

RESOLUTION NO. 2018-_____

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

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

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

Project Location

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

Project Description

The Project, would technologically update and expand facilities within the existing Studio Campus, while retaining the Studio's unique ambiance and prominent place in

1 downtown Culver City. CPA No. 7 includes some, but not all, of the improvements approved
2 as part of CPA No. 6 but not yet constructed, including new Building Y and the Van Buren
3 Parking Structure near Van Buren Place. Although the historically significant bungalows have
4 been relocated to the area south of the Mansion and are currently being rehabilitated subject
5 to the mitigation measures required under CPA No. 6, this change to the Studio Campus is
6 also included in CPA No. 7.
7

8 No major exterior changes are proposed to the Mansion or adjacent Buildings
9 D, E, H, and I. Interior rehabilitation of the Mansion would be undertaken in a manner that
10 would protect the building's eligibility as a historical resource under the City's Historic
11 Preservation Ordinance. The four existing bungalow Buildings S, T, U, and V, previously
12 located along the western edge of the Studio Campus, were recently relocated to a site
13 immediately south of the Mansion as approved under CPA No. 6. Their relocation,
14 orientation and configuration in this area retains the historic grouping of the Bungalows within
15 the Studio Campus in keeping with their original setting. The Bungalows are now in the
16 process of being rehabilitated for continued use as offices. The rehabilitation work is being
17 undertaken by a team of qualified consultants and contractors in conformance with the
18 Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.
19
20

21 The Project proposes to modernize and expand the existing Central Area of the
22 Studio Campus south of the Mansion and the relocated bungalow area. Proposed
23 improvements include the construction of new Digital Media buildings consisting of a flexible
24 mix of creative space, production space, and digital media stages. The Digital Media
25 buildings would replace some of the existing buildings in the Central Area consisting of
26
27
28
29

1 offices, support services, and sound stages. New digital media stages would be provided
2 within the Central Area of the Studio Campus, co-located with media office and support uses.

3 Two new parking structures are proposed as part of CPA No. 7. The proposed
4 below-grade Central Parking Structure would be located south of the Mansion and the
5 existing Rear Lawn Parking Structure, within the existing Central Area of the Studio Campus.
6 The Central Parking Structure consists of two parking levels and would accommodate Studio
7 employee, VIP, and visitor parking. The Van Buren Parking Structure would be constructed
8 on the western edge of the Studio Campus on the site of an existing above-grade parking
9 structure, existing surface parking lot, and the former Bungalow Area. The Van Buren
10 Parking Structure would include two below-grade, one at-grade, and five above-grade levels.
11

12
13 Following public circulation of the Draft EIR and based on input received during
14 the environmental review process, particularly concerns regarding historical resources, the
15 Studio has elected to pursue adoption of Alternative 6 (Historic Preservation – Retain Stages
16 7/8/9 as Sound Stages), as the proposed Project. As further described in the Final EIR,
17 other than retaining (rather than demolishing) Stages 7/8/9 as Sound Stages, foregoing
18 construction of Building M, and an associated reduction in the size of the Central Parking
19 Structure, the essential characteristics of the Project would not change as described in the
20 Draft EIR. The modified Project results in a 66,120 sf reduction in net new development.
21 With the Project as modified, buildings to be demolished would total approximately 219,493
22 square feet (sf) and new construction at Project buildout would total approximately 564,500
23 sf, for a net new square footage total of approximately 345,007 sf Campus-wide.
24
25

26 Construction is anticipated to start in the first quarter of 2018, subject to Project
27 approval and is anticipated to be completed mid-2020; and
28
29

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

3
4 1. Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 7 (CPA No. 7): Ensures the
5 Project is in compliance with all required standards and City ordinances and
6 establishes all onsite and offsite conditions of approval to reflect the site features and
7 compatibility of the proposed Project with the uses on adjoining properties. Approval
8 of CPA No. 7 amends and supersedes all previous Comprehensive Plan
9 Amendments; supersedes all previous amendments;

10 2. Certificate of Appropriateness under the City's Historic Preservation
11 Ordinance; Ensures that the Project conforms to the City's Historic Preservation
12 Ordinance with regard to historic building modifications;

13 3. Conveyance of Agreement: Agreement for discharge of public sewer
14 waste through Studio conveyance system; Ensures that the Project will adequately
15 discharge sewer waste;

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

20 WHEREAS, the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) includes the Draft
21 EIR, dated September 2017 and circulated for public review, September 22, 2017 through
22 November 6, 2017, all comments received during the public review period, and written
23 responses to those comments and clarifications/changes to the EIR. As required by the
24 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines, the City conducted
25 an extensive environmental review of the Innovation Plan Project as follows:

26 1. In accordance with CEQA and the Culver City Municipal Code ("CCMC"),
27 the City of Culver City is the identified lead agency, and the City Planning Commission
28 is authorized to recommend and the City Council is authorized to approve
29 Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 7, the Certificate of Appropriateness,
Development Agreement, Mitigation Monitoring Program, Statement of Overriding
Consideration and Certification of the Final EIR. The City prepared an Initial Study for
the Project, which determined that the Project may have a significant effect on the

1 environment and that an environmental impact report must be prepared. The Initial
2 Study determined that the following areas must be addressed in the Project EIR:
3 aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas
4 emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use
5 and planning, noise, public services (fire and police), transportation and traffic, utilities
6 and public services (wastewater, water supply and solid waste), energy, and
7 mandatory findings of significance.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
2. A Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) for the EIR was circulated to affected agencies, pursuant to CEQA statutes and the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Cal. Code of Regs. §§ 15000 et seq.), for a 35-day review period, commencing November 17, 2016 and ending December 21, 2016. The NOP included notification of a Community Meeting and Scoping Meeting. The Community Meeting was held on December 8, 2016 at 6:00 P.M. followed by the Scoping Meeting at 7:00 P.M. at the Culver City Senior Center, located at 4095 Overland Avenue, Culver City, CA 90232. The Scoping Meeting was held in an open house/workshop format and provided interested individuals, groups, and public agencies the opportunity to view materials, ask questions, and provide written comments to the City regarding the scope and focus of the Draft EIR. [See Appendix A of the Draft EIR (Volume 2) for materials from the Scoping Meeting.]

Ten written comment letters and emails responding to the NOP were submitted to the City by public agencies, organizations, and individuals. Correspondence was received from the State of California, Native American Heritage Commission; State of California, Department of Transportation (Caltrans)-District 7; Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG); South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD); and The Los Angeles Conservancy. Also, written comments were provided by an additional five interested organizations and/or individual parties via mail and e-mail. Two Written Comment Forms with public responses to the NOP were submitted at the Scoping Meeting. [See Appendix A of the Draft EIR (Volume 2) for written comments.]

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

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

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

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
4. The Project was duly noticed in accordance with the noticing requirements for each of the Entitlements. The Project was advertised in the Culver City News, through on-site posting 21 days prior to the hearing, and by direct first-class mail to property owners within 500 feet of the Studio Campus. In addition, the date and time of each public hearing was on the City's website.

The Final EIR, which is incorporated by reference, includes the Draft EIR, comments on the Draft EIR, and the responses to written comments on the Draft EIR, modifications to the Draft EIR text, and the Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP"). On December 1, 2017, the Final EIR was sent to each agency that submitted timely comments on the Draft EIR. The Final EIR was presented to the Planning Commission on December 13, 2017.

5. The Planning Commission recommended to the City Council certification of the Final Project EIR and its Mitigation Monitoring Program ("MMP"), and adoption of the Statement of Overriding Considerations, as set forth in Section 6 of this Resolution, in compliance with CEQA.

6. The Planning Commission considered the Final EIR prepared for the Project, as well as information provided in the agenda reports, the Planning Division staff reports, the amended text of the Final EIR, information presented to the Planning Commission from experts, and information presented in public testimony, and other matters in the public record prior to making its recommendation to City Council to certify the Final EIR and approve the Project.

7. The City Council has considered the Final EIR prepared for the Project, as well as the Planning Commission's recommendations, information provided in the agenda reports, information presented to the City Council from experts, information presented in public testimony, and other matters in the public record.

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

1 WHEREAS, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; Pub. Res. Code
2 §§ 21000 et seq.) provides that “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if
3 there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would
4 *substantially lessen* the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]” (CEQA § 21002;
5 emphasis added.) The procedures required by CEQA “are intended to assist public agencies
6 in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible
7 alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such
8 significant effects.” (CEQA § 21002; emphasis added.)
9

10 WHEREAS, CEQA also provides that “in the event [that] specific economic,
11 social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation
12 measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects.”
13 (CEQA § 21002.) CEQA provides that a public agency has an obligation to balance a variety
14 of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors and in particular
15 the goal of providing a decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian.
16 (CEQA § 21081; CEQA Guidelines, 14 Cal. Code of Regulations, § 15021(d).) CEQA
17 requires decision-makers to balance the benefits of a proposed project against its significant
18 unavoidable adverse environmental impacts, and, if the benefits of a proposed project
19 outweigh the significant unavoidable adverse environmental impacts, the unavoidable
20 adverse environmental impacts may be considered “acceptable” by adopting a “Statement of
21 Overriding Considerations.” (CEQA Guidelines § 15093.) The Statement of Overriding
22 Considerations must set forth the project benefits or reasons why the Lead Agency is in favor
23 of approving the project and must weigh these benefits against the project’s adverse
24
25
26
27
28
29

1 environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-
2 significant level.

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

12 1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into,
13 the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as
14 identified in the Final EIR.

15 2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and
16 jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such
17 changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by
18 such other agency.

19 3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other
20 considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained
21 workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in
22 the Final EIR. Public Resources Code Section 21061.1 defines "feasible" to mean
23 "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of
24 time, taking into account economic, environmental, social and technological factors."
25 CEQA Guidelines section 15364 adds another factor: "legal" considerations. (Citizens
26 of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 565). The concept of
27 "feasibility" also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or
28 mitigation measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (City of
29 Del Mar v. City of San Diego (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417).

WHEREAS, CEQA requires decision-makers to adopt a mitigation monitoring
and reporting program (MMP) for those mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR that
would mitigate or avoid each significant impact identified in the EIR and to incorporate the
mitigation monitoring and reporting program, including all mitigation measures, as conditions

1 of project approval. In addition, the Project Design Features (PDFs), which are incorporated
2 into the Project and relied on in the analyses in the EIR, are included in the MMP to ensure
3 implementation of these measures as part of the Project.

4 WHEREAS, CEQA requires that the responses to comments in the Final EIR
5 demonstrate good faith and a well-reasoned analysis, and not be overly conclusory. In
6 response to comments received and as otherwise appropriate, portions of the Draft EIR
7 have been revised. Although new material has been added to the Draft EIR through
8 preparation of the Final EIR, (i) this new material provides clarification to points and
9 information already included in the Draft EIR (ii) the new material is not considered to be
10 significant new information or a substantial change to the Draft EIR; (iii) certain factual
11 corrections and minor changes are set forth as additions and corrections to the Draft EIR;
12 (iv) the new material constitutes factual corrections and minor changes to the Draft EIR and
13 not substantial changes in the draft EIR that would deprive the public of a meaningful
14 opportunity to comment on a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project, a
15 feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect, or a feasible project alternative that the
16 Applicant declines to adopt; (v) the new material added to the Draft EIR will not result in new
17 significant environmental impacts or substantially increase the severity of the previously
18 identified significant effects disclosed in the Draft EIR; (vi) the new material added to the
19 Draft EIR will not involve mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably
20 different from those analyzed in the Draft EIR that would substantially reduce one or more
21 significant effects on the environment; and (vii) the new material added to the Draft EIR
22 does not render the Draft EIR so fundamentally inadequate and conclusory in nature that
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

1 meaningful public review and comment would be precluded, and, therefore, the new
2 material added to the EIR does not necessitate recirculation of the Draft EIR.

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

9
10 NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CULVER CITY,
11 CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

12
13 **SECTION 1.** The foregoing recitals are true and correct and are a substantive
14 part of this Resolution.

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

22 **SECTION 3. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FINDINGS REQUIRED BY CEQA.**
23
24 Based on the foregoing recitals and the entire record, including, without limitation, the entire
25 EIR, oral and written testimony and other evidence received at the public hearings held on
26 the Project and the EIR, reports and other transmittals from City staff to the City Council, and
27 upon studies and investigations made by the Planning Commission, the City Council does
28 hereby find that the Final EIR for the Innovation Plan Project for the Comprehensive Plan
29

1 and Development Agreement identifies and discloses project-specific impacts and
2 cumulative impacts. Environmental impacts, mitigation measures and conclusions regarding
3 environmental impacts after mitigation identified in the EIR, findings, and facts in support of
4 findings, all set forth in Exhibit A, attached to this Resolution, are incorporated herein as
5 “Findings Required by CEQA”, and identified as follows:
6

7 1. The Final EIR identifies issue areas as “Environmental Impacts Found to
8 Be Significant,” as set forth in Section 1 (significant and unavoidable) of Exhibit A.
9 Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that will
10 avoid or lessen certain of the Project impacts, but that will not avoid or reduce all of
11 the potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. These remaining significant
12 impacts are balanced against Project benefits and are found to be overridden by the
13 Project benefits, as stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section 6
14 of this Resolution.

15 2. The Final EIR identifies issue areas as “Environmental Impacts Found to
16 Be Less Than Significant After Mitigation,” as set forth in Section 2 of Exhibit A.
17 Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that will
18 avoid or reduce these potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

19 3. The Final EIR identifies issue areas as “Environmental Impacts Found to
20 Be Less Than Significant Prior to Mitigation,” as set forth in Section 3 of Exhibit A.

21 4. The Final EIR evaluates cumulative impacts, which are included in
22 Sections 1, 2, and 3 of Exhibit A. Changes or alterations have been required in, or
23 incorporated into, the project that will avoid or lessen certain of the cumulative
24 impacts, but that will not avoid or reduce all of the potential cumulative impacts to a
25 less-than-significant level for cumulative construction related traffic congestion. These
26 remaining significant impacts are balanced against Project benefits and are found to
27 be overridden by the Project benefits, as stated in the Statement of Overriding
28 Considerations in Section 6 of this Resolution.

29 5. Pursuant to CEQA Guideline Section 15088.5 and CEQA section
21092.1, on the basis of its review and consideration of the Final EIR, the City Council
further finds that:

1. The changes made and information added to the Draft EIR or
incorporated into the Final EIR during the public process do not constitute
significant new information or substantial changes that would deprive the public
of a meaningful opportunity to comment on a substantial adverse
environmental effect of the project, a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an

1 impact that the project's proponents have declined to implement, or a feasible
2 project alternative.

3 2. The changes made and information added to the Draft EIR or
4 incorporated into the Final EIR during the public review process will not result in
5 new significant environmental effects or substantially increase the severity of
6 previously identified significant effects disclosed in the Draft EIR.

7 3. The Applicant has not declined to adopt any feasible mitigation
8 measures or alternatives considerably different from those analyzed in the Draft
9 EIR that would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the
10 Project. Rather, the Applicant has elected to adopt an Alternative evaluated in
11 the Draft EIR that reduces net new development and lessens the significant
12 environmental impacts of the Project.

13 4. The Draft EIR was not so fundamentally inadequate and conclusory
14 in nature that meaningful public review and comment have been precluded.

15 6. The MMP, attached hereto as Exhibit B and incorporated herein by this
16 reference, includes mitigation measures and Project Design Features (PDFs) that
17 are required to mitigate project impacts.

18 **SECTION 4. CONSIDERATION OF A REASONABLE RANGE OF**
19 **ALTERNATIVES.**

20 Based upon the above recitals and the entire record, including the Final
21 EIR, oral and written testimony and other evidence received at the public hearings held on
22 the Project and the EIR, and based upon reports and other transmittals from City staff to the
23 Planning Commission, the City Council further finds that the Final EIR analyzes a reasonable
24 range of project alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the
25 Project but would substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the project, and
26 adequately evaluates the comparative merits of each alternative. The City Council further
27 finds, as follows:

28 **Project Objectives**

29 The underlying purpose and primary objective of the Project, as specified in the
Final EIR, is to sustain The Culver Studio's prominent role as a dynamic, independent studio

1 in the entertainment, digital media, and creative industries, through transformation and
2 technological updates to its Studio Campus that will support a wide range of related activities.

3 As further required by the State CEQA Guidelines, the specific objectives sought by the
4 Applicant for the Project are:

5 **Objective 1.** Create a state-of-the-art Studio Campus of media and
6 digital content stages, film and television production offices, and support facilities that
7 will ensure the Studio's resilience, competitiveness, and continued position at the
8 cutting edge of innovation essential to the invention and production of entertainment
9 and digital media for future generations.
10

11 **Objective 2.** Through new and upgraded facilities foster current and
12 further content creation, digital media, creative technologies, virtual reality, and related
13 uses consistent with the Studio's heritage and the history and evolution of the
14 entertainment industry.
15

16 **Objective 3.** Support the continued economic viability of the Studio and
17 its ability to respond to changing industry needs and market conditions through a plan
18 that technologically updates and expands Campus facilities while allowing flexibility in
19 the application of development standards.
20

21 **Objective 4.** Implement an innovative plan that supports development of
22 flexible and sustainable new media space, inviting/collaborative landscaped open
23 areas, sensitive treatment of neighborhood interfaces, and redesigned and improved
24 access.
25

26 **Objective 5.** Upgrade and rehabilitate the Mansion in a manner that
27 protects its eligibility as a historical resource under the City's preservation ordinance
28
29

1 while allowing for interior alterations to accommodate future uses and bring the
2 building up to current standards. Upgrade the Front Lawn of the Mansion in a manner
3 that respects the original landscape design intent and scale.

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

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

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

23 **Alternatives Evaluated**

24 Chapter 5, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR contains an analysis of nine
25 alternatives to the proposed Project that were considered to reduce significant effects
26 identified, as well as to address comments received during public scoping, and based on City
27
28
29

1 staff consideration. The following provides a brief description of the alternatives and a
2 comparative summary of the environmental impacts anticipated under each alternative to the
3 environmental impacts associated with the Project based on the detailed evaluation of the
4 potential impacts associated with each alternative provided in the EIR. (Draft EIR, Table 5-
5 12, Comparison of Impacts Associated with the Project and the Alternatives.)
6

7 **Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative.** In accordance with the
8 CEQA Guidelines, the No Project/No Build Alternative for a development project on an
9 identifiable property consists of the circumstance under which the project does not
10 proceed. Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the Guidelines states that, "In certain instances,
11 the no project alternative means 'no build' wherein the existing environmental setting
12 is maintained." Under the No Project/No Build Alternative, the Project would not be
13 developed and use of the entire Studio Campus would continue as under current
14 conditions.
15

16
17 The No Project/No Build Alternative would avoid all of the Project's
18 potentially significant impacts, including significant project impacts to historical
19 resources, project construction traffic, project and cumulative operational traffic
20 impacts. While mitigation measures would reduce Project impacts to less than
21 significant levels in the following issue areas, the No Project/No Build Alternative
22 would avoid these impacts: archaeological/tribal resources, paleontological resources,
23 geology and soils, construction noise and vibration, and wastewater infrastructure.
24 Finally, the No Project Alternative would also avoid the project's less than significant
25 impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and
26 hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, operational
27
28
29

1 noise and vibration, fire protection, police protection, public transit, access and
2 circulation, wastewater treatment capacity, water supply, and solid waste.

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

27 **Alternative 2: No Project/CPA No. 6 Buildout Alternative.** Under the
28 No Project/CPA No. 6 Buildout Alternative, the Studio Campus would be built out in
29

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

11
12 Access and circulation improvements (with the exception of new Gate
13 2A), relocation of the Bungalows, and landscaping of the Front Lawn, Van Buren
14 Place, and Ince Boulevard, would occur as proposed under the Project. Other
15 proposed improvements include: relocation of the existing guard shack at Gate 1;
16 realignment of existing Gate 4; upgrades to aging Studio Campus infrastructure
17 including heating/ventilation/air conditioning, electrical, and domestic and fire water
18 systems; and some off-site improvements including new curbs, gutters, sidewalks,
19 streetlights, parking meters, and street trees on Ince Boulevard and Van Buren Place.
20

21
22 Lastly, this alternative includes rehabilitation of the four historically
23 significant bungalows recently relocated near the Mansion (Buildings S, T, U and V)
24 subject to a required Relocation and Rehabilitation Plan and approval of a Certificate
25 of Appropriateness by the City consistent with requirements under CPA No. 6.
26

27 Since the No Project/CPA No. 6 Buildout Alternative would result in
28 substantially less development than the Project (e.g., 138,997 sf vs. 413,127 sf under
29

1 the Project, impacts compared with the Project would be less. Alternative 2 would
2 avoid the Project's potentially significant impacts to historical resources since Stages
3 2/3/4 and 7/8/9 would be retained. However, while Alternative 2 would result in less
4 traffic, as with the Project intersection level of service impacts during construction and
5 operation would be significant and unavoidable.
6

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

18 Since the No Project/CPA No. 6 Buildout Alternative would provide some
19 new development on the Project Site, it would accomplish some of the Project
20 objectives. Because the No Project/CPA No. 6 Buildout Alternative would provide
21 some new digital media/office space while removing some existing outdated stage
22 facilities, it would support the underlying purpose of the Project, although to a
23 substantially lesser degree than the Project. It would create some state-of-the-art
24 studio facilities that might help ensure the Studio's competitiveness and continued
25 position at the cutting edge of innovation essential to the invention and production of
26 entertainment. It would also, through some new and upgraded facilities, foster some
27
28
29

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

14
15
16
17 **Alternative 3: Reduced Density Alternative.** Under the Reduced
18 Density Alternative, the Project would be reduced in size by approximately 135,000 sf,
19 or an approximately 33 percent reduction in net new building sf, through a reduction in
20 digital media/office use floor area. The reduction in floor area would be achieved
21 through smaller building footprints (the heights of the proposed buildings would be the
22 same as under the Project). As with the Project, this alternative would involve minor
23 changes to the Mansion largely focused on interior rehabilitation, a connection to the
24 Culver/Main Tunnel, relocation/ rehabilitation of the Bungalows, and construction of six
25 new Digital Media buildings which would house a flexible mix of creative space,
26 production space, and digital media stages, and would replace six existing buildings
27
28
29

1 housing offices and support services (Buildings L, O, X, Y, Z, and the Commissary)
2 and four existing buildings housing sound stages.

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

15 Since the Reduced Density Alternative would result in less development
16 than the Project (e.g., 278,127 sf vs. 413,127 sf under the Project, impacts compared
17 with the Project would be less. However, Alternative 3 would not avoid the Project's
18 potentially significant impacts to historical resources since Stages 2/3/4 and 7/8/9
19 would be demolished. Furthermore, while Alternative 3 would result in less traffic, as
20 with the Project intersection level of service impacts during construction and operation
21 would be significant and unavoidable. As with the Project Alternative 3 would have
22 equivalent impacts for the environmental issue areas of geology and soils, hazards
23 associated with risk of upset conditions, hydrology and water quality, land use and
24 planning, traffic access and parking. Furthermore, Alternative 3 would reduce the
25 mitigated impacts of the Project in the following areas: archaeological/tribal resources,
26
27
28
29

1 paleontological resources, construction noise and vibration, and wastewater
2 infrastructure. Finally, the Reduced Density Alternative would also reduce the Project's
3 less than significant impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gas emissions,
4 other hazards and hazardous materials conditions, operational noise and vibration, fire
5 protection, police protection, public transit, wastewater treatment capacity, water
6 conveyance, water supply, and solid waste.
7

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

1 respond to changing industry needs. All-in-all, the Reduced Density Alternative would
2 support the underlying purpose of the Project, which is to sustain The Culver Studio's
3 prominent role as a dynamic, independent studio in the entertainment, digital media,
4 and creative industries, through expansion and modernization of the Studio Campus,
5 but to a substantially lesser degree than the Project.
6

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

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

25 The Full Historic Preservation Alternative would reduce by approximately
26 half, the amount of new and renovated development at the Project Site compared to
27 the Project, while still including proposed parking, circulation, landscaping, and
28
29

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

24 **Alternative 5: Historic Preservation – Retain Stages 2/3/4 as Sound**
25 **Stages Alternative.** Under Alternative 5, Stages 2/3/4 (32,400 sf) would be retained
26 in their current condition for continued use as sound stages. Proposed Building K
27 would not be constructed. This Alternative would include 274,727 sf of net new
28
29

1 development versus 413,127 sf under the Project (although due to the retention of
2 Stages 2/3/4, this alternative would result in more stage use than under the Project).
3 Other than these changes and a reduction in the size of the Central Parking Structure,
4 other aspects of the Alternative would be similar to the proposed Project.
5

6 Since this alternative would result in less development than the Project
7 (e.g., 274,727 sf vs. 413,127 sf under the Project, impacts compared with the Project
8 would be less and similar to Alternative 4. However, Alternative 5 would not avoid the
9 Project's potentially significant impacts to historical resources since Stages 7/8/9
10 would be demolished. Furthermore, while Alternative 5 would result in less traffic, as
11 with the Project intersection level of service impacts during construction and operation
12 would be significant and unavoidable. As with the Project Alternative 5 would have
13 equivalent impacts for the environmental issue areas of geology and soils, hydrology
14 and water quality, land use and planning, traffic access and parking. Furthermore,
15 Alternative 5 would reduce the mitigated impacts of the Project in the following areas:
16 archaeological/tribal resources, paleontological resources, construction noise and
17 vibration, and wastewater infrastructure. However, Alternative 5 would result in greater
18 (though less than significant) impacts compared to the Project regarding hazardous
19 materials management since this alternative would retain more of the existing on-site
20 studio use and activities that utilize hazardous materials. Finally, this alternative would
21 also reduce the Project's less than significant impacts associated with air quality,
22 greenhouse gas emissions, other hazards and hazardous materials conditions,
23 operational noise and vibration, fire protection, police protection, public transit,
24 wastewater treatment capacity, water conveyance, water supply, and solid waste.
25
26
27
28
29

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

22 **Alternative 6: Historic Preservation – Retain Stages 7/8/9 as Sound**
23 **Stages.** Under Alternative 6, Stages 7/8/9 (16,800 sf) would be retained in their
24 current condition for continued use as sound stages. Proposed Building M would not
25 be constructed. This alternative would include 345,007 sf of net new development
26 versus 413,127 sf under the Project (although due to the retention of Stages 7/8/9,
27 this alternative would result in more stage use than under the Project). Other than
28
29

1 these changes and a reduction in the size of the Central Parking Structure, other
2 aspects of the Alternative would be similar to the proposed Project. Following public
3 circulation of the Draft EIR and based on input received during the environmental
4 review process, the Studio has elected to pursue adoption of Alternative 6, as
5 evaluated in Chapter 5 of the Draft EIR and Topical Response TR-1: Modified Project
6 (Alternative 6: Historic Preservation – Retain Stages 7/8/9 as Sound Stages), as the
7 Project.
8

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

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

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

Alternative 7: Full Adaptive Reuse – Retain Stages 2/3/4 and 7/8/9

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

Since this alternative would result in less development than the Project (e.g., 206,607 sf vs. 413,127 sf under the Project, impacts compared with the Project would be less and similar to Alternative 4 (Full Historic Preservation – Retain Stages 2/3/4 and 7/8/9 as Sound Stages). Alternative 7 would avoid the Project’s potentially significant impacts to historical resources since Stages 2/3/4 and 7/8/9 would be retained and adaptively reused. Furthermore, while Alternative 7 would result in less traffic, as with the Project intersection level of service impacts during construction and operation would be significant and unavoidable. As with the Project Alternative 7 would have equivalent impacts for the environmental issue areas of geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, traffic access and parking. Furthermore, Alternative 7 would reduce the mitigated impacts of the Project in the following areas: archaeological/tribal resources, paleontological resources, construction noise and vibration, and wastewater infrastructure. Finally, this alternative would also reduce the Project’s less than significant impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, operational

1 noise and vibration, fire protection, police protection, public transit, wastewater
2 treatment capacity, water conveyance, water supply, and solid waste.

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

24 **Alternative 8: Adaptive Reuse – Retain Stages 2/3/4 for Digital**
25 **Media.** Under Alternative 8, Stages 2/3/4 (32,400 sf) would be adaptively reused to
26 balance historic preservation with the need for efficient digital media production space.
27 Proposed Building K (170,800 sf), all of which would be digital media space under the
28
29

1 Project, would not be constructed. Although Stages 2/3/4 would provide 32,400 sf of
2 digital media space, this is a net reduction of 138,400 sf of digital media space
3 compared to the floor area that would be provided with the development of Building K
4 under the proposed Project. Other than these changes and associated reductions in
5 parking spaces, other aspects of the Project would not change.
6

7 Since this alternative would result in less development than the Project
8 (e.g., 274,727 sf vs. 413,127 sf under the Project, impacts compared with the Project
9 would be less and similar to Alternative 5 (Historic Preservation – Retain Stages 2/3/4
10 as Sound Stages). However, Alternative 8 would not avoid the Project’s potentially
11 significant impacts to historical resources since Stages 7/8/9 would be demolished.
12 Furthermore, while Alternative 8 would result in less traffic, as with the Project
13 intersection level of service impacts during construction and operation would be
14 significant and unavoidable. As with the Project Alternative 8 would have equivalent
15 impacts for the environmental issue areas of geology and soils, hydrology and water
16 quality, land use and planning, traffic access and parking. Furthermore, Alternative 8
17 would reduce the mitigated impacts of the Project in the following areas:
18 archaeological/tribal resources, paleontological resources, construction noise and
19 vibration, and wastewater infrastructure. Finally, this alternative would also reduce the
20 Project’s less than significant impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gas
21 emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, operational noise and vibration, fire
22 protection, police protection, public transit, wastewater treatment capacity, water
23 conveyance, water supply, and solid waste.
24
25
26
27
28
29

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

13
14 **Alternative 9: Adaptive Reuse – Retain Stages 7/8/9 for Digital**
15 **Media.** Under Alternative 9, Stages 7/8/9 (16,800 sf) would be adaptively reused to
16 balance historic preservation with the need for efficient digital media production space.
17 Proposed Building M (84,920 sf) would not be constructed. Overall, this alternative
18 would result in 345,007 sf of net new development versus 413,127 sf under the
19 Project. Other than these changes and associated reductions in parking spaces, other
20 aspects of the Project would not change.
21

22
23 Since this alternative would result in less development than the Project
24 (e.g., 345,007 sf vs. 413,127 sf under the Project, impacts compared with the Project
25 would be less and similar to Alternative 6 (Historic Preservation – Retain Stages 7/8/9
26 as Sound Stages). However, Alternative 9 would not avoid the Project's potentially
27 significant impacts to historical resources since Stages 2/3/4 would be demolished.
28
29

1 Furthermore, while Alternative 9 would result in less traffic, as with the Project
2 intersection level of service impacts during construction and operation would be
3 significant and unavoidable. As with the Project Alternative 9 would have equivalent
4 impacts for the environmental issue areas of geology and soils, hydrology and water
5 quality, land use and planning, traffic access and parking. Furthermore, Alternative 9
6 would reduce the mitigated impacts of the Project in the following areas:
7 archaeological/tribal resources, paleontological resources, construction noise and
8 vibration, and wastewater infrastructure. Finally, this alternative would also reduce the
9 Project's less than significant impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gas
10 emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, operational noise and vibration, fire
11 protection, police protection, public transit, wastewater treatment capacity, water
12 conveyance, water supply, and solid waste.
13
14

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

Environmentally Superior Alternative

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

Alternatives Considered and Rejected. The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c) recommends that an EIR identify alternatives that were considered for analysis but rejected as infeasible and briefly explain the reasons for their rejection. According to the

1 State CEQA Guidelines, the following factors may be used to eliminate alternatives from
2 detailed consideration: the alternative's failure to meet most of the basic Project Objectives,
3 the alternative's infeasibility, or the alternative's inability to avoid significant environmental
4 impacts. The following Alternatives have been considered and rejected as infeasible:

5 **Alternative Off-Site Locations.** Per CEQA Guidelines Section
6 15126.6(f)(2), in making the decision to include or exclude analysis of an alternative
7 site, the "key question and first step in analysis is whether any of the significant effects
8 of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in
9 another location. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the
10 significant effects of the project need to be considered for inclusion in the EIR."
11 Developing the Project at an alternative site would be infeasible because a large
12 portion of the existing buildings and other structures at the Project Site would be
13 retained and continue to be utilized for studio production uses under the Project, and
14 developing all of these existing studio uses at an alternative site would be
15 economically prohibitive. In addition, developing the Project at an alternative site
16 would not feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project because it would
17 not: technologically update and expand the existing Studio Campus; adaptively reuse
18 existing buildings designated as Landmark and Significant historical structures; update
19 and rehabilitate the Mansion in a manner that protects its eligibility as a historical
20 resources; and/or update and redevelop the Studio Campus with a high quality state-
21 of-the-art design that supports environmental sustainability. Lastly, there are no
22 existing vacant parcels in the City of approximately 14 acres or larger that are
23 designated and zoned by the City as Studio and S Zoning District (Studio),
24
25
26
27
28
29

1 respectively, and it would be unlikely to secure a site of similar size, in a location with
2 the amenities provided at the current Studio Campus location in downtown Culver City
3 and in close proximity to the Metro Station. As such, alternative off-site locations are
4 considered infeasible.

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

17
18
19
20 **SECTION 5. FINDINGS FOR CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL EIR.** Based
21 upon the above recitals and the entire record, including, without limitation, the CPA No. 7
22 Final EIR, oral and written testimony and other evidence received, at the public hearings held
23 on the Project and the Final EIR, the City Council further finds:
24

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

27 2. That the City Council has independently reviewed and considered
28 the Final EIR in reaching its conclusions.
29

1 3. That the Final EIR was presented to the Planning Commission, as
2 the recommending body to the City Council, and that the Planning Commission has
3 reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to making a
4 recommendation to approve the Project.

5 4. That, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and
6 15093, the Final EIR includes a description of each potentially significant impact and
7 rationale for finding that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated
8 into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental
9 effect, as detailed in Exhibit A attached hereto. The analyses included in the Final EIR
10 to support each conclusion and recommendation therein is hereby incorporated into
11 these findings.

12 5. That, in accordance with the CEQA Section 21081, mitigation
13 measures and other modifications have been incorporated into the Project to reduce
14 significant effects.

15 6. That, in accordance with the CEQA Section 21081 and CEQA
16 Guidelines Section 15091, changes and alterations have been required and
17 incorporated into the Project that avoid or substantially lessen its significant
18 environmental effects because feasible mitigation measures, including those in the
19 MMP, are made conditions of approval for the Project.

20 7. That the Statement of Overriding Considerations identifies and
21 weighs the Project's significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to a level less than
22 significant against the benefits from this Project, and concludes, based on substantial
23 evidence in the record, that the Project's benefits outweigh its unavoidable significant
24 impacts.

25 8. That the Final EIR reflects the decision-maker's independent
26 judgment and analysis.

27 9. That a mitigation monitoring program (MMP) has been prepared
28 and is adopted to enforce the mitigation measures required by the Final EIR and
29 Project approvals.

 10. That the documents and other materials which constitute the
record of proceedings on which this decision is based are under the custody of the
City Clerk and are located at the City of Culver City, Community Development
Department Planning Division, 9770 Culver Boulevard, Culver City, California 90232.

SECTION 6. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS. Based
upon the above recitals and the entire record, including the Final EIR, oral and written
testimony and other evidence, received at the public hearings held on the Project EIR, the

1 City Council further finds that there is substantial evidence that supports the conclusion that
2 the Project will result in public benefits, including specific environmental, economic, legal,
3 social, technological, and other benefits, that outweigh the significant effects of the project on
4 the environment that cannot be mitigated to a level less than significant.

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

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

21 Each of the project alternatives discussed in the Draft EIR would avoid or
22 reduce some or all of the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project. However, with
23 the exception of Alternative 6 (Historic Preservation – Retain Stages 7/8/9 as Sound Stages),
24

1 which the Studio has elected to pursue, none of these alternatives would achieve the
2 underlying purpose of the Project, which is to sustain The Culver Studio's prominent role as a
3 dynamic, independent studio in the entertainment, digital media and creative industries,
4 though expansion and modernization of the Studio Campus, or satisfy the Project's specific
5 objectives, to the same degree as Alternative 6 and are therefore deemed infeasible based
6 on social, economic, and policy considerations.
7

8 While significant unavoidable impacts have been reduced through
9 modifications to the Project, the following significant unavoidable impacts still remain, as
10 further described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference:
11

12 1. Cultural Resources (Historic Resources): Implementation of the
13 Project will result in the removal of Stages 2/3/4. All of the other
14 historic resources on the Studio Campus will be retained.

15 2. Transportation and Circulation: Implementation of the Project will
16 result in Project and cumulative significant and unavoidable construction
17 transportation and circulation impacts. In addition, the Project will result in significant
18 and unavoidable operational level of service impacts at the following seven study
19 intersections during the AM and/or PM peak hours:

- 20 3. Duquesne Ave/Lucerne Ave (Culver City, AM & PM peak
21 hours)
- 22 8. Washington Blvd/Culver Blvd (Culver City, AM peak hour)
- 23 13. Robertson Blvd/Exposition Blvd/Venice Blvd (City of LA, AM &
24 PM peak hours)
- 25 14. National Blvd/Washington Blvd (Culver City, AM peak hour)
- 26 33. Overland Ave/Venice Blvd (City of Los Angeles, AM peak
27 hours)
- 28 38. Robertson Blvd/National Blvd (City of Los Angeles, AM & PM
29 peak hours)
- 42. Duquesne Ave/Braddock Dr (Culver City, AM & PM peak
hours)

30 The benefits of the Project outweigh its significant unavoidable impacts that
31 cannot be mitigated to a level less than significant. These benefits include the following (see
32 also Exhibit "A" hereto):
33

1 1. The Project will sustain The Culver Studio's prominent role as a
2 dynamic, independent studio while capitalizing on and strengthening the City's historic
3 and future identity as the "Heart of Screenland" and home to Sony Pictures, National
4 Public Radio West, the NFL Network studios, and other entertainment uses.

5 2. The Project will enable a state-of-the-art Studio Campus of media
6 and digital content stages, as well as traditional film and television production and
7 support facilities that will ensure the Studio's resilience and continued position at the
8 cutting edge of innovation essential to the invention and production of entertainment
9 and digital media for future generations.

10 3. The Project's new and upgraded facilities will foster content
11 creation, and support the continued economic viability of the Studio and its ability to
12 respond to changing industry needs and market conditions. The Project will provide for
13 technological updates and expanded Campus facilities while allowing flexibility in the
14 application of development standards.

15 4. The Project will encourage by example sustainable design
16 features and environment-friendly green building practices through high quality state-
17 of-the-art design that will meet or exceed Culver City's Green Building Program
18 requirements. The Project will use renewable, recycled and low VOC materials; and
19 will incorporate high efficiency HVAC systems, water conservation features,
20 stormwater filtration systems, photovoltaics and passive solar design, and electric
21 vehicle (EV)-ready parking.

22 5. Neighborhood interfaces will be sensitively treated, and access
23 will be redesigned and improved. The Project will promote compatible neighborhood
24 interfaces and a high level of visual quality through new and expanded landscaping
25 and linear open space, redesigned gate entries, articulation of building massing,
26 privacy screening, increased setbacks, and accommodation of production vehicles
27 within the Studio Campus rather than on surface streets.

28 6. The Project's circulation plan will move vehicles as efficiently as
29 possible onto the Studio Campus from the surrounding street network with a minimum
of queuing or delays. The circulation plan will reduce production vehicle use of
directly adjacent streets and ensure that vehicles access buildings through below-
grade loading facilities. In addition, the circulation plan will minimize truck/passenger
vehicle and truck/emergency vehicle and fire lane conflicts. The circulation plan results
in freeing up at-grade areas thus providing for more attractive and usable outdoor
open space.

 7. The Project's enhanced Studio Campus will further the
pedestrian-friendly environment with direct access to downtown Culver City and clear
linkages to regional and local transportation systems. Within walking distance of the
Expo Station, the Project will promote alternate modes of transit, as well as implement
transportation demand management measures, and promote the use of bicycles.

1 8. The Project will contribute to the development of the Culver City
2 Transit Oriented Development (TOD) District and area mobility by expanding
3 employment in proximity to mass transit.

4 9. The Project will involve significant tax benefits associated with
5 business growth and high-quality employment opportunities.

6 The City Council further finds, as follows:

7 The Final EIR has identified and discussed significant environmental effects,
8 which would occur as a result of the Project. With implementation of the PDFs and Mitigation
9 Measures discussed in the EIR, most of these effects can be avoided or mitigated to levels
10 considered less than significant. The City has proposed 40 PDFs as well as mitigation
11 measures to minimize the potential impacts of the Project on the community. The City has
12 adopted all feasible mitigation measures and approved the PDFs in the Final EIR. As
13 discussed above, the Applicant has elected to adopt Alternative 6 as the Project, which will
14 reduce the significant impacts identified in the EIR.
15

16 **Traffic**

17 Although the Project will generate significant and unavoidable construction
18 traffic impacts and long-term traffic impacts during Project operation, these impacts,
19 remaining after imposition of all feasible mitigation measures, are outweighed by the
20 Project's benefits.
21

22 1. The modifications to the Project now being carried forward will result in a
23 reduction in net new square footage thereby reducing trip generation by 66 vehicles in
24 the AM peak hour and 63 vehicles in the PM peak compared to the Project evaluated
25 in the Draft EIR.

26 2. During construction, MM-TRAF-1 through MM-TRAF-5, which address
27 construction activities such as haul truck staging, use of flagman, scheduling of
28 deliveries and pickups, access, and scheduling of lane closures, along with
29 implementation of PDF-TRAF-1, which requires a Construction Management Plan,
significant construction-related traffic impacts will be reduced to the extent feasible.

1 Impacts will be temporary in nature and will allow for implementation of the Innovation
2 Plan with all the benefits described above.

3 3. Traffic levels on many of the streets within the Project Study Area are
4 already high in their existing conditions. The implementation of MM-TRAF-7 and MM-
5 TRAF-8 will improve two intersections within the City.

6 4. The Project represents infill development on an already urbanized site,
7 within the existing Culver Studios Campus in an area targeted for growth by the City
8 and SCAG and near the Culver City Station.

9 5. The Project Site and Study Area are well served public transit routes,
10 including one light rail lines operated by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan
11 Transportation Authority (Metro) and 14 rapid, regional and local bus lines operated by
12 various operators (e.g., Metro, Culver City Bus, and LADOT, and Santa Monica Big
13 Blue Bus).

14 6. The Project will implement a Transportation Demand Management
15 (TDM) plan (MM TRAF-6) that will reduce peak hour trip generation by offering
16 services, actions, specific facilities, incentives, and contributions aimed at encouraging
17 use of alternative transportation modes (e.g., transit, bus, walking, bicycling, carpool,
18 etc.). The TDM is expected to reduce project trips by at least 10 percent during peak
19 AM and peak PM. times.

20 7. The Project will support pedestrian access to the Culver City TOD
21 District and downtown through the provision of a minimum 15-foot landscaped setback
22 with pedestrian improvements along the Van Buren Parking Structure, a 30-foot
23 landscaped setback along Building K, and additional landscaping along Van Buren
24 Place and Ince Boulevard.

25 **Cultural Resources/Historic Resources**

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

Six on-site buildings have been designated individually at the local level as
Landmark and Significant structures and also appear eligible for the National Register and

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

14 The Project as modified will retain Stages 7/8/9, which appear eligible for listing
15 in the National, California, and Local Registers, and continuing their use as sound stages,
16 thereby avoiding the significant unavoidable impact associated with their demolition under
17 the Project evaluated in the Draft EIR. However, even with the modifications to the Project,
18 the Project will result in a significant and unavoidable impact to historic resources as a result
19 of the demolition of Stages 2/3/4. These impacts, remaining after imposition of all feasible
20 mitigation measures, are outweighed by the Project's benefits.

23 1. The modified Project will reduce the significant impact to historic
24 resources compared to the Project evaluated in the Draft EIR through the retention of
25 Stages 7/8/9 thereby retaining three sound stages from the period of significance –
26 Stage 7/8/9 (1929), Stage 11/12/14 (1927) and Stage 15/16 (1940). Stage 7/8/9 and
27 11/12/14 were constructed around the same time as the Stage 2/3/4 and share the
28 same potential significance for its association with RKO Pictures and the Studio's
29 transition into sound films.

2. The Project will upgrade and rehabilitate the Mansion to protect its
eligibility as a historical resource under the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance

1 while allowing for interior alterations to accommodate future uses and bring the
2 building up to current standards.

3 3. MM-HIST-1 through MM-HIST-3 contained in the Final EIR for the
4 Project appropriately balance the need to preserve and value the historic resources
5 with the Project objectives and development within this area. The mitigation measures
6 will provide for recordation of the historic structure, preparation of a Salvage Plan, and
7 development of an Interpretive Program. Documentation as a result of this process will
8 be provided to the Library of Congress where it will be archived and publically
9 accessible. In addition, MM-HIST-4 requires the completion of a Studio Campus
10 Preservation Plan for maintenance, rehabilitation, or improvement of historical
11 resources on the Studio Campus.

12 4. Implementation of MM-HIST-3 will result in a better overall
13 understanding of the Studio's historical significance and contributions to the motion
14 picture industry through the creation of an Interpretive Program.

15 **SECTION 7.** The City Council has reviewed and considered the environmental
16 information contained in the Final EIR SCH No. 2016111044 and hereby determines that it is
17 adequate and in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources
18 Code, Section 21000 et seq.). In compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081 and
19 CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the City Council has considered the Project benefits as
20 balanced against its unavoidable adverse environmental effects and hereby determines that
21 the benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects; therefore, the City
22 Council determines that the unavoidable adverse environmental effects are considered
23 acceptable.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

EXHIBIT A

FINDINGS REQUIRED BY CEQA

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

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

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

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

1 All Final EIR mitigation measures, as discussed below and as set forth in the Mitigation
2 Monitoring Program (Exhibit B, following), are incorporated by reference into these findings.
3 The Mitigation Monitoring Program also contains the Project Design Features (PDFs) that are
4 incorporated into the Project. In addition, the modifications to the Project set forth in Section
5 1 of the Resolution, above, and the Statement of Overriding Considerations set forth in
6 Section 8, above, are incorporated by reference into these Findings. In accordance with the
7 provisions of CEQA (Cal. Pub. Res. Code §§ 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines, the
8 City adopts these findings as part of its certification of the Final EIR for the Culver Studios
9 Innovation Plan - Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 7 Project (Project).

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

26 **SECTION 1**

27 **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT AFTER MITIGATION**

28 **(Significant Unavoidable Effects)**

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

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

1 **1.1 CULTURAL RESOURCES (HISTORIC)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

18 1.2 TRAFFIC

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

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

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

1
2 **FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS.**
3

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

27 **SECTION 2**

28 **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT AFTER 29 MITIGATION**

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

CULTURAL RESOURCES (Archaeological and Tribal Resources and Paleontological Resources)

1 **FINDINGS.**

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

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

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

18 **FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS.**

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

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

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

12 **Cumulative Impacts:**

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

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

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

1 **2.1 GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

21 **2.2 NOISE AND VIBRATION**

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

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

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

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

3 With regard to vibration during construction, residential uses are located within approximately
4 5 feet to 50 feet from the Project Site. On-site historic buildings are located from 15 feet to 70
5 feet from operation of construction equipment. Residential buildings located within 15 feet
6 from the Project Site will experience potentially significant vibration impacts from the Project
7 construction. In addition, historic buildings located within 20 feet from operation of heavy
8 construction equipment will experience potentially significant vibration impacts from the
9 Project construction. With respect to human annoyance, residential uses located within 45
10 feet of the Project Site will experience potentially significant vibration impacts from Project
11 construction. As the Project, with the incorporation of PDFs, will result in potentially
12 significant construction noise and vibration impacts, mitigation measures are included in the
13 MMRP to reduce these impacts.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

19 **2.3 WASTEWATER**

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

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

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

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

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

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

24 Wastewater will be conveyed to the HTP for treatment. The existing treatment capacity of the
25 HTP is 450 mgd and projected 2020 capacity is 435 mgd, leaving a remaining available
26 treatment capacity of 15 mgd in 2020. The wastewater generated by the Project represents
27 only about 0.6 percent of the HTP's projected remaining available treatment capacity in
28 2020. In addition, the Project will pay the required Sewerage Facilities Charge and Sewer
29 User Fees to help offset the Project's contribution to City wastewater treatment demand (with
payments to the LACDPW per the Amalgamated Agreement for future improvements to the
HTP). The Project will not generate pollutant constituents that could potentially interfere with
the HTP meeting the water quality requirements of its discharge permit.

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

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

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

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

11 SECTION 3

12 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT PRIOR TO 13 MITIGATION

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

16 3.1 AESTHETICS

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

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

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

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

3.2 AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

11 For purposes of the cumulative air quality analysis with respect to CEQA Guidelines Section
12 15064(h)(3), the Project's incremental contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is
13 determined based on compliance with the SCAQMD adopted the AQMP. The Project will not
14 conflict with or obstruct implementation of AQMP and will be consistent with the growth
15 projections in the AQMP.

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

25 **3.3 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

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

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

1 25.7 percent reduction in emissions as compared to a scenario without GHG reduction
2 features and measures.

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

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

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

23 3.4 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

18 3.5 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9 **3.6 LAND USE AND PLANNING**

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

15 **FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS.** CPA No. 7, which will replace CPA No. 6 upon its
16 approval, is consistent with the requirements for preparing a Comprehensive Plan. CPA No.
17 7 permits the implementation of the Project, including a flexible mix of Digital Media space
18 within the existing Studio Campus footprint, while ensuring compatibility with the surrounding
19 neighborhoods and maintaining the integrity of historic structures

20 Project consistency with applicable land use plans, policies and regulations adopted for the
21 purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect are addressed in detail in Section
22 4.8 of the EIR. Plans evaluated include the Culver City General Plan Land Use, Circulation,
23 and Open Space Elements; Culver City Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan; Culver City Urban
24 Forest Master Plan; Culver City Zoning Code; Visioning Study for the Culver City Transit
25 Oriented Development; SCAG's 2016 RTP/SCS, and Metro's ATSP.

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

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

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

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

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

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

28 **3.7 FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8 **3.8 POLICE PROTECTION**

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

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

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

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

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

13 **Cumulative Impacts:** While the proposed Project and the related projects together could
14 potentially and hypothetically generate a demand for approximately four additional CCPD
15 sworn officers, this will represent only an approximately 3.7 percent increase over the
16 existing 109 CCPD sworn officers in the City, with the Project's contribution to this demand
17 (0.3 officer) representing only approximately 7.9 percent of the increase or 0.28 percent of
18 the total existing CCPD sworn officer force. Hence, not only will the cumulative demand for
19 additional CCPD sworn police officers be small, but the Project's contribution to this demand
20 will be less than cumulatively considerable given the strict security features, Project Site
21 controls, and security staff that will continue to be employed on the Studio Campus.

22 3.9 WATER SUPPLY

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

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

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

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

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

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

17 **3.10 SOLID WASTE**

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

28 **FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDINGS.**

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

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

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

5 **3.11 ENERGY**

6
7 **FINDINGS.** Section 6.6 of the EIR concludes that construction of the Project will not result in
8 wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy, and will not preempt
9 opportunities for future energy conservation. Operation of the Project will not result in the
wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy and will not preempt
opportunities for future energy conservation.

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

17 Upon occupancy of the Project, the studio operations will demand energy for on-site activities
18 and off-site transportation associated with vehicles traveling to and from the Project Site. The
19 amount of energy used will not represent a substantial percentage of the available energy
20 supply in terms of equipment and transportation fuels. Furthermore, the Project will
21 incorporate PDFs that promote energy efficiency, such as, green building measures,
22 consistent with state, regional, and local energy efficiency goals. Therefore, operation of the
23 Project will not result in the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy and
24 will not preempt opportunities for future energy conservation.
25
26
27
28
29

**EXHIBIT B
MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM**

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

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

**TABLE 4-1
MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM**

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

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project shall require all off-road diesel equipment greater than 50 horsepower (hp) used for this Project to meet USEPA Tier 4 off-road emission standards. Welders would also meet USEPA Tier 4 off-road emission standards or will be electric-powered. All equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) devices including a California Air Resources Board (CARB)-certified Level 3 Diesel Particulate Filter or equivalent. This PDF would allow for a reduction in diesel particulate matter and NOx emissions during construction activities. Consistent with CPA No. 6, the Project shall utilize low-VOC coatings during construction activities to avoid excessive VOC emissions. Consistent with CPA No. 6 Condition of Approval #140, trucks and other vehicles in loading and unloading queues shall be parked with engines off to reduce vehicle emissions during construction activities. 				
<p>PDF-AIR-2 (Design Elements): In accordance with CALGreen Building Standards, the Project shall incorporate the following mandatory energy and emission saving features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project shall recycle and/or salvage at least 65 percent of non-hazardous construction and demolition debris. The Project shall use water efficient landscaping and native drought tolerant plants. The Project shall include easily accessible recycling areas dedicated to the collection and storage of non-hazardous materials such as paper, corrugated cardboard, glass, plastics, metals, and landscaping debris (trimmings). The Project shall include efficient heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems. The Project shall install low-flow water fixtures that are consistent with USEPA WaterSense specifications. The parking structures shall be designed with occupancy-sensor controlled lighting that would place lighting fixtures in a low power state in unoccupied zones. 	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit and Ongoing during Construction and Operation	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division
<p>PDF-AIR-3 (Voluntary Design Elements): The Project shall incorporate the following operational energy and emission saving features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project design would meet criteria for the LEED Certification level. The Project shall install 100 bicycle parking 	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Building Permit and Ongoing during Operation	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
<p>spaces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project shall install infrastructure for future gray water uses. The Project shall install a solar photovoltaic power system equivalent to at least 1 percent of the Project's electricity demand and at least 1 kW of solar photovoltaics per 10,000 sf of new development. 				
Biological Resources (Initial Study)				
<p>MM-BIO-1: The Applicant shall be responsible for the implementation of mitigation to reduce impacts to migratory and/or nesting bird species to below a level of significance through one of two ways. Vegetation removal activities shall be scheduled outside the nesting season which runs from February 15 to August 31 to avoid potential impacts to nesting birds. This would ensure that no active nests are disturbed.</p> <p>Any construction activities that occur during the nesting season shall require that all suitable habitat be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting birds by a qualified biologist, retained by the Applicant as approved by the City of Culver City, before commencement of clearing and prior to grading permit issuance. The survey shall be conducted within 72 hours prior to the start of construction. A copy of the pre-construction survey shall be submitted to the City. If any active nests are detected, a buffer of at least 300 feet (500 feet for raptors) shall be delineated, flagged, and avoided until the qualified biological monitor has verified that the young have fledged or the nest has otherwise become inactive.</p> <p>If the biologist determines that a narrower buffer between the Project activities and observed active nests is warranted, he/she should submit a written explanation as to why (e.g., species-specific information; ambient conditions and birds' habituation to them; and the terrain, vegetation, and birds' lines of sight between the Project activities and the nest and foraging areas) to the City of Culver City and, upon request, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Service. Based on the submitted information, the City of Culver City (and the Department, if the Department requests) shall determine whether to allow a narrower buffer</p>	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, and Building Permit.	Culver City Planning Division
Historical Resources				
<p>MM-HIST-1 (Recordation): Perform a Level II Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) documentation of The Culver Studios (interior and exterior of all structures dating from the period of significance to be removed). Documentation shall include selective laser</p>	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Report, and Field Inspection	Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Cultural Affairs, Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
<p>MM-HIST-2 (Salvage Plan): Applicant shall prepare a Salvage Plan that shall be filed with the City of Culver City Planning Division. Prior to demolition, key character-defining physical features of the two individually eligible sound stages (Stage 2/3/4 and Stage 7/8/9) to be demolished shall be identified and made available for use in an interpretive program to be developed for the Project or donated for curatorial and/or educational purposes to a local historical society, preservation organization, or the like. Unsound, decayed, or toxic materials (e.g. asbestos, lead paint, etc.) need not be included in the salvage process. The salvage materials which will not be reused for the Project shall be offered for donation or shall be advertised for a period of not less than thirty (30) days in historic preservation websites and the Culver City News, as well as by posting on the Project Site itself and by other means as deemed appropriate. Salvage efforts shall be conducted by the Applicant. These efforts shall be documented in writing by summarizing all measures taken to encourage receipt of salvage materials by the public. Copies of notices, evidence of publication of such notices, along with a summary of results from the publicity efforts, a list of salvage offers (if any) that were made, and an explanation of why the features were not or could not be accepted shall be included in this salvage summary document.</p>	<p>Condition of Approval</p>	<p>Plan Check Notes, Reports, Notices, and Field Inspection</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction</p>	<p>Culver City Cultural Affairs, Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division</p>
<p>MM-HIST-3 (Interpretive Program): The Applicant shall, in consultation with an expert in museum curation and/or the history of the motion picture industry, develop a publicly accessible interpretive and commemorative program with enforceable performance standards ("Interpretive and Commemorative Program" or "Program"), commemorating and actively illustrating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the significant creative, production, and administrative activities and events that took place and films produced during the Thomas H. Ince, Cecile B. DeMille/RKO Pictures, and David O. Selznik eras of the Studio's history, • how these activities and events were associated with the continued evolution of the motion picture industry through the pioneering era of independent studios, the emergence of The Big Eight major motion picture studios and the "studio system," and the rise of smaller independent production companies in the post-war era, • significant innovations, technical approaches, and technology developed at the Studio and how these important events contributed significantly to the physical development of the site and the evolving motion picture studio. 	<p>Condition of Approval</p>	<p>Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspection</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction</p>	<p>Culver City Cultural Affairs, Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
<p>Program elements may be located on-site, entirely off-site or in a combination of on-site and one or more off-site locations such as new or existing museums and exhibition spaces; provided, however, that at least one publically accessible element of the Program be placed or housed on the Studio Campus property and incorporated as part of any future use and development of the property (e.g., commemorative elements incorporated as part of publically accessible open space features).</p> <p>Substantive Program Requirements. This Interpretative and Commemorative Program shall be based on a research phase to identify and/or determine the availability of the following resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An inventory of museums, exhibition spaces or other institutions (such as the Academy Museum of Motion Pictures currently under development, The Culver City Public library, or The Culver City Historical Society) that provide public programming regarding the motion picture industry, with which the Interpretative and Commemorative Program might share resources or house Program components; • An inventory of physical assets or artifacts extant in public or private collections that may be available for exhibition as part of the Interpretive and Commemorative Program; • Sources of supplementary funding, such as foundation grants. • With knowledge of such availability, the Interpretative and Commemorative Program shall contain recommendations for programming, which collectively commemorate the history of motion picture production, development, administration, and technical engineering achievements at The Culver Studios and may, by way of example, include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – exhibition locations, – artifacts for display, – thematic content, – audio presentations, – video-based interpretive virtual tour or 3-D modeling of the most significant areas of the Studio, and database accessibility. <p>[Note: The above mitigation measure is intended to supersede and replace Mitigation Measure CR-5, Virtual Museum/Exhibition, required under CPA No. 6. In the event the proposed Project is not approved Mitigation Measure CR-5</p>				

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

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

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

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
commencement of demolition or construction activity in order to ensure that any and all pests (including, but not limited to, rodents, bees, ants and mosquitoes) that may populate the Property do not relocate to or impact adjoining properties.				
PDF-HAZ-2 (Groundwater Filtration System): For the permanent dewatering required at the subterranean levels of the proposed Central and Van Buren Parking Structures, and along the proposed underground vehicular connection between the existing on-site subterranean parking structure and Culver Boulevard, carbon filter tank treatment systems will be installed by the Applicant in these structures to treat the dewatered groundwater prior to discharge.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
PDF-WW-1 (Dewatering)	See Wastewater.	See Wastewater.	See Wastewater.	See Wastewater.
Hydrology and Water Quality				
PDF-H/WQ-1 (Structural BMPs): The following structural BMPs would be implemented during Project operation: <ul style="list-style-type: none">13 Environmental Passive Integrated Chamber (EPIC) stormwater treatment areas of 18-inches in depth will be developed on the Project Site totaling 24,200 sf (approximately 0.56 acres) to retain the SWQDv (37,600 cf) through capture and reuse. Pipes will channel rainwater collected from roof and area drains to the treatment areas, which will be planted with native vegetation to remove the collected rainwater over time through uptake and transpiration. Flow entering the treatment areas in excess of the SWQDv will be discharged directly to the off-site storm drain system via overflow valves. The sizes and locations of the proposed treatment areas are identified in Figure 4.7-2, Preliminary LID Plan.Trash enclosure areas will have floor drains that connect to the sewer system rather than the storm drain system.On-site drains, catch basins and stormwater treatment areas will be stenciled to indicate that no substance other than stormwater is to be collected by the storm drain system.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
PDF-H/WQ-2 (Non-Structural BMPs): The following non-structural BMPs will be implemented during Project operation: Open Paved Areas and Planter Areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Maintenance records will be kept of, regular visual inspections/sweeping/removal of debris will be conducted for, and regulator disposal	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy and Ongoing during Operation	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, and Planning Division

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
<p>and replacement of the absorbent materials will be conducted in, the stormwater treatment areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular sweeping of all open hardscape areas, at a minimum, on a weekly basis in order to prevent dispersal of pollutants that may collect on those surfaces. Regular pruning of the trees and shrubs in the planter areas to avoid formation of dried leaves and twigs, which are normally blown by the wind during windy days. These dried leaves are likely to clog the surface inlets of the drainage system when rain comes, which would result to flooding of the surrounding area due to reduced flow capacities of the inlets. Trash and recycling containers will be used such that, if they are to be located outside or apart from the principal structure, are fully enclosed and watertight in order to prevent contact of stormwater with waste matter, which can be a potential source of bacteria and other pollutants in runoff. These containers will be emptied and the wastes disposed of properly on a regular basis. <p><u>Education and Training:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Operation and Management Manual will include education/training standards to ensure training of studio staff as to proper maintenance of on-site BMPs. Training will include information on proper methods of handling and disposal of wastes. Monitoring and Maintenance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All BMPs will be operated, monitored, and maintained for the life of the Project. At a minimum, all structural BMPs will be inspected, cleaned-out, and where necessary, repaired, at the following minimum frequencies: 1) prior to October 15th each year; 2) during each month between October 15th and April 15th of each year and, 3) at least twice during the dry season (between April 16 and October 14 of every year). Debris and other water pollutants removed from structural BMPs during cleanout will be contained and disposed of in a proper manner. The drainage system and BMPs will be maintained according to manufacturer's specification to ensure maximum pollutant removal efficiencies. 				
Land Use and Planning				
Not Applicable.	Not Applicable.	Not Applicable.	Not Applicable.	Not Applicable.

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

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

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

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
<p>proposed construction site management responsibilities in order to ensure that disturbance of nearby land uses or interruption of pedestrian, vehicle, and alternative transportation modes and public transit are minimized to the extent feasible. The FCMP shall be subject to review and approval by Culver City's Building Official, City Engineer and/or Planning Manager, as applicable, prior to issuance of any Project demolition, grading or excavation permit. The FCMP shall also be reviewed and approved by Culver City's Fire and Police Departments. The Culver City Building Official, City Engineer and/or Planning Manager, as applicable, reserve the right to reject any engineer at any time and to require that the FCMP be prepared by a different engineer.</p> <p>Prior to commencement of construction, the contractor shall advise the Public Works Inspector and Building Inspector (Inspectors) of the construction schedule and shall meet with the Inspectors. Also, biweekly construction management meetings with City Staff and other representatives of surrounding developments if under construction at around the same time as the Project shall be required, as determined appropriate by City Staff, to ensure concurrent construction projects are managed in collaboration with one another. The FCMP shall assess project construction impacts and provide effective strategies to limit the use of the public right of way (streets and sidewalks) during peak traffic periods, and shall be subject to adjustment by City staff as deemed necessary and appropriate to preserve the general public safety and welfare.</p> <p>Prior to approval of the FCMP, the applicant shall conduct one (1) Community Meeting pursuant to the notification requirements of the City's Community Meeting guidelines, to discuss and provide the following information to the surrounding community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction schedule and hours. • Framework for construction phases. • Identify traffic diversion plan by phase and activity. (The Traffic Control Plan will be submitted for review and approval by the City for each phase). • Potential location of construction parking and office trailers. • Truck hauling routes and material deliveries (i.e. identify the potential routes and restrictions. Discuss the types and number of trucks anticipated and for what construction activity). • Emergency access plan. • Demolition plan. 				

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staging plan for the concrete pours, material loading and removal. • Crane location(s). • Accessible applicant and contractor contacts during construction activity and during off hours (relevant email address and phone numbers). • Community notification procedures. • The FCMP shall at a minimum include the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The name and telephone number of a contact person who can be reached 24 hours a day regarding construction or construction traffic complaints or emergency situations. 2. An up-to-date list of local police, fire, and emergency response organizations and procedures for the continuous coordination of construction activity, potential delays, and any alerts related to unanticipated road conditions or delays, with local police, fire, and emergency response agencies. Coordination shall include the assessment of any alternative access routes that might be required through the site, and maps showing access to and within the site and to adjacent properties. 3. Construction plans and procedures to address: community and City notification of key construction activities; temporary construction fencing and maintenance of construction areas within public view; noise and vibration controls; dust management and control; and worker education on required mitigation measures and best practices to reduce disturbances to adjacent and nearby land uses. 4. Procedures for the training and certification of flag persons. 5. To the extent known identification of the location, times, and estimated duration of any roadway closures; procedures for traffic detours, pedestrian protection, reducing effects on public transit and alternate transportation modes; and, plans for use of protective devices, warning signs, and staging or queuing areas. 6. The location of temporary power, portable toilet and trash and materials storage locations. 7. The timing and duration of all street and/or lane closures shall be made available to the City in digital format for 				

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
<p>MM-TRAF-5: Lane Closures: Temporary lane closures, if needed, shall be scheduled to avoid peak commute hours and peak school drop-off and pick-up hours to the extent possible. In the event of a lane closure, a worksite traffic control plan, approved by Culver City, shall be implemented to route traffic around any such lane closures.</p>	<p>Condition of Approval</p>	<p>Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, Grading Permit, and Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction</p>	<p>Culver City Public Works and Planning Division</p>
<p>MM-TRAF-6: Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program: TCS shall require the following TDM measures to be provided by each tenant, given the term of the tenancy is long enough for the programs to be implemented (for example, tenancy longer than six months). TCS shall integrate these TDM measures into standard lease documents for each respective tenant leasing over 25,000 gross square feet:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Site Design</u> – The site perimeter shall be designed to encourage walking, biking, and transit. Amenities include wide sidewalks and pedestrian plaza/paseo accessible to neighborhood, street trees and landscaped pathways between buildings, improved street and pedestrian lighting and improved bus shelters, lighting and landscaping on the perimeter of the Project Site. 2. <u>Rideshare Programs</u> – Rideshare programs typically include the provision of an on-site transit and rideshare information center that provides assistance to help people form carpools or access transit alternatives. Rideshare programs often also include priority parking for carpools. The research literature shows that rideshare programs can reduce commuting VMT by up to 15% (CAPCOA, 2010). 3. <u>Bicycle Parking and other Complimentary Services</u> – Culver Studios plans to provide both long-term and short-term bicycle parking. In addition, the Project will provide complementary amenities such as shower facilities, lockers, and a self-service bike repair area to encourage bicycle use. 4. <u>Contribution to Bike Share Program</u> – Bike share service, available for employees and visitors to use, will be provided off-site, adjacent to the property. 5. <u>Unbundled Parking</u> – Unbundling parking typically separates the cost of purchasing or renting parking spaces from the cost of leasing commercial space. Saving money on commercial space by forgoing a parking space acts as an incentive that minimizes auto usage. Similarly, paying for parking (by purchasing or leasing a space) acts as a disincentive that discourages auto ownership and trip-making. The research literature shows that unbundled parking costs can reduce vehicle miles traveled 	<p>Condition of Approval</p>	<p>Plan Check Notes and Field Inspections</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy and Temporary Certificate of Occupancy</p>	<p>Culver City Traffic Engineering, Public Works, and Planning Division</p>

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

Project Design Feature/Mitigation Measure	Implementing Action, Condition or Mechanism	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Persons
Wastewater				
PDF-WW-1 (Dewatering): Similar to the existing dewatering operation at the Project Site since 2014, any additional permanent dewatering required under the Project will be treated and used for on-site landscape irrigation rather than being treated and discharged to the local sewer system.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy and Ongoing during Operation	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
MM-WW-1: Unless further sewer flow monitoring determines to the satisfaction of the City that the Project would not trigger exceedance of the half flow capacity of the Ince sewer main, the Project Applicant shall upsize the existing 10" Ince sewer main with a 12" line from Hubbard Street to Lucerne Ave. (approximately 700 linear feet) (Exhibit 4 of the Wastewater Report shows the recommended sewer line segment to be upsized). The upsizing shall occur prior to the issuance of occupancy permits for the proposed new buildings.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
Water Supply				
PDF-WATER-1 (Water Conservation): The Project shall implement conservation measures related to landscape irrigation. Conservation measures include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Low water-demand and drought tolerant planting will be used on the Project Site.• Irrigation runoff on the Project Site will be collected and treated on site.• Irrigation will have weather sensor input to determine need of irrigation.• All irrigation will be drip irrigation.• Irrigation will be on timers.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy and Ongoing during Operation	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
PDF-WATER-2 (Water Lines): Rerouting and/or and potential future reconnection of the on-site 4-inch service line to the City's water main shall be coordinated with GSWC prior to construction of the proposed parking building.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
PDF-WATER-3 (Water Service): Prior to construction of additional buildings, the need for new connections to City lines or on-site service lines to maintain adequate on-site domestic water service and pressure levels shall be coordinated with GSWC.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Public Works, Engineering, and Planning Division
PDF-WATER-4 (Fire Flow): Prior to construction, building plans shall be submitted to the Culver City Fire Department (CCFD) to determine fire flow and time period requirements based on tenant type, building size, and building type. If additional fire service lines and hydrants are required to maintain adequate fire flow, the Project shall install fire service lines and hydrants as required.	Condition of Approval	Plan Check Notes, Reports, Surveys, and Field Inspections	Prior to issuance of a Grading Permit, Building Permit, and Ongoing during Construction	Culver City Building Safety Division, Building Safety Inspector, Fire Prevention, Fire Inspector, and Planning Division

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

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