The Modified Project would not alter the site location, and proposes a reduced building height (6 stories and 136.5 feet vs. 12 stories and 189.5 feet) and development program (281,209 square feet vs 326,974 square feet) than the Approved Project. Based on methodology (fire standards methodology) utilized in the Certified EIR for estimated employment, the Modified Project could

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
	measures to address traffic congestion and maintain adequate access in the area would be implemented during construction and operation of the Approved Project. Further, the Approved Project would implement design features in accordance with the City's Fire Code. The Approved Project's 342,409 square feet of office spaces could support as many as 3,424 employees estimated to generate 31 incidents and 70 unit responses on an annual basis, which would represent a less than one percent increase in incidents within the City. Therefore, the Approved Project would not have a significant impact with respect to fire company emergency response and response times. The Approved Project would increase the demand for CCFD personnel, equipment, and services, and the CCFD indicated that additional personnel may be required to adequately maintain current service levels. The increase in general fund revenue would fund additional resource needs. With mandatory compliance with the Fire Code and other applicable requirements, the Approved Project's impact on fire protection services would be less than significant.	support as many as 2,812 employees (compared to 3,424 employees), which would be estimated to generate 25 incidents and 55 unit responses (compared to 31 incidents and 70 unit responses under the Approved Project). Demand for fire protection services are attributable to the amount and type of development, response time and distance, fire flows, hydrant size and locations, access and potential for use or storage of hazardous materials. Regarding response times, as with the Approved Project, Fire Station 3 at a distance of 0.92 mile would continue to serve the Modified Project and would meet the response time criteria of 5 minutes. In addition, the Modified Project would have reduced daily and peak hour trip generation than the Approved Project contributing less traffic to the roadway system during emergency responses. Thus, impacts with respect to fire company emergency response would be less than the Approved Project and less than significant. Regarding fire flows, hydrants, and emergency access provisions, the Modified Project would be subject to similar regulations and ordinances as the Approved Project regarding fire safety and fire prevention features, including the City's Fire Code and other requirements identified by the CCFD. The Modified Project would enhance Project Site circulation for fire vehicles. As with the Approved Project, the increase in general fund revenues could be expected to meet additional resource needs attributable to the Modified Project. Therefore, impacts related to fire protection services would be less than significant. And, similar to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would not trigger the need for new or expanded fire facilities that would cause significant physical impacts on the environment. Therefore, the Modified Project would not result in new or substantially more severe impacts.
b) Police protection	The increase in traffic caused by the Approved Project would have the potential to increase Culver City Police Department (CCPD) response times for emergency and routine calls. However, impacts on CCPD response times as a result of Project-generated traffic would be less than significant. The continued use of emergency vehicle sirens, motorcycle units, alternate response routes, and multiple station/jurisdiction responses when necessary, are expected to support adequate emergency access and response, as occurs under existing deficient roadway conditions in many areas of the affected jurisdictions. The intensification of development under the Approved Project would increase the demand for CCPD police protection services. The occupancy of the office tower would increase the daytime population on site by approximately 1,370 employees. Based on the ratio of approximately one CCPD	As with the Approved Project, the Modified Project would increase traffic on area roadways**.** However, the continued use of emergency vehicle sirens, motorcycle units, alternate response routes, and multiple station/jurisdiction responses when necessary, are expected to support adequate emergency access and response, as occurs under existing deficient roadway conditions in many areas of the affected jurisdictions. Therefore, the Modified Project would result in a less than significant impact with regard to police response time. As with the Approved Project, the intensification of uses on the Project Site is anticipated to increase the demand for CCPD police protection services. However, as the Modified Project represents a reduced development program when compared to the Approved Project (281,209 square feet vs 326,974 square feet), it is also anticipated to result in the demand for less than one additional officer. In addition, the Modified Project would incorporate security features similar to the Approved Project that would further reduce the demand for services resulting from the intensification of uses on the Project Site. Therefore, the Modified Project would result in a less than significant impact with regard to

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
	officer for every 1,695 individuals in the City during daytime hours, the Proposed Project would generate demand for somewhat less than one officer if current ratios were to be maintained. Given the controlled nature of the Project Site, the provision of on-site security staff, and the use of state-of-the-art security features, it is expected that a safe and high quality environment will be maintained and demand for calls and CCPD services substantially reduced. Furthermore, the CCPD would review the Proposed Project and architectural plans to ensure that public safety and site security measures are adequately incorporated. Thus, with CCPD review, provision of on-site security personnel, and incorporation of the Project's security features, impacts on CCPD services would be less than significant.	police protection services and similar to those of the Approved Project.
I. Transportation/ Circulation		
a) Construction Impacts	During the 22-month construction period, the Approved Project would contribute construction worker trips, haul truck trips, and other construction-related vehicle trips to the Project Site. Construction of the Approved Project would occur in compliance with City of Culver City standards; construction activities would occur from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M., Monday through Friday. The staging of construction trucks and construction worker parking is expected to be accommodated on Site. Any construction staging off-Site that might be necessary would be limited and infrequent. Any lane closure, if needed, would occur during the off-peak traffic period of 9:00 A.M. to 3:30 P.M., and would not block usage of the remaining lanes on Centinela Avenue. Construction workers would park primarily on-site. Occasional worker parking and hotel/conference parking would be provided off-Site. The most likely candidate to accommodate the parking is the surface lot across the street on the south side of Centinela Avenue. A large number of additional nearby parking facilities are available to accommodate the parking. The Certified EIR concluded that the added construction traffic during the peak hour would increase congestion and therefore result in a significant, temporary short-term impact on traffic. Mitigation Measures H-1 through H-6 were recommended for the Approved Project to avoid substantial inconvenience to motorists,	An evaluation of construction traffic associated with the Modified Project's construction activity has been prepared and is included as Appendix D-1, Addendum Construction Traffic Section, below. The analysis documents construction activity and related construction traffic impacts as being substantially the same as with the Approved Project. Appendix D-1 identifies slight increases in the number of haul trucks and worker trips that might occur within the various construction phases. The Modified Project would: have a maximum of 120 haul trips per day versus 100 with the Approved Project; have a maximum of 140 workers on-Site versus 130; and would increase the average number of workers from 62 workers to 70 workers. This incremental increase in construction traffic associated with the Modified Project would be negligible due to the following: the increases are relatively small, days of maximum activity would be intermittent and most of the added trips would occur during non-peak traffic times. The updated construction traffic analysis recommends implementation of the previously required Mitigation Measures, which would substantially reduce construction impacts on traffic. Based on the above, impacts of the Modified Project would be similar to those of the Approved Project. As was conservatively assumed for the Approved Project, temporary construction related impacts on traffic would be considered significant and unavoidable short-term impacts.

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
	pedestrians, and businesses in the vicinity during construction activities. These mitigation measures require: maintained access to Centinela Avenue; implementation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan; the use of flag persons; staging and queuing construction vehicles where it would not interfere with or block vehicular/pedestrian traffic or access to adjacent businesses; prohibiting construction-related vehicles from parking on public streets; and the review and approval of a Construction Replacement Parking Plan by the Culver City Planning Division. Regardless, the Certified EIR concluded that even with the implementation of mitigation measures the number of trips associated with the construction workers and the importing/exporting of construction materials (concrete and other delivery truck traffic) during the peak hours would increase congestion, resulting in a significant temporary construction traffic impact.	
b) Future Intersection Conditions	The Approved Project would intensify uses on the Project Site, leading to an increase in vehicle trips to and from the Project Site. The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project would result in significant traffic impacts at 12 study intersections prior to the implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation Measures H-7 through H-15, which require both a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan for the Approved Project and physical improvements (e.g., signal upgrades, restriping) at affected intersections. With the implementation of the mitigation measures, 11 of the 12 potentially significantly impacted study area intersections would be reduced to a less than significant level under "Future With Project With Mitigation" conditions. However, the Certified EIR ultimately concluded that a significant and unavoidable impact would remain at the intersection of Howard Hughes Parkway and Sepulveda Boulevard.	An analysis of the Modified Project's impacts on traffic is included herein as Appendix D-2, Traffic Impact Study Report – 2016 (the "2016 Traffic Report"). The 2016 Traffic Report provides an analysis of the impacts of the Modified Project as measured against 2016 existing (2016) and future (2018) traffic conditions. In Addition, the 2016 Traffic Report includes an analysis of the Approved Project also measured against the existing (2016) and future (2018) traffic conditions, to support an up to date and more accurate basis of comparison between the Approved Project and the Modified Project than a comparison of the Modified Project impacts to the analysis of the Approved Project in the Certified EIR. That analysis evaluated impacts against 2007 and 2010 baseline conditions and did not account for changes in such factors as traffic patterns and availability of mitigation measures. For purposes of providing equivalent comparisons, the trip generation for the Approved Project was also recalculated based on more recent trip generation values in the Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, published in 2012 by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). Using this data, the traffic generation in the Certified EIR of 3,442 daily trips is now estimated to be 3,345 daily trips. The 2016 analyses are based on traffic counts taken in March 2016. The 2018 future baseline conditions take into account an average annual traffic growth factor of 1.0 percent, as well as potential traffic from an updated list of 22 potential related projects within the City of Culver City and the City of Los Angeles. The future conditions also account for one roadway improvement at the intersection of Centinela Avenue/La Tijera Boulevard that is expected to be completed by 2018.

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
		The Modified Project reduces the amount of office area, with resulting reductions in associated traffic. The reduced-size, Modified Project would generate approximately 2,880 daily trips, with 438 trips during the AM peak hour and 393 trips during the PM peak hour. Compared to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would generate approximately 14 percent fewer daily trips, 14 percent fewer AM peak-hour trips, and 15 percent fewer PM peak-hour trips. Therefore, as further described below and in the 2016 Traffic Report, Appendix D-2, the Modified Project would contribute less to traffic congestion and would reduce overall traffic impacts compared to the Approved Project. **Comparison of the Modified Project Impacts to the Analysis of Impacts in the Certified EIR.** The analysis of the Modified Project indicates that the decrease in trips would result in reduced intersection impacts overall with no increase in the number of intersections operating at LOS E or F during peak hours. Further, there would be no new intersections significantly impacted prior to mitigation and the number of significantly impacted intersections prior to mitigation would be reduced from 12 intersections under the Approved Project to 8 intersections under the Modified Project. Mitigation for the Modified Project would include a TDM Plan and physical improvements to the roadway network. However, one of the mitigation measures proposed for the Approved Project, the mitigation measure previously proposed for Intersection 29, Centinela Avenue and La Cienega Boulevard has been implemented independent of the Project and is no longer available to offset the impacts of the Approved Project or the Modified Project. As a result, although impacts on this intersection under the Modified Project would be less than the Approved Project, due solely to previous implementation of mitigation at this intersection the impact would now remain significant after implementation of mitigation measures. Alternative feasible mitigation measures were considered for this location but were determined to not be available. As discussed further below, under a current updated analysis that is more accurate and representative of traffic impacts that would occur if the Approved Project were implemented today, the impacts of the Modified Project would be less than those of the Approved Project at the Centinela/La Cienega intersection, as well as at the remaining intersections. As was the case with the Approved Project, the impact at Howard Hughes Parkway and Sepulveda Boulevard would continue to be significant, although the impacts of the Modified Project would be less than those of the Approved Project. As indicated, when compared to the analysis in the Certified EIR, the operational traffic impacts associated with the Modified Project would be reduced compared to the Approved Project, and the Modified Project would not create new or more intensive traffic impacts compared to the Approved Project.

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
		Comparison of the Modified Project to the Approved Project under Current Baseline Conditions The 2016 Traffic Report comparison of the Approved Project to the Modified Project against the same set of current baseline conditions further illustrates the reduced traffic impacts of the Modified Project. This analysis of pre-mitigation impacts indicates that at the time of completion in 2018, the Modified Project would have less impact than the Approved Project during both the AM and PM peak hours at 20 of the 33 intersections analyzed. Impacts of the Modified Project would be the same as or less than the Approved Project during either the AM or PM peak hour at 10 of the intersections. Impacts would be the same at the remaining three intersections.[5] The analysis of County intersections with County methodology indicates that in 2018 six of the seven County intersections would have reduced impacts with the Modified Project during both the AM and PM peak hour. The seventh intersection would have the same impact during the AM peak hour and a reduced impact during the PM peak hour with the Modified Project. The 2016 Traffic Report comparison also showed that implementation of the Modified Project would reduce the significant impacts of the Approved Project from 10 intersections to eight intersections. Pre-mitigation, significant impacts would be eliminated at the intersections of Slauson Avenue/Corning Avenue and 76th Street—77th Street/Sepulveda Boulevard. As these intersections are no longer significantly impacted mitigation measures at these locations for the Approved Project are no longer required and have been deleted from the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Modified Project. Overall, under common updated baseline conditions, the traffic impacts of the Modified Project would be reduced and would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts compared to the Approved Project. Also, it should be noted that the equivalent comparison of the Modified Project impact to the Approved Project demonstrates that the Modified Project would reduce the impacts at the Centinela Avenue/La Cienega Boulevard intersection identified as significant above. The Modified Project would result in lower contributions to volume/capacity ratio under the 2016 baseline analysis (0.002 in the AM Peak Hour and 0.001 in the PM Peak Hour); and under the 2018 baseline analysis (0.001 in the AM and the PM Peak Hours).

5 The 2016 baseline analysis resulted in generally similar results, with the same or reduced impacts for the Modified Project during the AM and/or PM peak hours, for all but one intersection. The analysis showed that the Modified Project would add 0.001 more than the Approved Project to the volume/capacity ratio during the AM peak hour at Intersection 30, Howard Hughes Parkway/I-405 SB Ramps. At the same time the Modified Project would contribute 0.005 less to the volume/capacity ratio during the PM peak hour.

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
c) Public Transit System.	The Approved Project was estimated to generate approximately 25 and 23 person trips that would use transit during the respective A.M. and P.M. peak hours, according to the Congestion Management Program (CMP) methodology. The analysis concluded that there would be sufficient transit capacity to accommodate the additional trips, and impacts would be less than significant.	As the Modified Project represents a reduced development program when compared to the Approved Project, it would also result in a corresponding reduction in transit trips during the peak hours. The reduction would be proportionate to the reduction in trip generation from 3,442 daily trips under the Approved Project to 2,880 trips under the Modified Project, or approximately 16 percent less. Transit demand would be reduced to 21 and 19 person trips transit during the respective A.M. and P.M. peak hours; and impacts would be less under the Modified Project.
d) Access	Under the Approved Project, direct vehicular site access would be via three driveways on Centinela Avenue. The existing westerly driveway would remain in the same location but be reshaped slightly to better serve the internal roadway. A new Center Driveway would become the main project and hotel driveway. It would be signalized and replace most of the access functions of the existing main hotel driveway. Other roadway improvements proposed under the Approved Project include widening Centinela Avenue, adding a free right-run lane onto Mesmer Avenue, modifying the raised center median on Centinela Avenue. The Approved Project plans would be required to be reviewed by the Department of Public Works and approved by the City Engineer. Plan approval would ensure the Proposed Project would provide safe ingress and egress to the site, along with adequate internal circulation for traffic, delivery trucks, and emergency vehicles.	The Modified Project would have Site access that is similar to that of the Approved Project, with Site access from three driveways off of Centinela Avenue, including the Center Driveway at a signalized intersection. On-Site access movements have been modified to accommodate the new building design, enhance site circulation and provide more complete fire truck access with a fire access roadway along the north side of the Project Site. The Modified Project would also include an easement and modified medians to better accommodate turning movements from Centinela Avenue. Site access movements would be improved from those of the Approved Project and would be less than significant. The 2016 Traffic Report also evaluates the potential impacts of the Modified Project on bicycle access, a recent requirement of the City. The analysis indicates that the Modified Project would not interfere with the ability of Culver City or the City of Los Angeles to implement its bicycle plans, or result in bicycle access impacts.
e) Parking Supply and Demand	The Approved Project was concluded to meet the CCMC Code parking requirement of 1,243 parking spaces (978 office spaces and 265 replacement hotel spaces) through the provision of 1,248 on-Site parking spaces. The Approved Project also included 60 parking spaces in the surface parking lot adjacent to Centinela Avenue opposite the Project Site for a total of 1,259 spaces. Per the Code, 1,243 spaces were required. The Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project would provide more than adequate parking supply to accommodate the existing hotel and conference center and proposed office uses, and a less than significant impact would result.	The Modified Project would also include 265 hotel parking spaces to replace the surface parking spaces displaced by the office building; and it would include 772 parking spaces to meet the office parking needs per City Code, as well as seven excess spaces for a total of 1,044 parking spaces. The Modified Project would thus exceed the Code requirement of 1,037 parking spaces.[6] Both tandem and self-parking spaces would be provided, and valets and/or parking attendants would be provided to ensure that vehicles parked in tandem spaces are accessible. A valet parking plan is also proposed to address occasional peak demand associated with special events. In addition, the Applicant would continue to provide 60 spaces in the off-Site parking lot directly across the street on the south side of Centinela Avenue for hotel employee parking. With these additional spaces, there would be a combined total of 1,104 parking spaces available to serve the Modified Project and hotel.

6 The Parking analysis for the 281,209 square foot office building is calculated on 270,055 square feet of leasable floor area.

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
		The number of parking spaces would be reduced from those of the Approved Project commensurate with the reduction in the amount of office space and the amount of parking required to meet parking for office needs. Impacts regarding parking for the Modified Project would be similar to those of the Approved Project and less than significant.
f) Regional Transportation System	The Approved Project would not add 50 or more peak-hour trips at the seven CMP monitoring intersections in the vicinity or 150 trips CMP mainline freeway monitoring locations affected by the Approved Project. Therefore, further CMP analysis was not required, and impacts would be less than significant.	The Modified Project has a reduced development program with reduced trip generation compared to the Approved Project. As a result, there would be fewer trips added to CMP facilities. The Modified Project would also add fewer than 50 peak-hour trips at the seven CMP monitoring intersections and less than 150 trips at CMP mainline freeway monitoring locations. Impacts would be less than significant.
J. Utilities/ Service Systems		
a) Water Supply	Water use during construction of the Approved Project would be incrementally small and an impact on adjacent water conveyance systems would not occur. As such, no significant impact would result. Operation would require the consumption of water provided by the Golden State Water Company (GSWC); the Project Site is located within the GSWC Culver City Service Area (CCSA). GSWC imports 100 percent of its water from the West Basin Municipal Water District (WBMWD). WBMWD is a member agency of the larger Municipal Water District (MWD). Using the demand factor of 230 gallons per day (gpd) per 1,000 square feet of office space provided by the GSWC, operation would increase water demand by 79,000 gallons per day (gpd), or approximately 88.5 acre-feet per year (AFY). This additional water demand was concluded to fall within the projections set forth in the GSWC 2005 UWMP, which concluded that its water supply is "expected to be 100 percent reliable through 2030." That plan projected that between 2005 and 2010, water demands in the CCSA would increase by 478 AFY, which is a sufficient increase to include 88.5 AFY for the Approved Project. Further, the MWD, which is the largest water source for the WBMWD, was concluded to have adequate water supplies to meet 100 percent of the imported water demands within its service area in normal, single dry- and multiple dry-years. Further, water supplies for the CCSA, including the Approved Project, are expected to be 100 percent reliable through at least 2030. As a result, the	Water use during construction of the Modified Project would be similar to that of the Approved Project. As such, it would be incrementally small and an impact on adjacent water conveyance systems would not occur. No significant impact would result. Operation of the Modified Project would also require water consumption for Site uses. When utilizing the water consumption factors in the Certified EIR, the Modified Project would be expected to increase water demand on the Project Site by 64,700 gpd (a reduction of 14,500 gpd, or 18 percent, when compared to the Approved Project's 79,000 gpd increase in water demand). This Modified Project's increase in water demand equates to 72.5 AFY. The Modified Project would require less water consumption than the Approved Project and therefore have less impact on the consumption of such resources. Further, the Modified Project would generate lower rates of water consumption than those estimated on the basis of the assumed water consumption rate in the WSA due to State mandates and City provisions for reduced water consumption. The Modified Project would be subject to the City's Water Conservation and Water Supply Shortage Program (CCMC, Chapter 2.03, enacted in 2009) and Mandatory Green Building Program (effective June 2009), which require water conservation measures such as drought-tolerant landscaping, drip or bubbler irrigation systems, and single-pass cooling systems. As the Approved Project was subject to a WSA, its water consumption is anticipated by GSWC and accounted for in subsequent cycles of UWMP preparation. Subsequent to Certification of the EIR, GSWC has adopted a 2010 UWMP, and in June 2016 adopted the 2015 UWMP. The updated UWMPs include evaluation of water supply and demand for water services for 25 year planning horizons. Updated UWMPs, particularly the 2015 UWMP take into account changing water availability due such issues as climate change and on-going draught conditions.

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
	Approved Project's impacts to water supply were concluded to be less than significant. With regard to water infrastructure, the Approved Project proposes development of a new 8-inch fire line to be installed along the center access drive between the conference center and the new office building to serve two new private fire hydrants and an additional fire service line would be installed to serve the fire sprinkler system for the new office building. The combined fire flow at the hydrants was concluded to be adequately served by the existing water infrastructure. In addition, GSWC reviewed the Culver City piping system and identified no physical restraints to providing the Project's normal domestic and irrigation demands. As a result, the Approved Project would result in a less than significant impact on water infrastructure. Nonetheless, the Certified EIR recommended Mitigation Measures I.1-1 and I.1-2, which require the use of water-saving irrigation systems and drought-tolerant plants.	The 2015 UWMP concludes that water supplies for the CCSA are expected to be 100 percent reliable for normal, single dry- and multiple dry-years through 2040. Of note, the 2015 UWMP includes Chapter 8, Water Shortage Contingency Planning and Chapter 9, Demand Management Measures to address variations in water supply availability. With regard to water infrastructure, the Modified Project would require the installation of new fire lines, hydrants, and domestic water mains in a manner consistent with the Approved Project. As with the Approved Project, GSWC and the City would review the proposed piping system and impacts to water infrastructure would be less than significant with approval of the proposed piping infrastructure. Therefore, the Modified Project would result in a less than significant impact on water supply infrastructure. Nonetheless, the Modified Project would continue to be required to implement Certified EIR Mitigation Measures I.1-1 and I.1-2, which require automatic drip irrigation systems and drought-tolerant landscaping. These mitigation measures now duplicate the requirements of CMCC Chapter 2.03 and the City's Mandatory Green Building Program. Impacts associated with water supply and water infrastructure under the Modified Project would be less than significant and similar to those of the Approved Project.
b) Wastewater	During construction, a nominal amount of wastewater would be generated. Operation was concluded to generate an average wastewater flow of approximately 52,000 gpd with a peak flow of approximately 88,400 gpd to the Project Site. The 15-inch sewer main located along Centinela Avenue had a wastewater flow of approximately 239,760 gpd (0.239 mgd) and a capacity of 1.60 mgd. With the Approved Project, the flow for the 15-inch sewer main would increase to 291,760 gpd (0.29 mgd) with a remaining capacity of 1.31 mgd. The increase in flow represented a 22 percent increase in the wastewater flow, retaining 82 percent of the sewer main capacity still available. Accordingly, the LADPW concluded that the sewer main would have sufficient available capacity to accommodate the Approved Project. The Mesmer Pump Station, which would serve the Project Site, has a maximum design discharge of 1.30 mgd. The increased flow of the Approved Project was considered nominal and would not cause an impact to the normal operation of the Mesmer Pump Station. Furthermore, the Approved Project would pay a proportionate share of the costs of conveyance, operation, maintenance, repair and capital improvements to	The Modified Project represents a reduced development program when compared to the Approved Project (281,209 square feet vs. 342,409 under the Approved Project). This would result in lower wastewater generation. Using the daily wastewater generation factor that was used in the Certified EIR, 152 gpd/1,000 sf for office space would result in a daily sewer generation of approximately 42,700 gpd. It may be noted that the wastewater generation rate of 152 gpd/1,000 sf is based on LADWP factors. Today LADWP uses a wastewater generation rate of 120 gals/day/1,000 sf. This reduced rate reflects reductions in water consumption due to improvements in greater efficiency in the provision of water for consumption. If the rate of 120 gpd/1,000 sf were applied, the Modified Project would generate approximately 34,000 gpd of wastewater generation. The estimated peak flow of 88,400 for the Approved Project would likewise be proportionately reduced to 72,600 gpd, or 52,799 gpd, depending on the wastewater generation factor of 152 gpd/1000 sf or 120 gpd/1000 sf, respectively, was applied. ; In addition, the HTP is designed to treat 450 million gallons per day (mgd) HTP has an average dry water flow of approximately 362 mgd, leaving approximately 88 mgd of capacity available. As a result, the HTP has a greater remaining capacity than anticipated by the Certified EIR. With regard to local conveyance, LADPW review of the design plans would ensure adequate remaining capacity in the 15-inch sewer main and Mesmer Pump Station. The Applicant would continue to be required to pay applicable Sewer User Fees and a Sewer Facility Charge pursuant to the Amalgamated Agreement.

Environmental Issues	Approved Project Impacts	Modified Project Impacts
	upgrade and improve the City of Los Angeles sewer system through payment of Sewer User Fees and a Sewer Facility Charge pursuant to the Amalgamated Agreement. Therefore, the impact of wastewater generation from the Proposed Project on sewage conveyance infrastructure would be less than significant. The Certified EIR found that forecasted increases in wastewater flows without the Approved Project are well within the treatment capacity of the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP). To the extent that the Approved Project would increase demand, it would also be required to pay a proportionate share of the costs of conveyance, operation, maintenance, repair and capital improvements to upgrade and improve the Culver City sewer system as set forth in Section 5.02.220 of the CCMC and the City of Los Angeles sewer system pursuant to the Amalgamated Agreement between the City of Culver City and the City of Los Angeles. Ultimately, the Approved Project was concluded to have a less than significant impact on wastewater treatment facilities.	Therefore, with review of design plans, the impact of wastewater generation from the Modified Project on wastewater treatment capacity and sewage conveyance infrastructure would be less than significant and similar to those of the Approved Project.

2. Effects Regarding Other CEQA/Initial Study Topics

The Certified EIR analyzed topics that were identified in an Initial Study as having the potential to create significant impacts on the physical environment. The Initial Study, included in Appendix A of the EIR, was based on the Appendix G Environmental Questions of the CEQA Guidelines. It evaluated the Project's potential impacts on seventeen (17) environmental topics. Subsequently, Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines added an eighteenth topic for consideration in Initial Studies: Greenhouse Gas Emissions. While this topic was not identified as requiring an analysis in an EIR, the topic was nonetheless evaluated in the Certified EIR as Section III.J, Global Climate Change. The conclusions of that analysis and varied impacts under the Modified Project are discussed above.

One Initial Study topic that was scoped out of the EIR was selected for supplementary analysis in this Addendum. Shading, a component of the Aesthetics (light and glare) topic was evaluated and determined not to have a potential for a significant impact. Appendix B, Shading Analysis Supplement, below includes shadow diagrams of shading from the proposed new office building under the Modified Project design. The shading diagrams represent the most extreme shading conditions that would occur during the times considered in the shading analysis. As indicated in Appendix B, the modified building design would not result in significant impacts on the environment. Shadows would fall onto non-sensitive uses, primarily roads, for short durations.

The other Initial Study topics that were not evaluated in the EIR were so scoped out of the EIR as they were not subject to having potential significant impacts. As the Modified Project is reduced in size, resulting in a reduced impact profile, impacts for these topics would be similar to, or less than those identified in the Initial Study. Further, the setting conditions for the scoped out topics have not been changed. The natural setting has not changed (e.g. in regards Agriculture, Mineral Resources and Biological Resources). The Project Site has not changed (e.g. in regards to Geology/Soils or Soil Contaminants). Finally, as was the case with the Approved Project, the Modified Project would not include housing that would affect population projections or park and school services.

C. Conclusion Regarding Addendum as an Appropriate Mechanism

The above analysis demonstrates that the Modified Project includes the same uses and similar features as the Approved Project evaluated in the Certified EIR. Due to its reduced size and altered building design, the environmental impacts associated with the Modified Project would be reduced compared to the Approved Project as analyzed in the Certified EIR.

The Modified Project would reduce the amount of office space and thereby reduce operational impacts that are based on the occupancy of the Project Site and the amount of activity that would occur. Most notably the reduction in office space would reduce the amount of vehicle trips (thus reducing traffic, air quality, greenhouse gas, and noise impacts due to trip generation), while the decrease in occupancy would also reduce energy consumption and demand for services and utilities. Reductions in building height of 52 feet, and changes in massing would reduce the visual prominence of the building and the already less than significant impacts on views identified in the Certified EIR, particularly those from the Westchester Bluffs.

The analysis of Traffic impacts shows that the Modified Project would have less traffic impact than the Approved Project. Compared to the Approved Project, the Modified Project would generate approximately 14 percent fewer daily trips, 14 percent fewer AM peak-hour trips, and 15 percent fewer PM peak-hour trips. Therefore, as further described below and in the 2016 Traffic Report, Appendix D-2, the Modified Project would contribute less to traffic congestion and would reduce overall traffic impacts compared to the Approved Project. The analysis of the Modified Project indicates that the decrease in trips would result in reduced intersection impacts with no increase in the number of intersections operating at LOS E or F during peak hours. Further, there would be no new intersections significantly impacted prior to mitigation and the number of significantly impacted intersections prior to mitigation would be reduced from 12 intersections under the Approved Project to 8 intersections under the Modified Project. While the traffic analysis identifies one intersection location (Centinela Avenue/La Cienega Boulevard) as having a significant impact after mitigation that was not identified as significant after mitigation in the Certified EIR, that finding is the result of previous implementation of a mitigation measure by others during the years between the Certification of the EIR and the proposal for the Modified Project. The Modified Project would result in lower contributions to volume/capacity ratio at this

intersection than the Approved Project during the AM and PM Peak hours for the 2016 (existing) and 2018 (future) analyses.

Therefore, in light of the whole record, it has been determined herein that there are no substantial changes to the Project or circumstances that require major revisions to the EIR, and that preparation of a Subsequent EIR is not required. As evaluated under current conditions, the Modified Project proposes design changes and a reduction in height and size that that would reduce overall impacts on the environment, and it would not result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts than the Approved Project if it were implemented today. Thus, pursuant to Sections 15162 and 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines, this Addendum is the appropriate document under CEOA for addressing the impacts of the Modified Project.

This page intentionally blank.

IV. REVISED MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), which is provided in Table IV-1 of the EIR Addendum, has been prepared pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, which requires adoption of a MMRP for projects in which the Lead Agency has required changes or adopted mitigation to avoid significant environmental effects. The City of Culver City is the lead agency for the proposed Entrada Office Tower Project located at 6161 Centinela Avenue, therefore, responsible for administering and implementing the MMRP. The decision-makers must define specific reporting and/or monitoring requirements to be enforced during project implementation prior to final approval of the proposed project. The primary purpose of the MMRP is to ensure that the mitigation measures identified in the Draft and Final EIR, as modified in the 2016 EIR Addendum, are implemented thereby minimizing identified environmental effects.

The MMRP for the proposed project will be in place through all phases of the project, including design (preconstruction), construction, and operation (both prior to and post-occupancy). The City of Culver City Planning Division shall be responsible for administering the MMRP. The Planning Division will also ensure that monitoring is documented through periodic reports and that deficiencies are promptly corrected. The designated environmental monitor will track and document compliance with mitigation measures, note any problems that may result, and take appropriate action to remedy problems.

Each mitigation measure is categorized by impact area, with an accompanying identification of:

- The phase of the project during which the measure should be monitored;
  - Pre-Construction
  - Construction
  - Prior to occupancy
  - Post-occupancy
- The enforcement agency; and
- The monitoring agency.

TABLE IV-1
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Phase	Enforcement Agency	Monitoring/ Reporting Agency	Compliance Verification		
				Initial	Date	Comments
AESTHETICS						
Mitigation Measure A-1: The Applicant shall ensure, through appropriate postings and daily visual inspections, that any materials not authorized by the City be promptly removed from temporary construction barriers or temporary pedestrian walkways, and that such temporary barriers and walkways be maintained in a visually attractive manner throughout the construction period.	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Building Safety Division			
AIR QUALITY						
Construction						
Mitigation Measure B-1: General contractors shall require the use of diesel oxidation catalysts or equivalent control devices on all on-site heavy-duty construction equipment during excavation activities.	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Building Safety Division			
Mitigation Measure B-2: All construction equipment shall be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with manufacturer's specifications.	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Building Safety Division			
Mitigation Measure B-3: General contractors shall maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions. During construction, trucks and vehicles in loading and unloading queues should turn their engines off when not in use to reduce vehicle emissions. Construction emissions should be phased and scheduled to avoid emissions peaks and discontinued during second-stage smog alerts.	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Building Safety Division			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Phase	Enforcement Agency	Monitoring/ Reporting Agency	Compliance Verification		
				Initial	Date	Comments
Mitigation Measure B-4: Electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel- or gasoline-powered generators shall be used to the extent feasible.	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Building Safety Division			
Mitigation Measure B-5: The Applicant shall utilize coatings and solvents that are consistent with applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations**.**	Construction	SCAQMD	City Planning Division /City Building Safety Division			
Operations						
Mitigation Measure B-6: Outdoor areas shall utilize energy efficient light and mechanical, computerized or photo cell switching devices to reduce unnecessary energy usage.	Pre-Construction	City Community Development Department	City Building Safety Division			
CULTURAL RESOURCES						
Mitigation Measure C-1: An archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (the "Archaeologist") shall be retained by the Applicant and approved by the City to oversee and carryout the additional mitigation measures listed below.	Pre-Construction/ Construction	City Community Development Department	City Planning Division			
Mitigation Measure C-2: A qualified archaeological monitor shall be selected by the Archaeologist, retained by the Applicant, and approved by the City to monitor ground-disturbing activities within the Project Site. Ground-disturbing activities are here defined as activities that include digging, grubbing, or excavation into any sediments (fill or native sediments) that have not been previously disturbed for this project. Ground-disturbing activities do not include movement, redistribution, or compaction of sediments excavated during the project. The Archaeologist shall attend a pre-grade meeting with the construction contractor, the Applicant and the City to develop an appropriate monitoring program and schedule.	Pre-Construction/ Construction	City Community Development Department	City Planning Division			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Phase	Enforcement Agency	Monitoring/ Reporting Agency	Compliance Verification		
				Initial	Date	Comments
Mitigation Measure C-3: Due to the sensitivity of the Project Site for Native American resources, a Native American monitor shall be selected by the City and retained by the Applicant to monitor ground-disturbing activities in the Project Site. Selection of the monitor shall take into account guidance provided by the Native American Heritage Commission with respect to Native American groups identified as having affiliation with the Project Site. The Native American monitoring program may include a representative of the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council.	Pre-Construction/ Construction	City Community Development Department	City Planning Division			
Mitigation Measure C-4: In the event that cultural resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, the Archaeological or Native American monitor shall be empowered to halt or redirect ground-disturbing activities away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the vicinity of the find.	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Planning Division			
Mitigation Measure C-5: All cultural resources unearthed by Proposed Project-related construction activities shall be evaluated by the Archaeologist. If the Archaeologist determines that the resources may be significant, then the Archaeologist will notify the Applicant and the City and will develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources. The Archaeologist shall consult with the Native American monitor or other appropriate Native American representatives in determining appropriate treatment for unearthed cultural resources if the resources are prehistoric or Native American in nature.	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Planning Division			
Mitigation Measure C-6: Treatment plans developed for any unearthed resources shall consider reasonable measures to allow preservation of the resource or resources in place as a preferred option. If preserving the resource in place or leaving the resource undisturbed is not feasible, other appropriate mitigation measures shall be	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Planning Division			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Phase	Enforcement Agency	Monitoring/ Reporting Agency	Compliance Verification		
				Initial	Date	Comments
implemented, such as data recovery following a data recovery plan to allow for recovery of scientifically consequential information and curation of the recovered resources and data in an appropriate facility. Feasibility and means of preservation in place or other mitigation measures shall be determined through consultation between the Archaeologist, the Native American monitor or other appropriate representative, the Applicant, and the City.						
Mitigation Measure C-7: The Archaeologist shall prepare a final report to be reviewed and accepted by the City. The report shall be filed with the Applicant, the City, and the California Historic Resources Information System South Central Coastal Information Center. The report shall include a description of resources unearthed, if any, treatment of the resources, and evaluation of the resources with respect to the California Register of Historic Resources and the National Register of Historic Places. The report shall also include all specialists' reports as appendices, if any. If the resources are found to be significant, a separate report including the results of the recovery and evaluation process shall be required. The City shall designate repositories in the event cultural resources are uncovered.	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Planning Division			
Mitigation Measure C-8: Any accidental discovery of cultural resources during construction will be evaluated by the Archaeologist. If the find is determined to be potentially significant, then the Archaeologist, in consultation with the City and appropriate Native American representatives, will develop a treatment plan. All work adjacent to the unanticipated discovery (estimated at 25 feet) shall cease until the Archaeologist has evaluated the discovery, or the treatment plan has been implemented. The treatment plan shall consider preservation in place as a preferred option as set forth in Mitigation Measure C-6. Feasibility and means of preservation in place shall be	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Planning Division			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Phase	Enforcement Agency	Monitoring/ Reporting Agency	Compliance Verification		
				Initial	Date	Comments
determined through consultation between the Archaeologist, the Native American monitor or other appropriate representative, the Applicant, and the City.						
Mitigation Measure C-9: If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during construction excavation and grading activities, then State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, then the coroner has 24 hours to notify the NAHC. The NAHC will then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent of the deceased Native American, who will then help determine what course of action should be taken in dealing with the remains. Preservation of the remains in place or project design alternatives shall be considered preferred courses of action to the degree feasible as determined by the Applicant, the City, and the Most Likely Descendent.	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Planning Division			
Mitigation Measure C-10: A qualified paleontologist (the "Paleontologist") shall be retained by the Applicant and approved by the City to oversee and carryout the additional mitigation measures presented below. At this time, the City shall also designate an appropriate paleontological curation facility, in the event that fossils are recovered during mitigation. The facility should be a public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the materials, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.	Pre-Construction/ Construction	City Community Development Department	City Planning Division			
Mitigation Measure C-11: The Paleontologist shall perform inspections of excavation or grading activity in sediments five feet or more below the original ground surface. The frequency of inspections shall be based on consultation with the City and construction personnel and will depend on the rate of excavation and grading activities, the	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Planning Division			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Phase	Enforcement Agency	Monitoring/ Reporting Agency	Compliance Verification		
				Initial	Date	Comments
materials being excavated, and if found, the abundance and type of fossils encountered. Inspections shall consist of visually inspecting fresh exposures of rock for larger fossil remains and, where appropriate, collecting wet or dry screened sediment samples of promising horizons for smaller fossil remains. Inspections will not be conducted in areas where grading, excavation, and/or construction activities will not occur or in areas where exposed sediment will be buried, but not otherwise disturbed.						
Mitigation Measure C-12: If a potential fossil is found, the Paleontologist shall be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading and excavation activities in the area of the exposed fossil to facilitate evaluation and, if necessary, salvage.	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Planning Division			
Mitigation Measure C-13: At the Paleontologist's discretion and to reduce any construction delay, the grading and excavation contractor shall assist in removing rock samples for initial processing.	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Planning Division			
Mitigation Measure C-14: Any fossils encountered and recovered shall be prepared to the point of identification and catalogued before they are donated to their final repository. Appropriate notes, maps, and photographs shall accompany all fossils.	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Planning Division			
Mitigation Measure C-15: Following the completion of the above tasks, the Paleontologist shall prepare a report for review and approval by the City documenting the absence or discovery of fossil resources on-site. If fossils are found, then the report shall summarize the results of the inspection program, identify those fossils encountered, recovery and curation efforts, and the methods used in these efforts, as well as describe the fossils collected and their significance. A copy of the report shall be provided to the Applicant and to the City of Culver	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Planning Division			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Phase	Enforcement Agency	Monitoring/ Reporting Agency	Compliance Verification		
				Initial	Date	Comments
City, and the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County.						
NOISE						
Mitigation Measure F-1: Exterior noise generating construction activities shall be limited to Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M. and from 9:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. on Saturdays.	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Building Safety Division			
Mitigation Measure F-2: Noise-generating construction equipment operated at the Project Site shall be equipped with effective noise control devises, i.e., mufflers, lagging, and/or motor enclosures. All equipment shall be properly maintained to assure that no additional noise, due to worn or improperly maintained parts, would be generated.	Pre-Construction/ Construction	City Community Development Department	City Building Safety Division			
Mitigation Measure F-3: Stationary source equipment (e.g., compressors) shall be located so as to maintain the greatest distance from sensitive land uses and unnecessary idling of equipment shall be prohibited.	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Building Safety Division			
Mitigation Measure F-4: The construction contractor shall provide at least 72-hour advance notice of the start of construction activities to all noise sensitive uses within approximately 800 feet of the construction site. Notification shall be by mail. The notice shall state specifically where and when construction activities will occur, and provide contact information for filing noise complaints. Notices shall provide tips on reducing noise intrusion, for example, by closing windows facing the planned construction. The name and telephone number of a contact person for filing complaints shall also be posted on-site. In addition, the construction contractor shall coordinate with the Radisson Hotel manager when noisy construction activities occur, such as during site excavation and foundation work (placement of piles), to avoid conflicts with Hotel and conference center activities and to ensure the	Pre-Construction	City Community Development Department	City Building Safety Division			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Phase	Enforcement Agency	Monitoring/ Reporting Agency	Compliance Verification		
				Initial	Date	Comments
Hotel's occupants are notified as appropriate.						
Mitigation Measure F- 5: While not anticipated to be required during construction, impact pile drivers, if utilized, shall be equipped with standard noise control devices having a minimum sound attenuation factor of 10 dBA.	Construction	City Community Development Department	City Building Safety Division			
Mitigation Measure F-6: The Applicant shall retain the services of a qualified acoustical engineer with expertise in design of building sound isolations, who shall submit a signed report to the City during plan check for review and approval, indicating that the proposed building design achieves an interior sound environment of 50 dBA (CNEL).	Pre-Construction	City Community Development Department	City Building Safety Division			
TRAFFIC						
Mitigation Measure H-1: Vehicular and pedestrian access along Centinela Avenue shall be maintained at all times.	Construction	City Public Works Department	City Public Works Engineering Division			
Mitigation Measure H-2: A Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be prepared by a traffic or civil engineer registered in the State of California. The Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to the City's Public Works Department for review and approved by the City Engineer prior to the issuance of any Project demolition, grading, or excavation permit. The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall also be reviewed by the City's Fire and Police Departments. The Construction Management Plan shall contain but not be limited to the following: • The name and telephone number of a contact person who can be reached 24 hours a day regarding construction traffic complaints or emergency situations; • An up-to-date list of local police, fire, and emergency response organizations and procedures for the continuous coordination of construction activity, potential delays, and	Pre-Construction	City Public Works Department	City Public Works Engineering Division			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Phase	Enforcement Agency	Monitoring/ Reporting Agency	Compliance Verification		
				Initial	Date	Comments
any alerts related to unanticipated road conditions or delays, with local police, fire, and emergency response agencies. Coordination shall include the assessment of any alternative access routes that might be required through the Project Site, and maps showing access to and within the Project Site and to adjacent properties; • Procedures for the training and certification of the flag persons used in implementation of the Construction Traffic Management Plan; • The location, times, and estimated duration of any roadway closures, traffic detours, use of protective devices, warning signs, and staging or queuing areas; and • The location and travel routes of off-site staging and parking locations. As part of the Construction Traffic Management Plan, an assessment of temporary effects on traffic shall be completed to address off-site parking for the hotel and construction workers while the new parking structure is being completed. This assessment shall include an evaluation of anticipated traffic impacts during the construction phase, taking into account off-site parking facilities, their access routes and patterns, and their related vehicle trips on the roadway system. The objective of the assessment shall be to take all reasonable measures possible to reduce or avoid temporary congestion, potential hazards, and inconvenience due to off-site parking. The assessment shall also include an evaluation of candidate off-site parking locations. The conditions shall be reviewed by the City once the location is in use to refine or institute new measures or protocols as feasible to the satisfaction of the City.						
Mitigation Measure H-3: Flag persons with certified training shall be provided for work site traffic control to minimize impacts to traffic flow and to ensure the safe movement of vehicles into and out of the Project Site.	Construction	City Public Works Department	City Public Works Engineering Division			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Phase	Enforcement Agency	Monitoring/ Reporting Agency	Compliance Verification		
				Initial	Date	Comments
Mitigation Measure H-4: Construction vehicles shall not be permitted to stage or queue where they would interfere with vehicular and pedestrian traffic or block access to adjacent businesses. Off-site staging locations shall be approved by the City and be of sufficient length to accommodate large trucks without being unduly disruptive to traffic operations. The drivers of these trucks shall be in radio or phone communication with on-site personnel who shall advise the drivers when to proceed from the staging location to the site.	Pre-Construction/ Construction	City Public Works Department	City Public Works Engineering Division			
Mitigation Measure H-5: Construction-related vehicles shall not be permitted to park on public streets.	Construction	City Public Works Department	City Public Works Engineering Division			
Mitigation Measure H-6: A Construction Replacement Parking Plan shall be prepared and submitted to the Community Development Department for review and approval prior to the issuance of any Project demolition, grading or excavation permit. The Construction Replacement Parking Plan shall identify the off-site parking facilities and their parking space allocations that will be used for replacement parking during Project construction as well as the procedures that will be followed for safe pedestrian and vehicular movement between the off-site location(s) and the Project Site. The Construction Replacement Parking Plan shall also include parking lease agreements for the facilities not under the control of Project ownership and a shuttle service plan for transporting persons parking more than one-fourth mile from the site.	Pre-Construction	City Public Works Department	City Public Works Engineering Division/Planning Division			
Mitigation Measure H-7: Prior to receipt of a Certificate of Occupancy, the Project Applicant shall implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan, which is included as Appendix E to the Traffic Impact Report (Appendix D-2 of the EIR Addendum), that reduces Proposed Project trips by at least 10 percent. The TDM Plan shall be flexible and utilize as many measures as may be necessary	Prior to Occupancy/ Post-occupancy	City Public Works Department	City Public Works Engineering Division/Planning Division			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Phase	Enforcement Agency	Monitoring/ Reporting Agency	Compliance Verification		
				Initial	Date	Comments
to achieve the required trip reductions. To determine whether project trips have been reduced to the required levels, the Project Applicant shall, beginning at initial 85 percent occupancy of the building, conduct an annual monitoring measurement of Project driveway traffic volumes on three normal weekdays during a one-month period. The monitoring measurement will attempt to isolate and separate trips not associated with the Project, such as the trips associated with the adjacent hotel and conference center and the nearby Pacifica Plaza office building. The Project Applicant shall submit to the City of Culver City up to a total of five annual reports that document the effectiveness of the TDM Plan. The annual report shall be submitted within 45 days after the third day of trip measurement. The Project Applicant shall pay all costs associated with trip monitoring program and procedures, including $5,000 per year to the City to cover the cost of staff review of the annual reports. The City shall review the report within 45 days after its receipt and determine whether the site-wide trip generation has been reduced equivalent to 10 percent of the Project peak-hour trips. The City shall also determine whether any remedial measures are necessary for the Plan. In the event that the occupancy of the office building falls below 85 percent, then the measured trips shall be adjusted accordingly. If an annual report documents the average A.M. or P.M. peak-hour trips exceed the respective trip reduction level indicated above, then the Project Applicant shall have one year to achieve compliance. If the annual report subsequent to the noncompliant annual report shows that the Project is still not in compliance, the City and Project Applicant shall discuss other additional measures, operating improvements, and/or modifications to the TDM Plan as may be necessary to achieve compliance. If the City and Project Applicant reach agreement on such additional measures, operating improvements, and/or modifications, the Project Applicant shall implement them. If the City and						

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Phase	Enforcement Agency	Monitoring/ Reporting Agency	Compliance Verification		
				Initial	Date	Comments
Project Applicant are unable to reach agreement on such additional operating improvements and/or modifications, the City shall be able to require the Project Applicant to implement reasonable and feasible measures, operating improvements, and/or modifications that are suitable for achieving compliance, such as requiring the Project Applicant to (i) buy and provide free of charge to on-site tenants/employees an annual bus pass for each excess trip occurring in the peak hour with the most excess trips, up to a maximum of 44 annual bus passes (based on 438 A.M. peak hour trips), (ii) provide other reasonable economic incentives to encourage the use of public transit or increase ridesharing, and/or (iii) increase the number of reserved carpool and vanpool preferential parking spaces in order to further encourage employee carpool usage and ridesharing. Any such measures, improvements, and/or modifications shall be required only after consulting with the Project Applicant. The City shall also be able to impose a financial penalty on the Project Applicant for any excess trips. This cost shall be based on the median of the daily trip fees estimated in the Metro Congestion Management Mitigation Fee Feasibility Study Report, adopted September 2008, and adjusted by the highest ratio of the daily trip rate versus the A.M. or P.M. peak-hour trip rate general office uses according to the current 9th Edition of the ITE Trip Generation handbook. The adjustment factor is calculated to be 7.40, which is based on the P.M. trip rate. The range of daily trip fees in the Traffic Report is $200 to $1,600 and the median fee is $900. Applying the 7.40 factor to this median daily fee, the peak-hour penalty fee is calculated to be $6,660. The City shall be able to apply this peak-hour penalty fee against each excess A.M. and P.M. peak-hour trip as determined from the relevant annual monitoring report. The maximum penalty fee payment in any year shall not exceed $300,000, and the maximum total of all penalty payments in the aggregate for the entire monitoring program shall not exceed $1,000,000. Any collected penalty						

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Phase	Enforcement Agency	Monitoring/ Reporting Agency	Compliance Verification		
				Initial	Date	Comments
fees shall be used by the City for regional traffic improvements at the discretion of the City. Notwithstanding the trip fee requirements described above, the Project Applicant may instead elect to make a one-time payment of $300,000 (the "TDM Payment") to the City in lieu of the trip fee requirement set forth above. If the Project Applicant elects to make the TDM Payment, the Project Applicant shall give written notice to the City and make the TDM Payment before the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the Project. Upon payment of the TDM Payment, the trip free requirements above shall not apply. The TDM Payment will be used by the City to focus on transit, pedestrian, and bicycle modes of transportation that will help alleviate traffic congestion. Unless the Project Applicant elects to make the TDM Payment, before release of any Certificate of Occupancy, the Project Applicant shall be required to establish a letter of credit or other financial instrument acceptable to the City Attorney for $1,000,000 to cover the fee for the entire monitoring program. Once a letter of credit is established, the Project Applicant shall renew it on an annual basis from the initial deposit, with the amount adjusted down for trip fees paid during the year. Notwithstanding this condition, if the Project Applicant elects to make the one-time TDM Payment as described above, the requirement to provide the letter of credit or other financial instrument shall not be required. As appropriate, the Project Applicant may submit additional reports or supplemental information for consideration demonstrating that measures that may have been additionally required by the City for noncompliance reasons can be rescinded. When there are at least three consecutive annual reports demonstrating continuous compliance with the trip reduction levels, the Project shall be deemed to have satisfied the TDM mitigation measure requirement with respect to the payment of trip fees and no further action by the Project Applicant						

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Phase	Enforcement Agency	Monitoring/ Reporting Agency	Compliance Verification		
				Initial	Date	Comments
regarding this requirement shall be necessary.						
Mitigation Measure H-8: Jefferson Boulevard & Mesmer Avenue (I/S 16; Cities of Culver City and Los Angeles): The Project Applicant shall restripe the south and north legs of Mesmer Avenue to allow the installation of a second northbound right-turn lane. The Project Applicant shall modify the traffic signal equipment at the intersection, as necessary.	Prior to Occupancy	City Public Works Department	City Public Works Engineering Division			
Mitigation Measure H-9: Centinela Avenue & Sepulveda Boulevard (I/S 24; City of Culver City): The Project Applicant shall restripe Sepulveda Boulevard to provide a third northbound left-turn lane. The Project Applicant shall modify the raised island at the southeast corner of the intersection as necessary to maintain the third northbound through lane and the northbound right-turn-only lane. The Project Applicant shall modify the channelization and raised median island on the west leg of Centinela Avenue and restripe to provide three westbound departure lanes to receive the additional lane of left-turning traffic from Sepulveda Boulevard. The Project Applicant shall modify the traffic signal equipment and signage at this intersection, as necessary. All detectors for all the approaches tied to this intersection shall be functional to realize the operational improvements anticipated in this mitigation.	Prior to Occupancy	City Public Works Department	City Public Works Engineering Division			
Mitigation Measure H-10: Centinela Avenue & Sherbourne Drive (I/S 26; County and City of Los Angeles); Centinela Avenue & Alvern Street (I/S 27; County and City of Los Angeles): The Project Applicant shall restripe Centinela Avenue from approximately 200 feet east of Alvern Street to Green Valley Circle to provide a third westbound through lane. The additional westbound through	Prior to Occupancy	City Public Works Department	City Public Works Engineering Division			

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Phase	Enforcement Agency	Monitoring/ Reporting Agency	Compliance Verification		
				Initial	Date	Comments
lane would become a trap lane for the westbound right turn movement at Green Valley Circle. The Project Applicant shall modify the traffic signal equipment at the intersections with Sherbourne Drive and Alvern street.						
WATER SUPPLY						
Mitigation Measure I.1-1: Irrigation systems shall be properly designed, installed, operated, and maintained to prevent the waste of water. "Drip" irrigation and other water application techniques which conserve water such as soil moisture sensors and automatic irrigation systems shall be incorporated in the landscape areas.	Prior to Occupancy	Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department	Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department			
Mitigation Measure I.1-2: Landscaping shall emphasize drought-tolerant vegetation. Plants of similar water use shall be grouped to reduce over-irrigation of low-water-using plants. Those areas not designed with drought-tolerant vegetation shall be gauged to receive irrigation using the minimal requirements.	Pre-Construction/ Prior to Occupancy	Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department	Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department			

Appendix A: Visual Analysis Supplement

Background

The 2008 Certified EIR for the Entrada Office Tower Project (Approved Project) included an evaluation of Aesthetics that addressed, among other topics, the visual character of the Approved Project and its potential impact on views. That analysis included ten (10) photo-simulations that showed renderings of the then proposed Project placed into photos of the Project Site as seen from 10 vantage points that are located at various distances and directions from the Project Site.

The Project Applicant has since proposed modifications to the design, height and massing of the development (the Modified Project). In order to illustrate the effect of the modifications on the appearance of the Project Site and potential changes on view impacts with the Modified Project, new photo-simulations have been prepared.

The new photo-simulations present views of the Modified Project Site from four of the previous ten view locations considered most sensitive and representative of changes in visual conditions. The 10 original view locations and the four locations selected for updated photo-simulations are shown in **Figure 1**, *View Location Map*. Three of the View Locations selected are located along the Westchester Bluffs. These locations were selected to provide information regarding view impact issues raised during public review of the Approved Project in 2008. Views from the Westchester Bluffs typically include a complex of industrial buildings in the foreground, the Project Site, Interstate 405, the Fox Hills Mall, the Howard Hughes Center and the Los Angeles basin in the background. It should be noted that the views from the Westchester Bluffs are private views and are not protected by Los Angeles or Culver City ordinances or by California law. Views along the roadways in the Project vicinity do not involve long range views. The area is substantially developed and longer range views are blocked by intervening development. One View Location from the local street network was selected for the preparation of a photo simulation to show the Modified Project when viewed from the local street network. It was determined that the photo-simulations from the other six View Locations were not necessary for this analysis either because the four selected View Locations were representative or the other View Locations were sufficiently far away that the Modified Project would not be prominent from those locations.

Consistent with the photo-simulations prepared for the Certified EIR, the photo-simulations from the Westchester Bluff locations include simulations of the Approved Project and the Modified Project placed into a panoramic view from the bluffs and also into a more direct view of the Project Site. The panoramic views provide a general sense of extent of view blockage against a backdrop of the long-range viewing field available to those looking out from the bluffs. The more direct views from the bluffs provide a narrower view that better represents relative building heights in the Project vicinity and how the Approved Project and the Modified Project would appear in a focused view of the Project Site.

The Figures below include the following:

- **Figure 2**, *View 7 – Panoramic View* and **Figure 3**, *View 7 – Direct View* (photo simulations from Kentwood Court, Figure III,.A-10 and Figure III.A-9 in the Certified EIR);

- **Figure 4**, *View 8 – Panoramic View* and **Figure 5**, *View 8 – Direct View* (photo simulations from Arizona Avenue, Figure III,.A-12 and Figure III.A-11 in the Certified EIR);

- **Figure 6**, *View 9 – Panoramic View* and **Figure 7**, *View 9 – Direct View* (photo simulations from Riggs Place, Figure III,.A-14 and Figure III.A-13 in the Certified EIR);

- **Figure 8**, *View 1 – Direct View* (photo simulation from Sepulveda Boulevard, Figure III.A-3 in the Certified EIR).

Each of these figures includes a location map, portrayal of the existing conditions without the new development, simulation of the setting with the Approved Project and simulation of the setting with the Modified Project.

Findings

The Modified Project has a reduced building height (i.e. 137.5 feet vs. 189.5 feet) and more horizontal distribution of massing on the Project Site. The results of these changes to the Approved Project's design have the following effects:

- The reduction in building height reduces the prominence of the building against the distant horizon. Whereas, the Approved Project rose above the distant horizon, the top of the Modified Project does not notably extend above the backdrop of the distant hills. This reduces the prominence of the Modified Project within the view setting. Due to the reduced height, the Modified Project also appears to blend into the surrounding area more readily than the Approved Project. This is apparent in Figure 2 through Figure 7.

- The Modified Project is a bit wider in appearance. The added building width has a negligible effect on the degree of view blockage, particularly in the panoramic views; Figure 2, Figure 4 and Figure 6. The added width is most noticeable in the Direct View from Kentwood Court, but the slightly wider building profile does not result in a significant impact.

- The Modified Project presents a more horizontal building appearance in contrast to the more vertical appearance of the Approved Project. As such, the building is more akin to other larger buildings interspersed throughout the view field of Figure 2 though Figure 8. This variation is also apparent in the View 1 street view, Figure 8.

The analysis of View impacts in Section III.A Aesthetics of the Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project would not create substantial view blockages from the ten view locations analyzed. Notably, it concluded that substantial view blockages would not occur from the Westchester Bluffs. Views of the skyline, background cityscape and distant hills would remain. For these reasons, the analysis concluded that views of the Approved Project would be less than significant.

For the reasons stated above, the Modified Project would reduce the visual impacts from those of the Approved Project. Impacts of the Modified Project would also be less than significant.

SOURCE: Visual Impact Analysis, 2016

Entrada Creative Office

Figure 1
View Location Map

ESA PCR

Existing panoramic view of the Project Site from the easterly terminus of Kentwood Court looking northeast.

Panoramic view of the Approved Project from the easterly terminus of Kentwood Court looking northeast.

Panoramic view of the modified Project from the easterly terminus of Kentwood Court looking northeast.



SOURCE: KTUA, 2016

Entrada Creative Office

Figure 2

View 7 - Panaramic View

Existing direct view of the Project Site from the easterly terminus of Kentwood Court looking northeast.

Direct view of the Approved Project from the easterly terminus of Kentwood Court looking northeast.

Direct view of the Modified Project from the easterly terminus of Kentwood Court looking northeast.



SOURCE: KTUA, 2016

Entrada Creative Office

Figure 3

View 7 - Direct View

ESA PCR



Existing panoramic view of the Project Site from the upper terminus of Arizona Avenue looking northwest.

Panoramic view of the Approved Project from the upper terminus of Arizona Avenue looking northwest.



Panoramic view of the Modified Project from the upper terminus of Arizona Avenue looking northwest.



SOURCE: KTUA, 2016

Entrada Creative Office

Figure 4

View 8 - Panaramic View

ESA PCR

Existing direct view of the Project Site from the upper terminus of Arizona Avenue looking northwest.

Direct view of the Approved Project from the upper terminus of Arizona Avenue looking northwest.

Direct view of the Modified Project from the upper terminus of Arizona Avenue looking northwest.

SOURCE: KTUA, 2016

Entrada Creative Office

Figure 5

View 8 - Direct View

ESA PCR

Existing panoramic view of the Project Site from Riggs Place (approximately mid-block) looking northeast.

Panoramic view of the Approved Project from Riggs Place (approximately mid-block) looking northeast.

Panoramic view of the Modified Project from Riggs Place (approximately mid-block) looking northeast.



SOURCE: KTUA, 2016

Entrada Creative Office

Figure 6

View 9 - Panaramic View

Existing direct view of the Project Site from Riggs Place (approximately mid-block) looking northeast.

Direct view of the Approved Project from Riggs Place (approximately mid-block) looking northeast.

Direct view of the Modified Project from Riggs Place (approximately mid-block) looking northeast.



SOURCE: KTUA, 2016

Entrada Creative Office

Figure 7

View 9 - Direct View

ESA PCR

Existing direct view of the Project Site from Sepulveda Boulevard looking northwest.

Direct view of the Approved Project from Sepulveda Boulevard looking northwest.

Direct view of the Modified Project from Sepulveda Boulevard looking northwest.

SOURCE: KTUA, 2016

Entrada Creative Office

Figure 8
View 1 - Direct View

ESA PCR

Appendix B:
Shading Analysis
Supplement

Background

The Initial Study included within the 2008 Certified EIR for the Entrada Office Tower Project (Approved Project) included an evaluation of shading impacts (Appendix A, Attachment B, Explanation of Checklist Determination). The analysis included shading diagrams that showed the shadows of the Approved Project that would occur at the winter and summer solstices, Figures B-1 and B-2, respectively.

The currently proposed Entrada Creative Office project (Modified Project) has proposed minor modification to the Approved Project, inclusive of reduced building heights with a modified shape and a relocation of building massing. In order to illustrate the variations in shading that would occur under the Modified Project development scenario new shading diagrams have been prepared and included below. The new diagrams, Figure 1, Winter Shadows and Figure 2, Summer Shadows, respectively also represent shading for these two seasons. Shading at these two seasons represents extreme shading conditions. Equinox shadows would be intermediary.

Findings

As indicated in Figure 1 and Figure 2, Project shadows would fall primarily on parking areas, commercial buildings, and adjacent roadways and would not cause shading on shade sensitive uses. Shadows would be shorter in length and cover less ground area under the Modified Project.



NOTE:
CEQA Thresholds Guide Standard:
A significant impact would occur if shadow-sensitive uses would be shaded by project-related structures for more than three hours between the hours of 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM Pacific Standard Time (between early November and mid-March).

SOURCE: Gensler, 2016; ESA PCR, 2016

Entrada Creative Office

Figure 1
Winter Shadows - December 21

ESA PCR



NOTE:
CEQA Thresholds Guide Standard:
A significant impact would occur if shadow-sensitive uses would be shaded by project-related structures for more than four hours between the hours of 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM Pacific Daylight Saving Time (between mid-March and early November).

SOURCE: Gensler, 2016; ESA PCR, 2016

Entrada Creative Office

Figure 2
Summer Shadows - June 21

ESA PCR

Appendix C:
Air Quality Analysis Supplement – Construction impacts

Background

The 2008 Certified EIR for the Entrada Office Tower Project (Approved Project) included an evaluation of air quality impacts for construction activity and operations. The analysis concluded that the impacts on air quality due to construction would result in a significant impact in regards to regional NOx emissions, while remaining less than significant for other criteria pollutants. The operations of the Approved Project were less than significant for all criteria pollutants analyzed.

The currently proposed Entrada Creative Office project (Modified Project) has proposed minor modifications to the Approved Project, inclusive of reduced building heights, reduced office space and a modified shape and relocation of building massing. The Modified Project, like the Approved Project would require excavation for subterranean structures. The modified building configuration would require a small increase in the amount of excavation required, resulting in slight increases in the use of excavation equipment and the maximum number of haul trips per day. The Modified Project construction program would also result in an increase in the number of construction workers.

As the Modified Project would include the minor increases in construction activity, the regional and localized air quality emissions were analyzed to reflect the potential changes that could occur with the Modified Project. The analysis reflects the construction program for the Modified Project and analysis procedures that account for current fleet emissions, with construction of the development in 2016 – 2018 in contrast to construction in 2008 – 2009. The results of the analysis are presented below.

The operations of the Modified Project would generate fewer air quality emissions than the Approved Project due to the reduction in trip generation and improvements in the energy efficiency of building features/fixtures that are used today as compared to those in buildings developed in the 2008 – 2009 time period. It may be concluded the construction impacts of the Modified Project due to operations would be less than those of the Approved Project and like the Modified Project would be less than significant. Therefore, the operations impacts on air quality do not require further analysis.

Analysis of Construction Emissions

Overview of the Analysis

The analysis of construction impacts was evaluated for the pre-mitigation conditions; and for both regional and localized emissions. The analysis assumes the same number and mix of construction equipment and vehicles as was used in the Air Quality analysis in the Certified EIR. The overall construction period is also unchanged from the previous 22 month time-frame, with a generally similar phasing plan. As minor variation in the phasing plan varies the amount of time of construction of the office building from 11 months to 13 months with 3 months of overlap with the construction of the parking structure, whereas the overlap was previously estimated at 1 to 2 months). The amount of excavation has been increased from 19,285 cubic yards to 21,000 cubic yards. The number of construction workers has been increased slightly from a maximum of 130

workers per day to 140 workers per day and an increase in the average number of workers from 62 to 70 workers.

Methodology

The emissions have been estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), which is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals to quantify potential criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions from a variety of land use projects. CalEEMod was developed in collaboration with the air districts of California. Regional data (e.g., emission factors, trip lengths, meteorology, source inventory, etc.) have been provided by the various California air districts to account for local requirements and conditions. The model is considered to be an accurate and comprehensive tool for quantifying air quality and GHG impacts from land use projects throughout California.[1] Building electricity and natural gas usage rates are adjusted to account for prior Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards.[2] The worksheets from the model runs are included below.

Findings

Regional Emissions

The results of the analysis for the Modified Project for regional emissions and a comparison with the estimates for the Approved Project in the certified EIR are presented Table 1, Regional Construction Emissions – Unmitigated.

As indicated in Table 1, the regional construction emissions of the Modified Project would be less than those of the Approved Project. Constituents would be reduced as follows: VOC, -8 pounds per day (ppd); NOx, -48 ppd; CO -347 ppd; PM_{10} -3 ppd; and $PM_{2.5}$ -2/5 ppd. SOx emissions would be similar.

The Approved Project had impacts that were significant for NOx, (104 ppd v. a threshold of 100 ppd) but less than significant for the remaining constituents. The Approved Project was therefore assigned mitigation measures that reduced the NOx to 99 ppd, making the impact less than significant.

The NOx emissions for the Modified Project at 56 ppd would be 44 ppd less than the significance threshold of 100 ppd. Further, the NOx emissions would be 48 ppd less than the 104 ppd of the Approved Project prior to mitigation. They would also be 43 ppd less than mitigated impacts of the Approved Project. Regional impacts of both the Approved Project (after mitigation) and the Modified Project (prior to mitigation) are less than significant in regard to VOC, CO, Sox, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$.

1 See: http://www.caleemod.com.

2 California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, CalEEMod User's Guide, Appendix D, Table 8.1, July 2013, http://caleemod.com/. Accessed June 2016. Factors for the prior Title 24 standard are extrapolated based on the technical source documentation.

TABLE 1
REGIONAL CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS[A]- UNMITIGATED (POUNDS PER DAY)

	Analysis of the Modified Project					
	VOC	**NOx**	**CO**	**SOx**	**PM_{10}[b]**	**$PM_{2.5}$[b]**
Regional Emissions (On-site + Off-site) – Modified Project						
Demolition - 2016	2	24	20	<1	5	1.7
Excavation – 2017	5	56	44	<1	4	2.5
Piles and Foundation + Site Utilities- 2017	2	21	16	<1	2	1.3
Site Utilities + Concrete Pours - 2017	1	5	4	<1	0	0.4
Super Structure (Parking) + Concrete Pours – 2017	3	26	28	<1	3	1.6
Super Structure (Office) + Concrete Pours + Exterior Closure, MEP, Tenant Improvements - 2018	65	32	42	<1	5	2.3
Maximum Regional Emissions	65	56	44	<1	5	2.5
Regional Construction Daily Significance Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Over/(Under)	(10)	(44)	(506)	(150)	(145)	(53)
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Regional Emissions – Approved Project	73	104	391	<1	7	5
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Difference (Modified Project – Approved Project)	-8	-48	-347	<1	-2	-2.5

[a] Emission quantities are rounded to "whole number" values. As such, the "total" values presented herein may be one unit more or less than actual values.
[b] PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions estimates assume compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 requirements for fugitive dust suppression.

Source: ESA PCR, 2016.

As the Modified Project would have less than significant impacts for all constituents prior to mitigation, mitigation measures are no longer required. The Approved Project included five mitigation measures to reduce the significant impact. One of the mitigation measures previously recommended for the Approved Project, Mitigation Measure B-1, required diesel oxidation control devices that were applicable to the operating characteristics of diesel equipment circa 2008 – 2009. However, operating characteristics of diesel equipment are now improved and would exceed the standards that were addressed in the Mitigation Measure B-1. In fact, the reduced NOx emissions for the Modified Project are in part accounted for by such improvements. Therefore, this mitigation measure is not only no longer required, but also no longer applicable and should be removed from the MMRP for the Modified Project.

While not required to reduce a significant impact, Mitigation Measures B-2 through B-4, are considered best management practices for reducing air quality emissions and energy consumption. Therefore, these mitigation measures are still recommended to further reduce air quality impacts.

Localized Emissions

The results of the analysis for the Modified Project for localized emissions and a comparison with the estimates for the Approved Project in the certified EIR are presented Table 2, Localized Construction Emissions – Unmitigated below.

TABLE 2
LOCALIZED CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS[A] - UNMITIGATED (POUNDS PER DAY)

	Analysis of the Modified Project					
	VOC	**NOx**	**CO**	**SOx**	**PM_{10}[b]**	**$PM_{2.5}$[b]**
Regional Emissions (On-site) – Modified Project						
Demolition - 2016	1	10	8	**<1**	4	1.3
Excavation – 2017	2	24	17	**<1**	2	1.4
Piles and Foundation + Site Utilities- 2017	2	21	15	**<1**	2	1.2
Site Utilities + Concrete Pours - 2017	1	5	4	**<1**	0	0.3
Super Structure (Parking) + Concrete Pours – 2017	2	21	15	**<1**	1	1.1
Super Structure (Office) + Concrete Pours + Exterior Closure, MEP, Tenant Improvements - 2018	63	22	17	**<1**	1	1.3
Maximum Regional Emissions	**63**	**24**	**17**	**<1**	**4**	**1.4**
Localized Significance Thresholds [c]	-	225	1,496	-	34	10
Over/(Under)	-	(201)	(1,479)	-	(30)	(8.6)
Exceed Threshold?		**No**	**No**		**No**	**No**
Localized Emissions – Approved Project	**59**	**43**	**24**	**<1**	**7**	**3**
Exceed Threshold?		**No**	**No**		**No**	**No**
Difference (Modified Project – Approved Project)	**+4**	**-19**	**-7**	**<1**	**-3**	**-1.6**

[a] Emission quantities are rounded to "whole number" values. As such, the "total" values presented herein may be one unit more or less than actual values.
[b] PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions estimates assume compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 requirements for fugitive dust suppression.

Source: ESA PCR, 2016.

As indicated in Table 2, the differences in localized impacts between the Approved Project and the Modified Project are as follows: The Modified Project would generate 4 ppd more than the Approved Project. The Modified Project would reduce particulate matter by the following amounts: -19 ppd for NOx, - 7 ppd for CO, -3 ppd of PM_{10} and -1.6 ppd of $PM_{2.5}$. Impacts of both the Approved Project and the Modified Project would be less than significant prior to mitigation. Impacts of the Modified Project are generally reduced from those of the Approved Project.

While not required to avoid a significant impact, the Certified EIR proposed as a Project Feature, a mitigation measure requiring utilization of energy efficient light and mechanical, computerized or photo cell switching devices to reduce unnecessary energy usage. Utilization of such features continues to be encouraged under sustainability guidelines for reducing energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions, and therefore the mitigation measure, Mitigation Measure B-6 is recommended for the Modified Project as well as the Approved Project.

CALCULATION WORKSHEETS

Entrada - Construction

Los Angeles-South Coast County, Annual

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
General Office Building	281.21	1000sqft	3.70	281,209.00	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	**Wind Speed (m/s)**	2.2	**Precipitation Freq (Days)**	33
Climate Zone	11			**Operational Year**	2018
Utility Company	Los Angeles Department of Water & Power				
CO2 Intensity (lb/MWhr)	1227.89	**CH4 Intensity (lb/MWhr)**	0.029	**N2O Intensity (lb/MWhr)**	0.006

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

Project Characteristics -

Land Use - See construction assumptions

Construction Phase - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Trips and VMT - See Construction Assumptions

Demolition -

Grading - See construction assumptions

Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation -

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblAreaCoating	Area_Nonresidential_Interior	513000	0
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	20.00	131.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	230.00	152.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	230.00	109.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	20.00	22.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	20.00	16.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	20.00	69.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	10.00	284.00
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	11/30/2018	10/1/2018
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	12/31/2018	12/31/2017
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	12/30/2016	12/31/2016
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	4/28/2017	4/30/2017
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	7/3/2018	5/31/2018
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	6/28/2017	5/31/2017
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	6/1/2018	4/1/2018
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	6/1/2018	6/1/2017
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	6/1/2017	5/1/2017
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	5/1/2017	4/1/2017
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	0.00	34.50
tblGrading	MaterialExported	0.00	21,000.00
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	6.46	3.70
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	81.00	255.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	162.00	81.00

tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	84.00	171.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	255.00	97.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	78.00	81.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	205.00	174.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	9.00	97.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	9.00	226.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	9.00	78.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	171.00	255.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	171.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	130.00	89.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	80.00	97.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	199.00	97.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.73	0.40
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.38	0.73
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.74	0.42
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.40	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.48	0.73
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.50	0.41
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.56	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.56	0.29
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.56	0.48
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.42	0.40
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.42	0.01
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.36	0.20
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.38	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.36	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	1.00	2.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	1.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	1.00

tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	1.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	1.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	1.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	4.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	6.00	8.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	7.00	4.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	7.00	4.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	8.00	6.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	8.00	6.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	7.00	8.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	7.00	8.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	8.00	7.00
tblProjectCharacteristics	OperationalYear	2014	2018
tblTripsAndVMT	HaulingTripNumber	847.00	1,071.00
tblTripsAndVMT	HaulingTripNumber	1,875.00	1,920.00
tblTripsAndVMT	VendorTripNumber	0.00	56.00
tblTripsAndVMT	WorkerTripNumber	22.00	109.00

2.0 Emissions Summary

2.1 Overall Construction

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Year	tons/yr									
2016	0.0247	0.2679	0.2143	5.4000e-004	0.1027	0.0109	0.1136	0.0169	0.0104	0.0273
2017	0.3506	3.1175	2.9573	5.6200e-003	0.1644	0.1539	0.3182	0.0413	0.1435	0.1848
2018	4.2124	1.8331	2.4164	4.8700e-003	0.1864	0.0847	0.2710	0.0503	0.0807	0.1310
Total	**4.5876**	**5.2184**	**5.5880**	**0.0110**	**0.4534**	**0.2495**	**0.7029**	**0.1085**	**0.2346**	**0.3431**

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Year	tons/yr									
2016	0.0247	0.2679	0.2143	5.4000e-004	0.0467	0.0109	0.0577	8.4100e-003	0.0104	0.0188
2017	0.3506	3.1175	2.9573	5.6200e-003	0.1525	0.1539	0.3064	0.0400	0.1435	0.1835
2018	4.2124	1.8331	2.4164	4.8700e-003	0.1864	0.0847	0.2710	0.0503	0.0807	0.1310
Total	**4.5876**	**5.2184**	**5.5880**	**0.0110**	**0.3856**	**0.2495**	**0.6350**	**0.0987**	**0.2346**	**0.3333**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Percent Reduction	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**14.96**	**0.00**	**9.65**	**9.02**	**0.00**	**2.85**

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Demolition	Demolition	12/1/2016	12/31/2016	5	22	
2	Excavation	Grading	1/1/2017	1/23/2017	5	16	
3	Piles and Foundation	Grading	1/24/2017	4/30/2017	5	69	
4	Site Utilities	Trenching	4/1/2017	5/31/2017	5	43	
5	Concrete Pours	Site Preparation	5/1/2017	5/31/2018	5	284	
6	Super Structure (Parking)	Building Construction	6/1/2017	12/31/2017	5	152	
7	Super Structure (Office)	Building Construction	1/1/2018	5/31/2018	5	109	
8	Exterior Closure, MEP, Tenant Improvements	Architectural Coating	4/1/2018	10/1/2018	5	131	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 0

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 0

Acres of Paving: 0

Residential Indoor: 0; Residential Outdoor: 0; Non-Residential Indoor: 513,000; Non-Residential Outdoor: 171,000 (Architectural Coating

OffRoad Equipment

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Demolition	Air Compressors	1	8.00	81	0.73
Demolition	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.00	255	0.40
Demolition	Excavators	0	8.00	162	0.38
Demolition	Rubber Tired Dozers	2	8.00	97	0.37
Demolition	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	6.00	97	0.37
Excavation	Excavators	2	8.00	81	0.73
Excavation	Other Construction Equipment	1	8.00	255	0.40
Excavation	Rubber Tired Dozers	0	8.00	255	0.40
Excavation	Rubber Tired Loaders	2	8.00	97	0.37

Excavation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	0	8.00	97	0.37
Piles and Foundation	Bore/Drill Rigs	1	8.00	174	0.41
Piles and Foundation	Cement and Mortar Mixers	1	8.00	97	0.37
Piles and Foundation	Cranes	1	4.00	226	0.29
Piles and Foundation	Excavators	0	8.00	162	0.38
Piles and Foundation	Graders	0	8.00	174	0.41
Piles and Foundation	Rubber Tired Dozers	0	8.00	255	0.40
Piles and Foundation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7.00	97	0.37
Site Utilities	Cement and Mortar Mixers	1	8.00	226	0.29
Site Utilities	Paving Equipment	1	8.00	89	0.20
Site Utilities	Rollers	1	8.00	97	0.37
Concrete Pours	Other Construction Equipment	1	1.00	1	0.01
Concrete Pours	Rubber Tired Dozers	0	8.00	255	0.40
Concrete Pours	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	0	8.00	97	0.37
Super Structure (Parking)	Cement and Mortar Mixers	2	8.00	78	0.48
Super Structure (Parking)	Cranes	1	4.00	226	0.29
Super Structure (Parking)	Forklifts	1	6.00	89	0.20
Super Structure (Parking)	Generator Sets	1	8.00	171	0.42
Super Structure (Parking)	Other Construction Equipment	1	8.00	171	0.42
Super Structure (Parking)	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37
Super Structure (Parking)	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45
Super Structure (Office)	Cement and Mortar Mixers	2	8.00	9	0.56
Super Structure (Office)	Cranes	1	4.00	226	0.29
Super Structure (Office)	Forklifts	1	6.00	89	0.20
Super Structure (Office)	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Super Structure (Office)	Other Construction Equipment	1	8.00	171	0.42
Super Structure (Office)	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37
Super Structure (Office)	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45
Exterior Closure, MEP, Tenant Improvements	Air Compressors	1	8.00	78	0.48

Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Demolition	6	15.00	0.00	1,071.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Excavation	5	13.00	0.00	1,920.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Piles and Foundation	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Site Utilities	3	8.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Concrete Pours	1	3.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Super Structure (Parking)	8	109.00	56.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Super Structure (Office)	8	109.00	56.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Exterior Closure, MEP, Tenant Improvements	1	109.00	56.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Water Exposed Area

3.2 Demolition - 2016

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Fugitive Dust					0.0917	0.0000	0.0917	0.0139	0.0000	0.0139
Off-Road	0.0142	0.1087	0.0835	1.2000e-004		8.6900e-003	8.6900e-003		8.3600e-003	8.3600e-003
Total	**0.0142**	**0.1087**	**0.0835**	**1.2000e-004**	**0.0917**	**8.6900e-003**	**0.1004**	**0.0139**	**8.3600e-003**	**0.0222**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	9.8100e-003	0.1582	0.1199	4.0000e-004	9.1700e-003	2.2200e-003	0.0114	2.5100e-003	2.0500e-003	4.5600e-003
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	7.2000e-004	1.0500e-003	0.0110	2.0000e-005	1.8100e-003	2.0000e-005	1.8300e-003	4.8000e-004	2.0000e-005	5.0000e-004
Total	**0.0105**	**0.1592**	**0.1308**	**4.2000e-004**	**0.0110**	**2.2400e-003**	**0.0132**	**2.9900e-003**	**2.0700e-003**	**5.0600e-003**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Fugitive Dust					0.0358	0.0000	0.0358	5.4100e-003	0.0000	5.4100e-003
Off-Road	0.0142	0.1087	0.0835	1.2000e-004		8.6900e-003	8.6900e-003		8.3600e-003	8.3600e-003
Total	**0.0142**	**0.1087**	**0.0835**	**1.2000e-004**	**0.0358**	**8.6900e-003**	**0.0444**	**5.4100e-003**	**8.3600e-003**	**0.0138**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	9.8100e-003	0.1582	0.1199	4.0000e-004	9.1700e-003	2.2200e-003	0.0114	2.5100e-003	2.0500e-003	4.5600e-003
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	7.2000e-004	1.0500e-003	0.0110	2.0000e-005	1.8100e-003	2.0000e-005	1.8300e-003	4.8000e-004	2.0000e-005	5.0000e-004
Total	**0.0105**	**0.1592**	**0.1308**	**4.2000e-004**	**0.0110**	**2.2400e-003**	**0.0132**	**2.9900e-003**	**2.0700e-003**	**5.0600e-003**

3.3 Excavation - 2017

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Fugitive Dust					1.1900e-003	0.0000	1.1900e-003	1.8000e-004	0.0000	1.8000e-004
Off-Road	0.0192	0.1906	0.1335	2.0000e-004		0.0125	0.0125		0.0115	0.0115
Total	**0.0192**	**0.1906**	**0.1335**	**2.0000e-004**	**1.1900e-003**	**0.0125**	**0.0137**	**1.8000e-004**	**0.0115**	**0.0117**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	0.0166	0.2604	0.2070	7.2000e-004	0.0164	3.6400e-003	0.0201	4.5100e-003	3.3500e-003	7.8600e-003
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	4.1000e-004	6.0000e-004	6.2500e-003	1.0000e-005	1.1400e-003	1.0000e-005	1.1500e-003	3.0000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.1000e-004
Total	**0.0170**	**0.2610**	**0.2132**	**7.3000e-004**	**0.0176**	**3.6500e-003**	**0.0212**	**4.8100e-003**	**3.3600e-003**	**8.1700e-003**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Fugitive Dust					4.6000e-004	0.0000	4.6000e-004	7.0000e-005	0.0000	7.0000e-005
Off-Road	0.0192	0.1906	0.1335	2.0000e-004		0.0125	0.0125		0.0115	0.0115
Total	**0.0192**	**0.1906**	**0.1335**	**2.0000e-004**	**4.6000e-004**	**0.0125**	**0.0130**	**7.0000e-005**	**0.0115**	**0.0116**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	0.0166	0.2604	0.2070	7.2000e-004	0.0164	3.6400e-003	0.0201	4.5100e-003	3.3500e-003	7.8600e-003
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	4.1000e-004	6.0000e-004	6.2500e-003	1.0000e-005	1.1400e-003	1.0000e-005	1.1500e-003	3.0000e-004	1.0000e-005	3.1000e-004
Total	**0.0170**	**0.2610**	**0.2132**	**7.3000e-004**	**0.0176**	**3.6500e-003**	**0.0212**	**4.8100e-003**	**3.3600e-003**	**8.1700e-003**

3.4 Piles and Foundation - 2017

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Fugitive Dust					0.0183	0.0000	0.0183	1.9800e-003	0.0000	1.9800e-003
Off-Road	0.0505	0.5378	0.3946	5.9000e-004		0.0324	0.0324		0.0298	0.0298
Total	**0.0505**	**0.5378**	**0.3946**	**5.9000e-004**	**0.0183**	**0.0324**	**0.0506**	**1.9800e-003**	**0.0298**	**0.0317**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.0200e-003	2.9900e-003	0.0311	7.0000e-005	5.6700e-003	5.0000e-005	5.7200e-003	1.5100e-003	5.0000e-005	1.5500e-003
Total	**2.0200e-003**	**2.9900e-003**	**0.0311**	**7.0000e-005**	**5.6700e-003**	**5.0000e-005**	**5.7200e-003**	**1.5100e-003**	**5.0000e-005**	**1.5500e-003**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Fugitive Dust					7.1300e-003	0.0000	7.1300e-003	7.7000e-004	0.0000	7.7000e-004
Off-Road	0.0505	0.5378	0.3946	5.9000e-004		0.0324	0.0324		0.0298	0.0298
Total	**0.0505**	**0.5378**	**0.3946**	**5.9000e-004**	**7.1300e-003**	**0.0324**	**0.0395**	**7.7000e-004**	**0.0298**	**0.0305**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	2.0200e-003	2.9900e-003	0.0311	7.0000e-005	5.6700e-003	5.0000e-005	5.7200e-003	1.5100e-003	5.0000e-005	1.5500e-003
Total	**2.0200e-003**	**2.9900e-003**	**0.0311**	**7.0000e-005**	**5.6700e-003**	**5.0000e-005**	**5.7200e-003**	**1.5100e-003**	**5.0000e-005**	**1.5500e-003**

3.5 Site Utilities - 2017

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Off-Road	0.0117	0.1088	0.0758	1.0000e-004		7.9700e-003	7.9700e-003		7.3300e-003	7.3300e-003
Total	**0.0117**	**0.1088**	**0.0758**	**1.0000e-004**		**7.9700e-003**	**7.9700e-003**		**7.3300e-003**	**7.3300e-003**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	6.7000e-004	9.9000e-004	0.0103	2.0000e-005	1.8800e-003	2.0000e-005	1.9000e-003	5.0000e-004	2.0000e-005	5.2000e-004
Total	**6.7000e-004**	**9.9000e-004**	**0.0103**	**2.0000e-005**	**1.8800e-003**	**2.0000e-005**	**1.9000e-003**	**5.0000e-004**	**2.0000e-005**	**5.2000e-004**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Off-Road	0.0117	0.1088	0.0758	1.0000e-004		7.9700e-003	7.9700e-003		7.3300e-003	7.3300e-003
Total	**0.0117**	**0.1088**	**0.0758**	**1.0000e-004**		**7.9700e-003**	**7.9700e-003**		**7.3300e-003**	**7.3300e-003**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	6.7000e-004	9.9000e-004	0.0103	2.0000e-005	1.8800e-003	2.0000e-005	1.9000e-003	5.0000e-004	2.0000e-005	5.2000e-004
Total	**6.7000e-004**	**9.9000e-004**	**0.0103**	**2.0000e-005**	**1.8800e-003**	**2.0000e-005**	**1.9000e-003**	**5.0000e-004**	**2.0000e-005**	**5.2000e-004**

3.6 Concrete Pours - 2017

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Fugitive Dust					0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Total	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.0300e-003	1.5200e-003	0.0158	4.0000e-005	2.8800e-003	3.0000e-005	2.9000e-003	7.6000e-004	2.0000e-005	7.9000e-004
Total	**1.0300e-003**	**1.5200e-003**	**0.0158**	**4.0000e-005**	**2.8800e-003**	**3.0000e-005**	**2.9000e-003**	**7.6000e-004**	**2.0000e-005**	**7.9000e-004**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Fugitive Dust					0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Total	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	1.0300e-003	1.5200e-003	0.0158	4.0000e-005	2.8800e-003	3.0000e-005	2.9000e-003	7.6000e-004	2.0000e-005	7.9000e-004
Total	**1.0300e-003**	**1.5200e-003**	**0.0158**	**4.0000e-005**	**2.8800e-003**	**3.0000e-005**	**2.9000e-003**	**7.6000e-004**	**2.0000e-005**	**7.9000e-004**

3.6 Concrete Pours - 2018

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Fugitive Dust					0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Total	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	5.7000e-004	8.6000e-004	8.9000e-003	2.0000e-005	1.7900e-003	2.0000e-005	1.8100e-003	4.8000e-004	1.0000e-005	4.9000e-004
Total	**5.7000e-004**	**8.6000e-004**	**8.9000e-003**	**2.0000e-005**	**1.7900e-003**	**2.0000e-005**	**1.8100e-003**	**4.8000e-004**	**1.0000e-005**	**4.9000e-004**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Fugitive Dust					0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Total	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	5.7000e-004	8.6000e-004	8.9000e-003	2.0000e-005	1.7900e-003	2.0000e-005	1.8100e-003	4.8000e-004	1.0000e-005	4.9000e-004
Total	**5.7000e-004**	**8.6000e-004**	**8.9000e-003**	**2.0000e-005**	**1.7900e-003**	**2.0000e-005**	**1.8100e-003**	**4.8000e-004**	**1.0000e-005**	**4.9000e-004**

3.7 Super Structure (Parking) - 2017

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Off-Road	0.1812	1.6112	1.1067	1.7800e-003		0.0912	0.0912		0.0859	0.0859
Total	**0.1812**	**1.6112**	**1.1067**	**1.7800e-003**		**0.0912**	**0.0912**		**0.0859**	**0.0859**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0349	0.3548	0.4786	9.3000e-004	0.0261	5.2100e-003	0.0313	7.4500e-003	4.7900e-003	0.0122
Worker	0.0324	0.0478	0.4977	1.1500e-003	0.0908	8.4000e-004	0.0916	0.0241	7.7000e-004	0.0249
Total	**0.0673**	**0.4026**	**0.9763**	**2.0800e-003**	**0.1169**	**6.0500e-003**	**0.1229**	**0.0316**	**5.5600e-003**	**0.0371**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Off-Road	0.1812	1.6112	1.1067	1.7800e-003		0.0912	0.0912		0.0859	0.0859
Total	**0.1812**	**1.6112**	**1.1067**	**1.7800e-003**		**0.0912**	**0.0912**		**0.0859**	**0.0859**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0349	0.3548	0.4786	9.3000e-004	0.0261	5.2100e-003	0.0313	7.4500e-003	4.7900e-003	0.0122
Worker	0.0324	0.0478	0.4977	1.1500e-003	0.0908	8.4000e-004	0.0916	0.0241	7.7000e-004	0.0249
Total	**0.0673**	**0.4026**	**0.9763**	**2.0800e-003**	**0.1169**	**6.0500e-003**	**0.1229**	**0.0316**	**5.5600e-003**	**0.0371**

3.8 Super Structure (Office) - 2018

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Off-Road	0.1252	1.0738	0.8085	1.3000e-003		0.0625	0.0625		0.0592	0.0592
Total	**0.1252**	**1.0738**	**0.8085**	**1.3000e-003**		**0.0625**	**0.0625**		**0.0592**	**0.0592**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0235	0.2338	0.3294	6.7000e-004	0.0187	3.5200e-003	0.0223	5.3400e-003	3.2400e-003	8.5800e-003
Worker	0.0209	0.0311	0.3232	8.3000e-004	0.0651	5.8000e-004	0.0657	0.0173	5.4000e-004	0.0178
Total	**0.0444**	**0.2649**	**0.6527**	**1.5000e-003**	**0.0838**	**4.1000e-003**	**0.0879**	**0.0226**	**3.7800e-003**	**0.0264**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Off-Road	0.1252	1.0738	0.8085	1.3000e-003		0.0625	0.0625		0.0592	0.0592
Total	**0.1252**	**1.0738**	**0.8085**	**1.3000e-003**		**0.0625**	**0.0625**		**0.0592**	**0.0592**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0235	0.2338	0.3294	6.7000e-004	0.0187	3.5200e-003	0.0223	5.3400e-003	3.2400e-003	8.5800e-003
Worker	0.0209	0.0311	0.3232	8.3000e-004	0.0651	5.8000e-004	0.0657	0.0173	5.4000e-004	0.0178
Total	**0.0444**	**0.2649**	**0.6527**	**1.5000e-003**	**0.0838**	**4.1000e-003**	**0.0879**	**0.0226**	**3.7800e-003**	**0.0264**

3.9 Exterior Closure, MEP, Tenant Improvements - 2018

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Archit. Coating	3.9629					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0261	0.1752	0.1619	2.6000e-004		0.0132	0.0132		0.0132	0.0132
Total	**3.9890**	**0.1752**	**0.1619**	**2.6000e-004**		**0.0132**	**0.0132**		**0.0132**	**0.0132**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0282	0.2810	0.3959	8.0000e-004	0.0225	4.2300e-003	0.0267	6.4200e-003	3.8900e-003	0.0103
Worker	0.0251	0.0374	0.3885	9.9000e-004	0.0782	7.0000e-004	0.0789	0.0208	6.5000e-004	0.0214
Total	**0.0533**	**0.3184**	**0.7844**	**1.7900e-003**	**0.1007**	**4.9300e-003**	**0.1057**	**0.0272**	**4.5400e-003**	**0.0317**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Archit. Coating	3.9629					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0261	0.1752	0.1619	2.6000e-004		0.0132	0.0132		0.0132	0.0132
Total	**3.9890**	**0.1752**	**0.1619**	**2.6000e-004**		**0.0132**	**0.0132**		**0.0132**	**0.0132**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	tons/yr									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0282	0.2810	0.3959	8.0000e-004	0.0225	4.2300e-003	0.0267	6.4200e-003	3.8900e-003	0.0103
Worker	0.0251	0.0374	0.3885	9.9000e-004	0.0782	7.0000e-004	0.0789	0.0208	6.5000e-004	0.0214
Total	**0.0533**	**0.3184**	**0.7844**	**1.7900e-003**	**0.1007**	**4.9300e-003**	**0.1057**	**0.0272**	**4.5400e-003**	**0.0317**

Entrada - Construction

Los Angeles-South Coast County, Summer

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
General Office Building	281.21	1000sqft	3.70	281,209.00	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	**Wind Speed (m/s)**	2.2	**Precipitation Freq (Days)**	33
Climate Zone	11			**Operational Year**	2018
Utility Company	Los Angeles Department of Water & Power				
CO2 Intensity (lb/MWhr)	1227.89	**CH4 Intensity (lb/MWhr)**	0.029	**N2O Intensity (lb/MWhr)**	0.006

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

Project Characteristics -

Land Use - See construction assumptions

Construction Phase - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Trips and VMT - See Construction Assumptions

Demolition -

Grading - See construction assumptions

Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation -

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblAreaCoating	Area_Nonresidential_Interior	513000	0
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	20.00	131.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	230.00	152.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	230.00	109.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	20.00	22.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	20.00	16.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	20.00	69.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	10.00	284.00
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	11/30/2018	10/1/2018
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	12/31/2018	12/31/2017
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	12/30/2016	12/31/2016
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	4/28/2017	4/30/2017
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	7/3/2018	5/31/2018
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	6/28/2017	5/31/2017
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	6/1/2018	4/1/2018
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	6/1/2018	6/1/2017
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	6/1/2017	5/1/2017
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	5/1/2017	4/1/2017
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	0.00	34.50
tblGrading	MaterialExported	0.00	21,000.00
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	6.46	3.70
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	81.00	255.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	162.00	81.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	84.00	171.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	255.00	97.00

tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	78.00	81.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	205.00	174.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	9.00	97.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	9.00	226.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	9.00	78.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	171.00	255.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	171.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	130.00	89.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	80.00	97.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	199.00	97.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.73	0.40
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.38	0.73
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.74	0.42
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.40	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.48	0.73
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.50	0.41
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.56	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.56	0.29
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.56	0.48
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.42	0.40
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.42	0.01
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.36	0.20
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.38	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.36	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	1.00	2.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	1.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	1.00	0.00

tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	1.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	1.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	4.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	6.00	8.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	7.00	4.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	7.00	4.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	8.00	6.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	8.00	6.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	7.00	8.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	7.00	8.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	8.00	7.00
tblProjectCharacteristics	OperationalYear	2014	2018
tblTripsAndVMT	HaulingTripNumber	847.00	1,071.00
tblTripsAndVMT	HaulingTripNumber	1,875.00	1,920.00
tblTripsAndVMT	VendorTripNumber	0.00	56.00
tblTripsAndVMT	WorkerTripNumber	22.00	109.00

2.0 Emissions Summary

2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Year	lb/day									
2016	2.2110	23.6086	18.3108	0.0495	9.3495	0.9936	10.3430	1.5384	0.9472	2.4856
2017	4.4479	54.7861	40.3772	0.1164	2.3839	2.0226	4.4064	0.6333	1.8607	2.4940
2018	64.8064	31.6080	40.1413	0.0844	3.1691	1.4974	4.6665	0.8540	1.4261	2.2801
Total	**71.4654**	**110.0026**	**98.8293**	**0.2503**	**14.9024**	**4.5136**	**19.4160**	**3.0258**	**4.2340**	**7.2598**

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Year	lb/day									
2016	2.2110	23.6086	18.3108	0.0495	4.2657	0.9936	5.2593	0.7687	0.9472	1.7159
2017	4.4479	54.7861	40.3772	0.1164	2.2933	2.0226	4.3159	0.6196	1.8607	2.4803
2018	64.8064	31.6080	40.1413	0.0844	3.1691	1.4974	4.6665	0.8540	1.4261	2.2801
Total	**71.4654**	**110.0026**	**98.8293**	**0.2503**	**9.7281**	**4.5136**	**14.2417**	**2.2423**	**4.2340**	**6.4764**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Percent Reduction	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**34.72**	**0.00**	**26.65**	**25.89**	**0.00**	**10.79**

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Demolition	Demolition	12/1/2016	12/31/2016	5	22	
2	Excavation	Grading	1/1/2017	1/23/2017	5	16	
3	Piles and Foundation	Grading	1/24/2017	4/30/2017	5	69	
4	Site Utilities	Trenching	4/1/2017	5/31/2017	5	43	
5	Concrete Pours	Site Preparation	5/1/2017	5/31/2018	5	284	
6	Super Structure (Parking)	Building Construction	6/1/2017	12/31/2017	5	152	
7	Super Structure (Office)	Building Construction	1/1/2018	5/31/2018	5	109	
8	Exterior Closure, MEP, Tenant Improvements	Architectural Coating	4/1/2018	10/1/2018	5	131	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 0

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 0

Acres of Paving: 0

Residential Indoor: 0; Residential Outdoor: 0; Non-Residential Indoor: 513,000; Non-Residential Outdoor: 171,000 (Architectural Coating –

OffRoad Equipment

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Demolition	Air Compressors	1	8.00	81	0.73
Demolition	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.00	255	0.40
Demolition	Excavators	0	8.00	162	0.38
Demolition	Rubber Tired Dozers	2	8.00	97	0.37
Demolition	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	6.00	97	0.37
Excavation	Excavators	2	8.00	81	0.73
Excavation	Other Construction Equipment	1	8.00	255	0.40
Excavation	Rubber Tired Dozers	0	8.00	255	0.40
Excavation	Rubber Tired Loaders	2	8.00	97	0.37

Excavation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	0	8.00	97	0.37
Piles and Foundation	Bore/Drill Rigs	1	8.00	174	0.41
Piles and Foundation	Cement and Mortar Mixers	1	8.00	97	0.37
Piles and Foundation	Cranes	1	4.00	226	0.29
Piles and Foundation	Excavators	0	8.00	162	0.38
Piles and Foundation	Graders	0	8.00	174	0.41
Piles and Foundation	Rubber Tired Dozers	0	8.00	255	0.40
Piles and Foundation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7.00	97	0.37
Site Utilities	Cement and Mortar Mixers	1	8.00	226	0.29
Site Utilities	Paving Equipment	1	8.00	89	0.20
Site Utilities	Rollers	1	8.00	97	0.37
Concrete Pours	Other Construction Equipment	1	1.00	1	0.01
Concrete Pours	Rubber Tired Dozers	0	8.00	255	0.40
Concrete Pours	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	0	8.00	97	0.37
Super Structure (Parking)	Cement and Mortar Mixers	2	8.00	78	0.48
Super Structure (Parking)	Cranes	1	4.00	226	0.29
Super Structure (Parking)	Forklifts	1	6.00	89	0.20
Super Structure (Parking)	Generator Sets	1	8.00	171	0.42
Super Structure (Parking)	Other Construction Equipment	1	8.00	171	0.42
Super Structure (Parking)	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37
Super Structure (Parking)	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45
Super Structure (Office)	Cement and Mortar Mixers	2	8.00	9	0.56
Super Structure (Office)	Cranes	1	4.00	226	0.29
Super Structure (Office)	Forklifts	1	6.00	89	0.20
Super Structure (Office)	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Super Structure (Office)	Other Construction Equipment	1	8.00	171	0.42
Super Structure (Office)	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37
Super Structure (Office)	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45
Exterior Closure, MEP, Tenant Improvements	Air Compressors	1	8.00	78	0.48

Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Demolition	6	15.00	0.00	1,071.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Excavation	5	13.00	0.00	1,920.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Piles and Foundation	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Site Utilities	3	8.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Concrete Pours	1	3.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Super Structure (Parking)	8	109.00	56.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Super Structure (Office)	8	109.00	56.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Exterior Closure, MEP, Tenant Improvements	1	109.00	56.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Water Exposed Area

3.2 Demolition - 2016

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					8.3340	0.0000	8.3340	1.2619	0.0000	1.2619
Off-Road	1.2868	9.8780	7.5860	0.0109		0.7900	0.7900		0.7599	0.7599
Total	**1.2868**	**9.8780**	**7.5860**	**0.0109**	**8.3340**	**0.7900**	**9.1240**	**1.2619**	**0.7599**	**2.0217**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.8575	13.6465	9.6842	0.0364	0.8478	0.2021	1.0498	0.2321	0.1859	0.4180
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0668	0.0841	1.0406	2.1800e-003	0.1677	1.5900e-003	0.1693	0.0445	1.4600e-003	0.0459
Total	**0.9243**	**13.7306**	**10.7248**	**0.0385**	**1.0154**	**0.2036**	**1.2191**	**0.2766**	**0.1873**	**0.4639**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					3.2503	0.0000	3.2503	0.4921	0.0000	0.4921
Off-Road	1.2868	9.8780	7.5860	0.0109		0.7900	0.7900		0.7599	0.7599
Total	**1.2868**	**9.8780**	**7.5860**	**0.0109**	**3.2503**	**0.7900**	**4.0402**	**0.4921**	**0.7599**	**1.2520**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.8575	13.6465	9.6842	0.0364	0.8478	0.2021	1.0498	0.2321	0.1859	0.4180
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0668	0.0841	1.0406	2.1800e-003	0.1677	1.5900e-003	0.1693	0.0445	1.4600e-003	0.0459
Total	**0.9243**	**13.7306**	**10.7248**	**0.0385**	**1.0154**	**0.2036**	**1.2191**	**0.2766**	**0.1873**	**0.4639**

3.3 Excavation - 2017

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					0.1484	0.0000	0.1484	0.0225	0.0000	0.0225
Off-Road	2.3972	23.8237	16.6869	0.0250		1.5662	1.5662		1.4409	1.4409
Total	**2.3972**	**23.8237**	**16.6869**	**0.0250**	**0.1484**	**1.5662**	**1.7147**	**0.0225**	**1.4409**	**1.4634**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	1.9987	30.8965	22.8732	0.0895	2.0901	0.4550	2.5452	0.5723	0.4186	0.9909
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0520	0.0659	0.8171	1.8900e-003	0.1453	1.3200e-003	0.1466	0.0385	1.2100e-003	0.0398
Total	**2.0507**	**30.9624**	**23.6903**	**0.0914**	**2.2354**	**0.4563**	**2.6918**	**0.6109**	**0.4198**	**1.0306**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					0.0579	0.0000	0.0579	8.7700e-003	0.0000	8.7700e-003
Off-Road	2.3972	23.8237	16.6869	0.0250		1.5662	1.5662		1.4409	1.4409
Total	**2.3972**	**23.8237**	**16.6869**	**0.0250**	**0.0579**	**1.5662**	**1.6241**	**8.7700e-003**	**1.4409**	**1.4497**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	1.9987	30.8965	22.8732	0.0895	2.0901	0.4550	2.5452	0.5723	0.4186	0.9909
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0520	0.0659	0.8171	1.8900e-003	0.1453	1.3200e-003	0.1466	0.0385	1.2100e-003	0.0398
Total	**2.0507**	**30.9624**	**23.6903**	**0.0914**	**2.2354**	**0.4563**	**2.6918**	**0.6109**	**0.4198**	**1.0306**

3.4 Piles and Foundation - 2017

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					0.5303	0.0000	0.5303	0.0573	0.0000	0.0573
Off-Road	1.4632	15.5892	11.4383	0.0172		0.9376	0.9376		0.8626	0.8626
Total	**1.4632**	**15.5892**	**11.4383**	**0.0172**	**0.5303**	**0.9376**	**1.4678**	**0.0573**	**0.8626**	**0.9198**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0600	0.0761	0.9428	2.1800e-003	0.1677	1.5200e-003	0.1692	0.0445	1.4000e-003	0.0459
Total	**0.0600**	**0.0761**	**0.9428**	**2.1800e-003**	**0.1677**	**1.5200e-003**	**0.1692**	**0.0445**	**1.4000e-003**	**0.0459**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					0.2068	0.0000	0.2068	0.0223	0.0000	0.0223
Off-Road	1.4632	15.5892	11.4383	0.0172		0.9376	0.9376		0.8626	0.8626
Total	**1.4632**	**15.5892**	**11.4383**	**0.0172**	**0.2068**	**0.9376**	**1.1444**	**0.0223**	**0.8626**	**0.8849**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0600	0.0761	0.9428	2.1800e-003	0.1677	1.5200e-003	0.1692	0.0445	1.4000e-003	0.0459
Total	**0.0600**	**0.0761**	**0.9428**	**2.1800e-003**	**0.1677**	**1.5200e-003**	**0.1692**	**0.0445**	**1.4000e-003**	**0.0459**

3.5 Site Utilities - 2017

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Off-Road	0.5438	5.0602	3.5250	4.6300e-003		0.3708	0.3708		0.3411	0.3411
Total	**0.5438**	**5.0602**	**3.5250**	**4.6300e-003**		**0.3708**	**0.3708**		**0.3411**	**0.3411**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0320	0.0406	0.5028	1.1600e-003	0.0894	8.1000e-004	0.0902	0.0237	7.5000e-004	0.0245
Total	**0.0320**	**0.0406**	**0.5028**	**1.1600e-003**	**0.0894**	**8.1000e-004**	**0.0902**	**0.0237**	**7.5000e-004**	**0.0245**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Off-Road	0.5438	5.0602	3.5250	4.6300e-003		0.3708	0.3708		0.3411	0.3411
Total	**0.5438**	**5.0602**	**3.5250**	**4.6300e-003**		**0.3708**	**0.3708**		**0.3411**	**0.3411**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0320	0.0406	0.5028	1.1600e-003	0.0894	8.1000e-004	0.0902	0.0237	7.5000e-004	0.0245
Total	**0.0320**	**0.0406**	**0.5028**	**1.1600e-003**	**0.0894**	**8.1000e-004**	**0.0902**	**0.0237**	**7.5000e-004**	**0.0245**

3.6 Concrete Pours - 2017

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Total	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0120	0.0152	0.1886	4.4000e-004	0.0335	3.0000e-004	0.0338	8.8900e-003	2.8000e-004	9.1700e-003
Total	**0.0120**	**0.0152**	**0.1886**	**4.4000e-004**	**0.0335**	**3.0000e-004**	**0.0338**	**8.8900e-003**	**2.8000e-004**	**9.1700e-003**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Total	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0120	0.0152	0.1886	4.4000e-004	0.0335	3.0000e-004	0.0338	8.8900e-003	2.8000e-004	9.1700e-003
Total	**0.0120**	**0.0152**	**0.1886**	**4.4000e-004**	**0.0335**	**3.0000e-004**	**0.0338**	**8.8900e-003**	**2.8000e-004**	**9.1700e-003**

3.6 Concrete Pours - 2018

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Total	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0108	0.0138	0.1713	4.4000e-004	0.0335	2.9000e-004	0.0338	8.8900e-003	2.7000e-004	9.1700e-003
Total	**0.0108**	**0.0138**	**0.1713**	**4.4000e-004**	**0.0335**	**2.9000e-004**	**0.0338**	**8.8900e-003**	**2.7000e-004**	**9.1700e-003**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Total	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0108	0.0138	0.1713	4.4000e-004	0.0335	2.9000e-004	0.0338	8.8900e-003	2.7000e-004	9.1700e-003
Total	**0.0108**	**0.0138**	**0.1713**	**4.4000e-004**	**0.0335**	**2.9000e-004**	**0.0338**	**8.8900e-003**	**2.7000e-004**	**9.1700e-003**

3.7 Super Structure (Parking) - 2017

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Off-Road	2.3847	21.2000	14.5620	0.0234		1.2002	1.2002		1.1297	1.1297
Total	**2.3847**	**21.2000**	**14.5620**	**0.0234**		**1.2002**	**1.2002**		**1.1297**	**1.1297**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.4315	4.4674	5.3454	0.0123	0.3494	0.0683	0.4176	0.0994	0.0628	0.1622
Worker	0.4363	0.5526	6.8508	0.0158	1.2184	0.0110	1.2294	0.3231	0.0102	0.3333
Total	**0.8677**	**5.0200**	**12.1962**	**0.0281**	**1.5677**	**0.0793**	**1.6470**	**0.4225**	**0.0730**	**0.4955**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Off-Road	2.3847	21.2000	14.5620	0.0234		1.2002	1.2002		1.1297	1.1297
Total	**2.3847**	**21.2000**	**14.5620**	**0.0234**		**1.2002**	**1.2002**		**1.1297**	**1.1297**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.4315	4.4674	5.3454	0.0123	0.3494	0.0683	0.4176	0.0994	0.0628	0.1622
Worker	0.4363	0.5526	6.8508	0.0158	1.2184	0.0110	1.2294	0.3231	0.0102	0.3333
Total	**0.8677**	**5.0200**	**12.1962**	**0.0281**	**1.5677**	**0.0793**	**1.6470**	**0.4225**	**0.0730**	**0.4955**

3.8 Super Structure (Office) - 2018

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Off-Road	2.2964	19.7020	14.8355	0.0238		1.1464	1.1464		1.0871	1.0871
Total	**2.2964**	**19.7020**	**14.8355**	**0.0238**		**1.1464**	**1.1464**		**1.0871**	**1.0871**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.4064	4.1074	5.1061	0.0123	0.3494	0.0643	0.4137	0.0994	0.0591	0.1586
Worker	0.3928	0.5016	6.2251	0.0158	1.2184	0.0107	1.2291	0.3231	9.8900e-003	0.3330
Total	**0.7992**	**4.6090**	**11.3311**	**0.0281**	**1.5678**	**0.0750**	**1.6428**	**0.4226**	**0.0690**	**0.4916**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Off-Road	2.2964	19.7020	14.8355	0.0238		1.1464	1.1464		1.0871	1.0871
Total	**2.2964**	**19.7020**	**14.8355**	**0.0238**		**1.1464**	**1.1464**		**1.0871**	**1.0871**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.4064	4.1074	5.1061	0.0123	0.3494	0.0643	0.4137	0.0994	0.0591	0.1586
Worker	0.3928	0.5016	6.2251	0.0158	1.2184	0.0107	1.2291	0.3231	9.8900e-003	0.3330
Total	**0.7992**	**4.6090**	**11.3311**	**0.0281**	**1.5678**	**0.0750**	**1.6428**	**0.4226**	**0.0690**	**0.4916**

3.9 Exterior Closure, MEP, Tenant Improvements - 2018

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Archit. Coating	60.5027					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.3982	2.6743	2.4723	3.9600e-003		0.2007	0.2007		0.2007	0.2007
Total	**60.9009**	**2.6743**	**2.4723**	**3.9600e-003**		**0.2007**	**0.2007**		**0.2007**	**0.2007**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.4064	4.1074	5.1061	0.0123	0.3494	0.0643	0.4137	0.0994	0.0591	0.1586
Worker	0.3928	0.5016	6.2251	0.0158	1.2184	0.0107	1.2291	0.3231	9.8900e-003	0.3330
Total	**0.7992**	**4.6090**	**11.3311**	**0.0281**	**1.5678**	**0.0750**	**1.6428**	**0.4226**	**0.0690**	**0.4916**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Archit. Coating	60.5027					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.3982	2.6743	2.4723	3.9600e-003		0.2007	0.2007		0.2007	0.2007
Total	**60.9009**	**2.6743**	**2.4723**	**3.9600e-003**		**0.2007**	**0.2007**		**0.2007**	**0.2007**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.4064	4.1074	5.1061	0.0123	0.3494	0.0643	0.4137	0.0994	0.0591	0.1586
Worker	0.3928	0.5016	6.2251	0.0158	1.2184	0.0107	1.2291	0.3231	9.8900e-003	0.3330
Total	**0.7992**	**4.6090**	**11.3311**	**0.0281**	**1.5678**	**0.0750**	**1.6428**	**0.4226**	**0.0690**	**0.4916**

Entrada - Construction

Los Angeles-South Coast County, Winter

1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

Land Uses	Size	Metric	Lot Acreage	Floor Surface Area	Population
General Office Building	281.21	1000sqft	3.70	281,209.00	0

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

Urbanization	Urban	**Wind Speed (m/s)**	2.2	**Precipitation Freq (Days)**	33
Climate Zone	11			**Operational Year**	2018
Utility Company	Los Angeles Department of Water & Power				
CO2 Intensity (lb/MWhr)	1227.89	**CH4 Intensity (lb/MWhr)**	0.029	**N2O Intensity (lb/MWhr)**	0.006

1.3 User Entered Comments & Non-Default Data

Project Characteristics -

Land Use - See construction assumptions

Construction Phase - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Off-road Equipment - See Construction Assumptions.

Trips and VMT - See Construction Assumptions

Demolition -

Grading - See construction assumptions

Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation -

Table Name	Column Name	Default Value	New Value
tblAreaCoating	Area_Nonresidential_Interior	513000	0
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	20.00	131.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	230.00	152.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	230.00	109.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	20.00	22.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	20.00	16.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	20.00	69.00
tblConstructionPhase	NumDays	10.00	284.00
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	11/30/2018	10/1/2018
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	12/31/2018	12/31/2017
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	12/30/2016	12/31/2016
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	4/28/2017	4/30/2017
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	7/3/2018	5/31/2018
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseEndDate	6/28/2017	5/31/2017
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	6/1/2018	4/1/2018
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	6/1/2018	6/1/2017
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	6/1/2017	5/1/2017
tblConstructionPhase	PhaseStartDate	5/1/2017	4/1/2017
tblGrading	AcresOfGrading	0.00	34.50
tblGrading	MaterialExported	0.00	21,000.00
tblLandUse	LotAcreage	6.46	3.70
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	81.00	255.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	162.00	81.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	84.00	171.00

tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	255.00	97.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	78.00	81.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	205.00	174.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	9.00	97.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	9.00	226.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	9.00	78.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	171.00	255.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	171.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	130.00	89.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	80.00	97.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	HorsePower	199.00	97.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.73	0.40
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.38	0.73
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.74	0.42
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.40	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.48	0.73
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.50	0.41
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.56	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.56	0.29
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.56	0.48
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.42	0.40
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.42	0.01
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.36	0.20
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.38	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	LoadFactor	0.36	0.37
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	1.00	2.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	1.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	1.00

tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	1.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	1.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	1.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	1.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	3.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	OffRoadEquipmentUnitAmount	4.00	0.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	6.00	8.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	7.00	4.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	7.00	4.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	8.00	6.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	8.00	6.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	7.00	8.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	7.00	8.00
tblOffRoadEquipment	UsageHours	8.00	7.00
tblProjectCharacteristics	OperationalYear	2014	2018
tblTripsAndVMT	HaulingTripNumber	847.00	1,071.00
tblTripsAndVMT	HaulingTripNumber	1,875.00	1,920.00
tblTripsAndVMT	VendorTripNumber	0.00	56.00
tblTripsAndVMT	WorkerTripNumber	22.00	109.00

2.0 Emissions Summary

2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

Unmitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Year	lb/day									
2016	2.2643	24.0975	19.7876	0.0493	9.3495	0.9941	10.3435	1.5384	0.9477	2.4861
2017	4.5577	55.8782	44.1451	0.1161	2.3839	2.0236	4.4075	0.6333	1.8617	2.4950
2018	64.9112	31.9165	41.7043	0.0824	3.1691	1.4987	4.6678	0.8540	1.4273	2.2813
Total	**71.7332**	**111.8922**	**105.6370**	**0.2478**	**14.9024**	**4.5164**	**19.4188**	**3.0258**	**4.2366**	**7.2624**

Mitigated Construction

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Year	lb/day									
2016	2.2643	24.0975	19.7876	0.0493	4.2657	0.9941	5.2598	0.7687	0.9477	1.7164
2017	4.5577	55.8782	44.1451	0.1161	2.2933	2.0236	4.3169	0.6196	1.8617	2.4813
2018	64.9112	31.9165	41.7043	0.0824	3.1691	1.4987	4.6678	0.8540	1.4273	2.2813
Total	**71.7332**	**111.8922**	**105.6370**	**0.2478**	**9.7281**	**4.5164**	**14.2445**	**2.2423**	**4.2366**	**6.4789**

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Percent Reduction	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**34.72**	**0.00**	**26.65**	**25.89**	**0.00**	**10.79**

3.0 Construction Detail

Construction Phase

Phase Number	Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Num Days Week	Num Days	Phase Description
1	Demolition	Demolition	12/1/2016	12/31/2016	5	22	
2	Excavation	Grading	1/1/2017	1/23/2017	5	16	
3	Piles and Foundation	Grading	1/24/2017	4/30/2017	5	69	
4	Site Utilities	Trenching	4/1/2017	5/31/2017	5	43	
5	Concrete Pours	Site Preparation	5/1/2017	5/31/2018	5	284	
6	Super Structure (Parking)	Building Construction	6/1/2017	12/31/2017	5	152	
7	Super Structure (Office)	Building Construction	1/1/2018	5/31/2018	5	109	
8	Exterior Closure, MEP, Tenant Improvements	Architectural Coating	4/1/2018	10/1/2018	5	131	

Acres of Grading (Site Preparation Phase): 0

Acres of Grading (Grading Phase): 0

Acres of Paving: 0

Residential Indoor: 0; Residential Outdoor: 0; Non-Residential Indoor: 513,000; Non-Residential Outdoor: 171,000 (Architectural Coating –

OffRoad Equipment

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Type	Amount	Usage Hours	Horse Power	Load Factor
Demolition	Air Compressors	1	8.00	81	0.73
Demolition	Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.00	255	0.40
Demolition	Excavators	0	8.00	162	0.38
Demolition	Rubber Tired Dozers	2	8.00	97	0.37
Demolition	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	6.00	97	0.37
Excavation	Excavators	2	8.00	81	0.73
Excavation	Other Construction Equipment	1	8.00	255	0.40
Excavation	Rubber Tired Dozers	0	8.00	255	0.40
Excavation	Rubber Tired Loaders	2	8.00	97	0.37
Excavation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	0	8.00	97	0.37

Piles and Foundation	Bore/Drill Rigs	1	8.00	174	0.41
Piles and Foundation	Cement and Mortar Mixers	1	8.00	97	0.37
Piles and Foundation	Cranes	1	4.00	226	0.29
Piles and Foundation	Excavators	0	8.00	162	0.38
Piles and Foundation	Graders	0	8.00	174	0.41
Piles and Foundation	Rubber Tired Dozers	0	8.00	255	0.40
Piles and Foundation	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	3	7.00	97	0.37
Site Utilities	Cement and Mortar Mixers	1	8.00	226	0.29
Site Utilities	Paving Equipment	1	8.00	89	0.20
Site Utilities	Rollers	1	8.00	97	0.37
Concrete Pours	Other Construction Equipment	1	1.00	1	0.01
Concrete Pours	Rubber Tired Dozers	0	8.00	255	0.40
Concrete Pours	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	0	8.00	97	0.37
Super Structure (Parking)	Cement and Mortar Mixers	2	8.00	78	0.48
Super Structure (Parking)	Cranes	1	4.00	226	0.29
Super Structure (Parking)	Forklifts	1	6.00	89	0.20
Super Structure (Parking)	Generator Sets	1	8.00	171	0.42
Super Structure (Parking)	Other Construction Equipment	1	8.00	171	0.42
Super Structure (Parking)	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37
Super Structure (Parking)	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45
Super Structure (Office)	Cement and Mortar Mixers	2	8.00	9	0.56
Super Structure (Office)	Cranes	1	4.00	226	0.29
Super Structure (Office)	Forklifts	1	6.00	89	0.20
Super Structure (Office)	Generator Sets	1	8.00	84	0.74
Super Structure (Office)	Other Construction Equipment	1	8.00	171	0.42
Super Structure (Office)	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.00	97	0.37
Super Structure (Office)	Welders	1	8.00	46	0.45
Exterior Closure, MEP, Tenant Improvements	Air Compressors	1	8.00	78	0.48

Trips and VMT

Phase Name	Offroad Equipment Count	Worker Trip Number	Vendor Trip Number	Hauling Trip Number	Worker Trip Length	Vendor Trip Length	Hauling Trip Length	Worker Vehicle Class	Vendor Vehicle Class	Hauling Vehicle Class
Demolition	6	15.00	0.00	1,071.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Excavation	5	13.00	0.00	1,920.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Piles and Foundation	6	15.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Site Utilities	3	8.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Concrete Pours	1	3.00	0.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Super Structure (Parking)	8	109.00	56.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Super Structure (Office)	8	109.00	56.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT
Exterior Closure, MEP, Tenant Improvements	1	109.00	56.00	0.00	14.70	6.90	20.00	LD_Mix	HDT_Mix	HHDT

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction

Water Exposed Area

3.2 Demolition - 2016

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					8.3340	0.0000	8.3340	1.2619	0.0000	1.2619
Off-Road	1.2868	9.8780	7.5860	0.0109		0.7900	0.7900		0.7599	0.7599
Total	**1.2868**	**9.8780**	**7.5860**	**0.0109**	**8.3340**	**0.7900**	**9.1240**	**1.2619**	**0.7599**	**2.0217**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.9080	14.1263	11.2245	0.0363	0.8478	0.2026	1.0503	0.2321	0.1863	0.4184
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0695	0.0932	0.9771	2.0600e-003	0.1677	1.5900e-003	0.1693	0.0445	1.4600e-003	0.0459
Total	**0.9775**	**14.2196**	**12.2016**	**0.0384**	**1.0154**	**0.2041**	**1.2196**	**0.2766**	**0.1878**	**0.4644**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					3.2503	0.0000	3.2503	0.4921	0.0000	0.4921
Off-Road	1.2868	9.8780	7.5860	0.0109		0.7900	0.7900		0.7599	0.7599
Total	**1.2868**	**9.8780**	**7.5860**	**0.0109**	**3.2503**	**0.7900**	**4.0402**	**0.4921**	**0.7599**	**1.2520**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.9080	14.1263	11.2245	0.0363	0.8478	0.2026	1.0503	0.2321	0.1863	0.4184
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0695	0.0932	0.9771	2.0600e-003	0.1677	1.5900e-003	0.1693	0.0445	1.4600e-003	0.0459
Total	**0.9775**	**14.2196**	**12.2016**	**0.0384**	**1.0154**	**0.2041**	**1.2196**	**0.2766**	**0.1878**	**0.4644**

3.3 Excavation - 2017

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					0.1484	0.0000	0.1484	0.0225	0.0000	0.0225
Off-Road	2.3972	23.8237	16.6869	0.0250		1.5662	1.5662		1.4409	1.4409
Total	**2.3972**	**23.8237**	**16.6869**	**0.0250**	**0.1484**	**1.5662**	**1.7147**	**0.0225**	**1.4409**	**1.4634**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	2.1065	31.9814	26.6941	0.0894	2.0901	0.4561	2.5462	0.5723	0.4195	0.9918
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0540	0.0731	0.7641	1.7800e-003	0.1453	1.3200e-003	0.1466	0.0385	1.2100e-003	0.0398
Total	**2.1605**	**32.0545**	**27.4582**	**0.0912**	**2.2354**	**0.4574**	**2.6928**	**0.6109**	**0.4207**	**1.0316**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					0.0579	0.0000	0.0579	8.7700e-003	0.0000	8.7700e-003
Off-Road	2.3972	23.8237	16.6869	0.0250		1.5662	1.5662		1.4409	1.4409
Total	**2.3972**	**23.8237**	**16.6869**	**0.0250**	**0.0579**	**1.5662**	**1.6241**	**8.7700e-003**	**1.4409**	**1.4497**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	2.1065	31.9814	26.6941	0.0894	2.0901	0.4561	2.5462	0.5723	0.4195	0.9918
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0540	0.0731	0.7641	1.7800e-003	0.1453	1.3200e-003	0.1466	0.0385	1.2100e-003	0.0398
Total	**2.1605**	**32.0545**	**27.4582**	**0.0912**	**2.2354**	**0.4574**	**2.6928**	**0.6109**	**0.4207**	**1.0316**

3.4 Piles and Foundation - 2017

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					0.5303	0.0000	0.5303	0.0573	0.0000	0.0573
Off-Road	1.4632	15.5892	11.4383	0.0172		0.9376	0.9376		0.8626	0.8626
Total	**1.4632**	**15.5892**	**11.4383**	**0.0172**	**0.5303**	**0.9376**	**1.4678**	**0.0573**	**0.8626**	**0.9198**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0623	0.0843	0.8817	2.0600e-003	0.1677	1.5200e-003	0.1692	0.0445	1.4000e-003	0.0459
Total	**0.0623**	**0.0843**	**0.8817**	**2.0600e-003**	**0.1677**	**1.5200e-003**	**0.1692**	**0.0445**	**1.4000e-003**	**0.0459**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					0.2068	0.0000	0.2068	0.0223	0.0000	0.0223
Off-Road	1.4632	15.5892	11.4383	0.0172		0.9376	0.9376		0.8626	0.8626
Total	**1.4632**	**15.5892**	**11.4383**	**0.0172**	**0.2068**	**0.9376**	**1.1444**	**0.0223**	**0.8626**	**0.8849**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0623	0.0843	0.8817	2.0600e-003	0.1677	1.5200e-003	0.1692	0.0445	1.4000e-003	0.0459
Total	**0.0623**	**0.0843**	**0.8817**	**2.0600e-003**	**0.1677**	**1.5200e-003**	**0.1692**	**0.0445**	**1.4000e-003**	**0.0459**

3.5 Site Utilities - 2017

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Off-Road	0.5438	5.0602	3.5250	4.6300e-003		0.3708	0.3708		0.3411	0.3411
Total	**0.5438**	**5.0602**	**3.5250**	**4.6300e-003**		**0.3708**	**0.3708**		**0.3411**	**0.3411**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0332	0.0450	0.4702	1.1000e-003	0.0894	8.1000e-004	0.0902	0.0237	7.5000e-004	0.0245
Total	**0.0332**	**0.0450**	**0.4702**	**1.1000e-003**	**0.0894**	**8.1000e-004**	**0.0902**	**0.0237**	**7.5000e-004**	**0.0245**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Off-Road	0.5438	5.0602	3.5250	4.6300e-003		0.3708	0.3708		0.3411	0.3411
Total	**0.5438**	**5.0602**	**3.5250**	**4.6300e-003**		**0.3708**	**0.3708**		**0.3411**	**0.3411**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0332	0.0450	0.4702	1.1000e-003	0.0894	8.1000e-004	0.0902	0.0237	7.5000e-004	0.0245
Total	**0.0332**	**0.0450**	**0.4702**	**1.1000e-003**	**0.0894**	**8.1000e-004**	**0.0902**	**0.0237**	**7.5000e-004**	**0.0245**

3.6 Concrete Pours - 2017

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Total	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0125	0.0169	0.1763	4.1000e-004	0.0335	3.0000e-004	0.0338	8.8900e-003	2.8000e-004	9.1700e-003
Total	**0.0125**	**0.0169**	**0.1763**	**4.1000e-004**	**0.0335**	**3.0000e-004**	**0.0338**	**8.8900e-003**	**2.8000e-004**	**9.1700e-003**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Total	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0125	0.0169	0.1763	4.1000e-004	0.0335	3.0000e-004	0.0338	8.8900e-003	2.8000e-004	9.1700e-003
Total	**0.0125**	**0.0169**	**0.1763**	**4.1000e-004**	**0.0335**	**3.0000e-004**	**0.0338**	**8.8900e-003**	**2.8000e-004**	**9.1700e-003**

3.6 Concrete Pours - 2018

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Total	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0112	0.0153	0.1595	4.1000e-004	0.0335	2.9000e-004	0.0338	8.8900e-003	2.7000e-004	9.1700e-003
Total	**0.0112**	**0.0153**	**0.1595**	**4.1000e-004**	**0.0335**	**2.9000e-004**	**0.0338**	**8.8900e-003**	**2.7000e-004**	**9.1700e-003**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Fugitive Dust					0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Total	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**	**0.0000**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Worker	0.0112	0.0153	0.1595	4.1000e-004	0.0335	2.9000e-004	0.0338	8.8900e-003	2.7000e-004	9.1700e-003
Total	**0.0112**	**0.0153**	**0.1595**	**4.1000e-004**	**0.0335**	**2.9000e-004**	**0.0338**	**8.8900e-003**	**2.7000e-004**	**9.1700e-003**

3.7 Super Structure (Parking) - 2017

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Off-Road	2.3847	21.2000	14.5620	0.0234		1.2002	1.2002		1.1297	1.1297
Total	**2.3847**	**21.2000**	**14.5620**	**0.0234**		**1.2002**	**1.2002**		**1.1297**	**1.1297**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.4739	4.5771	6.5748	0.0122	0.3494	0.0689	0.4183	0.0994	0.0634	0.1628
Worker	0.4529	0.6128	6.4067	0.0149	1.2184	0.0110	1.2294	0.3231	0.0102	0.3333
Total	**0.9268**	**5.1899**	**12.9815**	**0.0272**	**1.5677**	**0.0800**	**1.6477**	**0.4225**	**0.0736**	**0.4961**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Off-Road	2.3847	21.2000	14.5620	0.0234		1.2002	1.2002		1.1297	1.1297
Total	**2.3847**	**21.2000**	**14.5620**	**0.0234**		**1.2002**	**1.2002**		**1.1297**	**1.1297**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.4739	4.5771	6.5748	0.0122	0.3494	0.0689	0.4183	0.0994	0.0634	0.1628
Worker	0.4529	0.6128	6.4067	0.0149	1.2184	0.0110	1.2294	0.3231	0.0102	0.3333
Total	**0.9268**	**5.1899**	**12.9815**	**0.0272**	**1.5677**	**0.0800**	**1.6477**	**0.4225**	**0.0736**	**0.4961**

3.8 Super Structure (Office) - 2018

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Off-Road	2.2964	19.7020	14.8355	0.0238		1.1464	1.1464		1.0871	1.0871
Total	**2.2964**	**19.7020**	**14.8355**	**0.0238**		**1.1464**	**1.1464**		**1.0871**	**1.0871**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.4446	4.2063	6.3223	0.0122	0.3494	0.0649	0.4144	0.0994	0.0597	0.1592
Worker	0.4068	0.5562	5.7962	0.0149	1.2184	0.0107	1.2291	0.3231	9.8900e-003	0.3330
Total	**0.8514**	**4.7624**	**12.1185**	**0.0271**	**1.5678**	**0.0756**	**1.6434**	**0.4226**	**0.0696**	**0.4922**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Off-Road	2.2964	19.7020	14.8355	0.0238		1.1464	1.1464		1.0871	1.0871
Total	**2.2964**	**19.7020**	**14.8355**	**0.0238**		**1.1464**	**1.1464**		**1.0871**	**1.0871**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.4446	4.2063	6.3223	0.0122	0.3494	0.0649	0.4144	0.0994	0.0597	0.1592
Worker	0.4068	0.5562	5.7962	0.0149	1.2184	0.0107	1.2291	0.3231	9.8900e-003	0.3330
Total	**0.8514**	**4.7624**	**12.1185**	**0.0271**	**1.5678**	**0.0756**	**1.6434**	**0.4226**	**0.0696**	**0.4922**

3.9 Exterior Closure, MEP, Tenant Improvements - 2018

Unmitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Archit. Coating	60.5027					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.3982	2.6743	2.4723	3.9600e-003		0.2007	0.2007		0.2007	0.2007
Total	**60.9009**	**2.6743**	**2.4723**	**3.9600e-003**		**0.2007**	**0.2007**		**0.2007**	**0.2007**

Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.4446	4.2063	6.3223	0.0122	0.3494	0.0649	0.4144	0.0994	0.0597	0.1592
Worker	0.4068	0.5562	5.7962	0.0149	1.2184	0.0107	1.2291	0.3231	9.8900e-003	0.3330
Total	**0.8514**	**4.7624**	**12.1185**	**0.0271**	**1.5678**	**0.0756**	**1.6434**	**0.4226**	**0.0696**	**0.4922**

Mitigated Construction On-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Archit. Coating	60.5027					0.0000	0.0000		0.0000	0.0000
Off-Road	0.3982	2.6743	2.4723	3.9600e-003		0.2007	0.2007		0.2007	0.2007
Total	**60.9009**	**2.6743**	**2.4723**	**3.9600e-003**		**0.2007**	**0.2007**		**0.2007**	**0.2007**

Mitigated Construction Off-Site

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	Fugitive PM10	Exhaust PM10	PM10 Total	Fugitive PM2.5	Exhaust PM2.5	PM2.5 Total
Category	lb/day									
Hauling	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Vendor	0.4446	4.2063	6.3223	0.0122	0.3494	0.0649	0.4144	0.0994	0.0597	0.1592
Worker	0.4068	0.5562	5.7962	0.0149	1.2184	0.0107	1.2291	0.3231	9.8900e-003	0.3330
Total	**0.8514**	**4.7624**	**12.1185**	**0.0271**	**1.5678**	**0.0756**	**1.6434**	**0.4226**	**0.0696**	**0.4922**

Appendix D
Modified Project Traffic Studies

D-1 Addendum Construction Traffic Section

ENTRADA CREATIVE OFFICE PROJECT
ADDENDUM CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC SECTION

The Entrada Creative Office Project (the "Modified Project"), like the Approved Project, would generate additional traffic during its construction. The amount of construction traffic would vary throughout the construction period. As indicated by the comparison below, the Modified Project construction traffic components would be the same as or fairly similar to those of the Approved Project components, including the duration of overall construction, site preparation, and garage construction.

Component	Unit	Approved Project	Modified Project
Duration of construction	Months	22	22
Duration of site prep work (demolition, grading, excavation, etc.)	Weeks	7	7
Duration of garage construction	Months	12	12
Duration of office building construction	Months	11 (1 to 2 mos. overlap with garage)	13 (3 mos. overlap with garage)
Number of construction workers on- site per day	Number	10 to 130	10 to 140
Average number of construction workers on-site per day	Number	62	70
Number of miscellaneous trips per day (lunch vans, mail delivery, visitors, etc.) to site	Number	5 to 20	5 to 20
Amount of material exported from site	Cubic yards	19,285	21,000
Duration of hauling with haul trucks	Weeks	3	3
Number of haul trucks per day from site (14 cy per truck assumed)	Trips	100	120
Frequency of concrete pours	Days per week	1	3 (over 10 mos.)
Number of concrete trucks per pour day to site (10 cy per truck assumed)	Trips	50	50
Number of trucks delivering construction materials (steel, rebar, pipes, dry wall, lumber, etc.) to site	Trips	4 to 30	4 to 30
Duration of potential closure of site- adjacent curb lane on Centinela (for positioning large machinery)	Days	5 to 10	5 to 10

Construction of the Modified Project, as was the case with the Approved Project, would occur in compliance with City of Culver City standards with construction activities occurring from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M., Monday through Friday. Based on a trip generation factor of 1.5 trips per person per day, the Modified Project construction worker trips would range from 15 to 210 trips per day, with an average of 105 trips per day. These trips are slightly higher than the Approved Project construction worker trip generations of 15 to 195 trips per day and an average of 93 trips per day. The Modified Project construction worker trips would be expected to have a significant short-term impact on traffic, as with the Approved Project.

The small number of miscellaneous trips generated by the Approved Project was determined not to significantly impact the street system. Approximately the same number of miscellaneous trips would be generated by the Modified Project, which would also not significantly impact the street system.

As with the Approved Project, construction of the Modified Project would necessitate the temporary relocation of the parking for Hotel guests, visitors and employees off-site during the construction period. It is anticipated that construction workers would park on-site throughout much of the construction period. However, it may be necessary at times for construction workers to also park off-site.

The surface lot across the street on the south side of Centinela Avenue, which is under the control of the Project ownership and would also be valet-parked as necessary, will be able to accommodate much of the Hotel parking. Prior to beginning construction, Project ownership and the general contractor will conduct a survey of available off-site parking locations and will arrange for off-site construction parking. Potential parking facilities that may be available for off-site construction worker parking include the large surface parking lot south of Centinela Avenue at 6300 Arizona Court, the large surface parking lot that served the now-closed supermarket adjacent to the Project site at 5750 Mesmer Avenue, and the parking structures in Howard Hughes Center. A shuttle service to and from the Project site would be implemented for those parking more than a short walk away. It is also likely that within several months after the start of its construction, the garage would be sufficiently usable for construction working parking. This would alleviate demand on off-site parking facilities, thereby freeing up capacity for other users.

It is estimated that the Modified Project would have approximately 1,715 more cubic yards of exported material (soil and debris) transported from the Project site than the Approved Project, which represents less than a 10% increase from the Approved Project. It is anticipated that the

basic haul route for exported material would be to and from the 405 Freeway, the same as for the Approved Project. For outbound travel, this would involve a right turn from the site onto Centinela Avenue, a right turn onto Mesmer Avenue, a right turn onto Jefferson Boulevard, and a left turn or right turn onto the respective northbound or southbound 405 Freeway on ramp, depending on the destination of the exported material. Return trips would travel the same basic route but in reverse order, with the possible exception that the trucks would use the traffic signal at the intersection of Major Street and Centinela Avenue to facilitate making the left turn onto Centinela Avenue to approach the Project site.

Concrete deliveries for pouring the Modified Project's parking garage and floor decks would occur approximately three days per week within a 10-month period. Approximately 50 concrete trucks per pour day (50 inbound trips and 50 outbound trips) would be generated by the Modified Project, the same as by the Approved Project. Trucks delivering construction materials for the Modified Project, such as steel, rebar, pipes, dry wall, lumber, etc., would generate approximately eight to 60 trips per day (i.e., up to 30 inbound trips and 30 outbound trips). This is the same number as estimated for the Approved Project. No significant overlap of days involving concrete deliveries and other deliveries is anticipated. In terms of the travel route for concrete and other delivery trucks, it is anticipated that the basic routing pattern discussed above for haul trucks would be used, which is also the same route identified for the Approved Project.

The Modified Project is expected to accommodate the staging of construction trucks on-site. Any construction staging off-site that might be necessary would be limited and infrequent. Off-site staging locations have not yet been determined, but they would be where sufficient length would be available to accommodate large trucks without being unduly disruptive to traffic operations. The drivers of these trucks would be in radio or phone communication with on-site personnel who would advise the drivers when to proceed from the staging location to the site. This procedure reduces the likelihood of construction trucks arriving at inappropriate times and causing more congestion and delay at the site locale. Depending on the staging location, the previously discussed travel routing pattern could be modified. These same staging and operational conditions were proposed for the Approved Project.

As with the Approved Project, it may be necessary for the Modified Project to close the site-adjacent curb lane on Centinela Avenue for five to 10 days. This would allow large machinery and equipment, such as cranes, to be positioned in that lane when they cannot be effectively accommodated on-site. On-street parking would not be affected as such parking is not allowed

in the site vicinity. Any such lane closure would occur during the off-peak traffic period, and would not block usage of the remaining lanes on Centinela Avenue. Temporary fencing would be installed around the site, but vehicular and pedestrian access would still be maintained.

As with the Approved Project, the Modified Project's haul truck traffic has the potential to result in a significant short-term traffic impact. Concrete and other delivery truck traffic attributable to the Modified Project could also have a significant short-term impact on traffic. It should be noted that for the Approved Project, these same categories of construction-related trips were also determined to have the potential to result in significant short-term traffic impacts. The following mitigation measures, which were approved for the Approved Project, are recommended for the Modified Project:

Mitigation Measures

- Vehicular and pedestrian access along Centinela Avenue shall be maintained at all times.
- A Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be prepared by a traffic or civil engineer registered in the State of California. The Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to the City's Public Works Department for review. The Construction Management Plan shall also be reviewed by the City's Fire and Police Departments. The Construction Management Plan must be approved by the City Engineer prior to the issuance of any project demolition, grading or excavation permit. The Plan shall contain but not be limited to the following:
  - The name and telephone number of a contact person who can be reached 24 hours a day regarding construction traffic complaints or emergency situations;
  - An up-to-date list of local police, fire, and emergency response organizations and procedures for the continuous coordination of construction activity, potential delays, and any alerts related to unanticipated road conditions or delays, with local police, fire, and emergency response agencies. Coordination shall include the assessment of any alternative access routes that might be required through the project site, and maps showing access to and within the project site and to adjacent properties;
  - Procedures for the training and certification of the flag persons used in implementation of the Plan;
  - The location, times and estimated duration of any roadway closures, traffic detours, use of protective devices, warning signs, and staging or queuing areas; and
  - The location and travel routes of off-site parking and staging locations.

  As part of the Construction Traffic Management Plan, an assessment of temporary effects on traffic shall be completed to address off-site parking for the hotel and construction workers while the new parking garage is being completed. This assessment shall include an evaluation of anticipated traffic impacts during the construction phase, taking into

account off-site parking facilities, their access routes and patterns, and their related vehicle trips on the roadway system. The objective of this assessment shall be to take all reasonable measures possible to reduce or avoid temporary congestion, potential hazards, and inconvenience due to off-site parking. This assessment shall also include an evaluation of candidate off-site parking locations. The conditions shall be reviewed by the City once the location is in use to refine or institute new measures or protocols as feasible to the satisfaction of the City.

- Flag persons with certified training shall be provided for work site traffic control to minimize impact to traffic flow, and to ensure the safe movement of vehicles into and out of the project site.
- Construction vehicles shall not be permitted to stage or queue where they would interfere with vehicular and pedestrian traffic, or block access to adjacent businesses. Off-site staging locations shall be approved by the City and be of sufficient length to accommodate large trucks without being unduly disruptive to traffic operations. The drivers of these trucks shall be in radio or phone communication with on-site personnel who shall advise the drivers when to proceed from the staging location(s) to the Project site.
- Construction-related vehicles shall not be permitted to park on public streets.
- A Construction Replacement Parking Plan shall be prepared and submitted to the Community Development Department for review and approval prior to the issuance of any Project demolition, grading or excavation permit. The Construction Replacement Parking Plan shall identify the off-site parking facilities and their parking space allocations that will be used for replacement parking during Project construction, as well as the procedures that will be followed for safe pedestrian and vehicular movement between the off-site locations and the Project site. The Construction Replacement Parking Plan shall also include parking lease agreements for the facilities not under the control of project ownership and a shuttle service plan for transporting persons parking more than one-fourth mile from the site.