

Errata to the
Millennium Hollywood Project
Environmental Impact Report

Project Information

Project Name: Millennium Hollywood Project

Project Location: The Project Site is generally bounded by Yucca Street, Ivar Avenue, Argyle Avenue, and Hollywood Boulevard, within the Hollywood Community Planning Area of the City of Los Angeles

Project Applicant: Millennium Hollywood, LLC

Authority under Section 15088.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines to prepare an Errata

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15088.5 an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) need not be recirculated if new information, including changes in the project or new data, is not significant. *“Recirculation is not required where new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.”*

“Significant new information” requiring recirculation would include, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.*
- (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.*
- (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.*
- (4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.*

EIR Background Information for the Millennium Hollywood Project

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Project was prepared in compliance with CEQA and was released on February 8, 2013. The EIR analyzed the proposed project’s potential environmental impacts and, in addition, analyzed six Alternatives to the Proposed Project, including a Reduced Height Development.

Subsequent to the release of the EIR, an Errata was prepared and released in May 2013 to clarify and correct information in the EIR as they pertain to the Development Agreement and the Development Regulations, in addition to other minor changes.

This Errata further clarifies and corrects information in the EIR on the method of implementation of development limitations and controls on the proposed project.

Proposed Project Modifications

The EIR prepared for the Proposed Project identified the use of a Development Agreement as a mechanism to implement the Project and impose development restrictions on the property. At this time, a development agreement is not being requested, however, the development restrictions that would have been included in the development agreement would instead be governed by the adoption of Development Regulations and a Land Use Equivalency Program through "Q" conditions adopted as part of a zone change ordinance.

The purpose of this Errata is to provide clarification that the analysis contained in the EIR has not changed due to the removal of the development agreement and the use of an alternative mechanism of implementation of the development regulations.

Assessment of Potential Environmental Impacts Associated with the Proposed Project Modifications

Withdrawal of the Development Agreement

As established and provided by California Government Code Sections 65864-65869.5, Development Agreements serve to vest project approvals and entitlements. Its main purpose is not to control the scale or scope of development analyzed in the EIR. Thus, the environmental analysis and the potential environmental impacts identified in the EIR remain the same since the project would not change with or without a development agreement.

Therefore, approval of the Project, the substantive provisions of the Development Regulations, and the Land Use Equivalency Program that control the height, bulk, massing, use, and other essential aspects of the Project that may impact the physical environment are not materially affected by removal of the Development Agreement. Stated differently, the controlling provisions of the Development Regulations and Land Use Equivalency Program were designed to remain independent of the Development Agreement.

Implementation of the Development Regulations and the Land Use Equivalency Program through the Q conditions

Section 12.32.G.2(a) of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) establishes special land use legislative actions to place Q conditions as part of a zoning ordinance so *"that the development of the site shall conform to certain specified standards, if the limitations are deemed necessary to:*

- (1) Protect the best interests of and assure a development more compatible with the surrounding property or neighborhood;*
- (2) Secure an appropriate development in harmony with the objectives of the General Plan; or*
- (3) Prevent or mitigate potential adverse environmental effects of the zone change."*

The development controls associated with the Development Regulations and the Land Use Equivalency Program would be incorporated into the Q conditions of the zone change ordinance that would be adopted and approved by the City as part of the approval of the Project and would be enforced by the City for the life of the Project. These controls, and thus the project, do not exceed any of the maximum impacts identified for each issue area studied in the Draft and Final EIR and the environmental impacts would remain the same.

Environmental Impact Analysis

The modifications of the Project are relatively minor and would not result in any new significant environmental impacts. The analysis contained herein demonstrates that the Modified Project is consistent with the size, scale, and massing of the Project and all of the impact issues previously examined in the EIR would remain unchanged with the proposed modifications. The Modified Project would result in little to no changes with respect to the environmental impact conclusions analyzed for the Project (see Table 1 below).

Specifically, the EIR included detailed analysis of potential impacts to aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, hazardous materials, land use/zoning, noise, population and housing, public services (police and fire protection, schools, libraries, parks and recreation), public utilities (energy conservation, sewer and wastewater, water supply, and solid waste and disposal) and transportation/circulation and parking. In addition, the following environmental categories were not evaluated within the scope of the EIR as they were concluded in the Initial Study evaluation as not likely to be significantly impacted by the proposed development: agricultural resources, biological resources, and mineral resources.

As the proposed changes to the Project would not alter the overall square footage or proposed uses of the Project, none of the environmental issue areas previously determined in the Initial Study to be less than significant would be affected to a degree that would warrant further analysis. The proposed changes associated with the Modified Project involve removal of the Development Agreement and use of the Q conditions as a means of implementing certain aspects of the Project. As demonstrated by the analysis in this errata, all of the potential environmental impacts of the Modified Project were previously addressed within the scope of the Draft and Final EIR. In addition, there is no significant new information associated with the changes that could trigger recirculation.

Therefore, the analysis of the Modified Project supports the determination that the proposed changes to the Project would not involve new significant environmental effects, or result in a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

Table 1
Comparison of Environmental Conclusions between the Project and the Modified Project

| Environmental Issue | Project | Modified Project | Conclusion |
|--|----------------|------------------|------------|
| Aesthetics | | | |
| Visual Character/Views | SU | SU | No change |
| Light and Glare | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No change |
| Air Quality | | | |
| Construction | SU | SU | No change |
| Operation | SU | SU | No change |
| Greenhouse Gas Emissions | | | |
| | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No change |
| Cultural Resources | | | |
| Historic | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No change |
| Archaeological | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No change |
| Paleontological | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No change |
| Hazards and Hazardous Materials | | | |
| Transport, Use, or Disposal | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No change |
| Release into the Environment | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No change |
| Oil and Gas Fields | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No change |
| Asbestos-Containing Materials | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No change |
| Hydrology and Water Quality | | | |
| Water Quality | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No change |
| Groundwater | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No change |
| Surface Water | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No change |
| Land Use/Planning | | | |
| Land Use Consistency | LTS | LTS | No Change |
| Land Use Compatibility | LTS | LTS | No change |
| Noise | | | |
| Construction Noise | SU | SU | No Change |
| Operation Noise | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No Change |
| Population, Housing, and Employment | | | |
| Pop and Housing | LTS | LTS | No change |
| Employment | LTS | LTS | No Change |
| Public Services | | | |
| Fire | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No Change |
| Police | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No Change |


| Environmental Issue | Project | Modified Project | Conclusion |
|---|----------------|------------------|------------|
| Schools | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No Change |
| Parks | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No Change |
| Libraries | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No Change |
| Transportation/Circulation | | | |
| Construction | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No change |
| Operation | SU | SU | No change |
| Cumulative | SU | SU | No change |
| Parking | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No change |
| Utilities | | | |
| Water | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No change |
| Wastewater | LTS | LTS | No change |
| Solid Waste | LTS/Mitigation | LTS/Mitigation | No change |
| Energy | LTS | LTS | No change |
| <i>Notes:</i> LTS = Less than significant LTS/Mitigation = Less than significant with mitigation SU = Significant and Unavoidable Table prepared based on a comparison of the characteristics of Project and Modified Project as related to each environmental impact category analyzed in the Draft and Final EIR. | | | |

Conclusion

As discussed above and as identified in Table 1, the use of an alternative mechanism to implement the Project would not result in any new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

The information presented in this document serves to clarify or amplify the conclusions in the EIR. This new information is not significant and recirculation is not required (see Guidelines Section 15088.5). In conformance with Section 15121 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the EIR, technical appendices and reports thereof, together with the Errata and the information contained in this document are intended to serve as documents that will generally inform the decision-makers and the public of environmental effects of the Project.

The City of Los Angeles Planning Department has reviewed this errata and has determined it to be prepared in accordance with all CEQA requirements and in so doing adequately addresses the potential environmental impacts of the Modified Project. Therefore, this errata is adequate under CEQA and can be used by an agency making a decision on the Project.


Diana Kitching
Los Angeles Department of City Planning

7/18/13
Date