Exhibit B

[PROPOSED]

CEQA STATEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND FINDINGS OF FACT

AUTRY NATIONAL CENTER'S GRIFFITH PARK CAMPUS IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT
4700 WESTERN HERITAGE WAY
State Clearinghouse No. 2007051084

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION BACKGROUND 1

III. FINDINGS REQUIRED TO BE MADE BY LEAD AGENCY UNDER CEQA 2

IV. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT 3

A. Phase 1 4
B. Phase 2 6
C. Green Building Design 7
D. Anticipated Project Development Schedule and Construction Phasing 7
E. Parking Reduction Variance 8
F. Signage Variance 9

V. IMPACTS DETERMINED IN THE INITIAL STUDY NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT 10

A. Agricultural Resources 10
B. Biological Resources 10
C. Cultural Resources 12
D. Geology 12
E. Hazards/ Hazardous Materials 13
F. Mineral Resources 14
G. Population/ Housing 14
H. Public Services (Police Protection, Schools and Recreation) 15
I. Utilities 15
1. Wastewater 15
2. Water 16
3. Solid Waste 16
4. Electricity and Natural Gas 17

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOUND IN THE EIR NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT 17

A. Aesthetics 17
1. Visual Character/Aesthetics 17
2. Views 19
3. Light and Glare 20
4. Shade and Shadow 21
5. Analysis of Parking Reduction Variance 21
6. Cumulative Impacts 21
B. Air Quality 22
1. Localized Construction Impacts 22

2. Operational Impacts 22
3. Cumulative Impacts 25
C. Cultural Resources 27
1. Historical Resources 27
a. Griffith Park Campus 27
b. Arroyo Campus 30
2. Cumulative Impacts 31
D. Hydrology 31
1. Construction Impacts 31
2. Operations Impacts 32
3. Cumulative Impacts 32
E. Land Use 33
1. Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies 33
2. Land Use Compatibility 38
3. Cumulative Impacts 39
F. Noise 40
1. Operational Impacts 40
2. Cumulative Impacts 40
a. Long-Term Operations 40
G. Public Services - Fire 41
1. Construction Impacts 41
2. Operational Impacts 42
3. Cumulative Impacts 43
H. Transportation and Circulation 43
1. Operational Impacts 43
2. Cumulative Impacts 46

VII. IMPACTS FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT AFTER MITIGATION 47

A. Cultural Resources 47
1. Archeological Resources 47
a. Description of Significant Effects 47
b. Mitigation Measures 47
c. Finding 49
d. Rationale for Finding 49
e. Reference 49
2. Paleontological Resources 49
a. Description of Significant Effects 49
b. Mitigation Measures 49
c. Finding 50
d. Rationale for Finding 50
e. Reference 50
B. Noise 50
1. Construction Impacts 50
a. Description of Significant Effects 50
b. Mitigation Measures 51
c. Finding 51

d. Rationale for Finding 51
e. Reference 52
C. Transportation and Circulation 52
1. Construction Impacts 52
a. Description of Significant Effects 52
b. Mitigation Measures 53
c. Finding 54
d. Rationale for Finding 54
e. Reference 54

VIII. REQUIRED CEQA FINDINGS: IMPACTS FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE 54

A. Air Quality 54
1. Regional Construction Impacts 54
a. Significant Environmental Effects 54
b. Mitigation Measures 56
c. Finding 56
d. Rationale for Finding 57
e. Reference 57
2. Cumulative Impacts 57
a. Construction Impacts 57
(1) Significant Environmental Effects 57
(2) Mitigation Measures 58
(3) Finding 58
(4) Rationale for Finding 58
(5) Reference 59
B. Noise 59
1. Cumulative Impacts 59
a. Construction Impacts 59
(1) Significant Environmental Effects 59
(2) Mitigation Measures 60
(3) Finding 60
(4) Rationale for Finding 60
(5) Reference 61
C. Transportation and Circulation 61
1. Cumulative Impacts 61
a. Operational Impacts 61
(1) Significant Environmental Effects 61
(2) Mitigation Measures 61
(3) Finding 61
(4) Rationale for Finding 61
(5) Reference 62
b. Construction Impacts 62
(1) Significant Environmental Effects 62
(2) Mitigation Measures 62
(3) Finding 63

(4) Rationale for Finding 63
(5) Reference 63

IX. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT 63

A. Project Objectives 63
B. Alternatives Considered but Rejected 64
C. Project Alternatives 66
1. Alternative A — No Project Alternative 66
a. Description of Alternative 66
b. Impact Summary of Alternative A 66
c. Finding 67
d. Rationale for Finding 67
e. Reference 67
2. Alternative B — Reduced Program 68
a. Description of Alternative 68
b. Impact Summary of Alternative B 68
c. Finding 68
d. Rationale for Finding 68
e. Reference 69
3. Alternative C — Above Ground Parking 69
a. Description of the Alternative 69
b. Impact Summary of Alternative C 70
c. Finding 70
d. Rationale for Finding 70
e. Reference 71
4. Alternative D — Off-Site Parking 71
a. Description of Alternative 71
b. Impact Summary of Alternative D 72
c. Finding 72
d. Rationale for Finding 72
e. Reference 73
5. Alternative E — Alternative Site — Arroyo Campus Expansion 73
a. Description of Alternative 73
b. Impact Summary of Alternative E 74
c. Finding 75
d. Rationale for Finding 75
e. Reference 76
D. Environmentally Superior Alternative 76

X. FINDINGS REGARDING OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS 77

A. Potential Secondary Effects 77
1. Aesthetics 77
2. Air Quality 77
3. Biological Resources 78
4. Cultural Resources 78

5. Geology/ Soils....79
6. Hydrology....79
7. Land Use....79
8. Noise....79
9. Public Services- Fire Protection....80
10. Transportation and Circulation....80
B. Growth Inducing Impacts of the Proposed Project....80
C. Significant Irreversible Impacts....81

XI. OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS....82

I. INTRODUCTION

To assist in implementing its mission to "explore the experiences and perceptions of the diverse peoples of the American West," the Autry National Center proposes the Griffith Park Campus Improvements Project (the Project) at its Griffith Park Campus (the Campus or Museum) in the City of Los Angeles. The Project would renovate and modernize certain portions of the existing Campus in two development phases. The key Project features include increasing the building space within the Campus by 129,000 gross square feet, renovating the exterior landscape areas, and enhancing vehicle and pedestrian circulation and parking amenities. These improvements would allow the Autry National Center to establish its Griffith Park Campus as the premier interpretive site for the exhibitions of the American West; to store its collections in a location with museum standard-of-care controls and appropriate physical storage conditions; to showcase the internal workings of the Campus (*e.g.*, storage of collections and staff areas); to provide additional gallery and presentation areas for the public; to enhance its research and education programs; and to enhance the Campus as a cultural resource.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION BACKGROUND

The City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks is the Lead Agency for the proposed Project, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). An Initial Study for the proposed Project was prepared in early 2007, and the Lead Agency subsequently made the determination that an environmental impact report (EIR) would be required. The EIR for the Project has been prepared at the direction and under the supervision of the Lead Agency in accordance with CEQA and the Guidelines for CEQA (State CEQA Guidelines), as amended.[1,2]

In accordance with CEQA requirements, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) soliciting comments regarding the preparation of a Draft EIR (the DEIR or Draft EIR) was circulated on May 14, 2007. In distributing the NOP, the Lead Agency issued over 3,000 NOP letters to numerous agencies and organizations as well as all residents and businesses within a 500 foot radius of Griffith Park in its entirety in order to ensure that all potentially interested individuals were informed about the proposed Project. These agencies and organizations included Council Offices and numerous Neighborhood Councils. In addition, numerous Griffith Park stakeholders from a mailing list previously created by the Department of Recreation and Parks were also included in the distribution for the NOP. Similarly, the Lead Agency held two scoping meetings during the NOP comment period (on May 29, 2007 and June 11, 2007) in order to solicit public comments regarding issues to be addressed in the Draft EIR. The NOP comment period commenced on May 14th, 2007 and ended on June 13th, 2007 and thus was circulated for the 30-day period required by CEQA. The NOP was also filed with the Office of Planning and Research on May 14th, 2007.

The Draft EIR for the Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2007051084), incorporated herein by reference in full, was prepared pursuant to CEQA and State, Agency, and City of Los Angeles

---

1 Public Resources Code Sections 21000-21178.

2 California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 3, Sections 15000-15387.

(City) CEQA guidelines (Pub Resources Code §21000, *et seq.*; 14 Cal. Code Regs. §15000, *et seq.*; City of Los Angeles Environmental Quality Act Guidelines), and was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research. The Draft EIR evaluated in detail the potential effects of the proposed Project. It also analyzed the effects of a reasonable range of five alternatives to the proposed Project, including potential effects of a "No Project" alternative. A public review period of 47 days, beginning on August 16, 2007 and ending on October 1, 2007, was initially provided in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15105(a). However, in response to several requests for an extension made to the Department of Recreation and Parks, this review period was extended through October 18, 2007 to provide more time for responsible and trustee agencies as well as the public to comment on the Draft EIR. Thus, the public review period of the Draft EIR lasted a total of 64 days. Additionally, as was indicated within the Notice of Completion and Availability, a public meeting was held during the Draft EIR comment period on September 18, 2007 in order to further solicit comments on the Draft EIR.

The Lead Agency prepared a Final EIR for the Project, which is hereby incorporated by reference in full. The Final EIR is intended to serve as an informational document for public agency decision-makers and the general public regarding the objectives and components of the proposed Project. The Final EIR addresses the environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed Project, identifies feasible mitigation measures and alternatives that may be adopted to reduce or eliminate these impacts, and includes written responses to all comments received on the Draft EIR during the public review period. Responses were sent to all public agencies that made comments on the Draft EIR at least 10 days prior to certification of the Final EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(b).

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the CEQA findings are based are located at the Department of Recreation and Parks, 1200 W. 7th Street, Suite 700, Los Angeles California 90017. This information is provided in compliance with CEQA Section 21081.6(a)(2).

III. FINDINGS REQUIRED TO BE MADE BY LEAD AGENCY UNDER CEQA

Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines require a public agency, prior to approving a project, to identify significant impacts of the project and make one or more of these possible findings for each of the significant impacts. The possible findings are:

- "Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR." (State CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(1))

- "Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency." (State CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(2))

- "Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible

the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR." (State CEQA Guidelines, § 15091, subd. (a)(3))

The findings reported in the following pages incorporate the facts and discussions of the environmental impacts that are found to be significant in the Final EIR for the Project as fully set forth therein. Although Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines does not require findings to address environmental impacts that an EIR identifies as merely "potentially significant," these findings would nevertheless fully account for all such effects identified in the Final EIR for the purpose of better understanding the full environmental scope of the Project. For each of the significant impacts associated with the Project, either before or after mitigation, a specific description of the environmental effects identified in the EIR, including a judgment regarding the significance of the impact, is provided. Also identified are the mitigation measures or actions that are required as part of the Project (numbering of the mitigation measures correspond to the Draft EIR and Section II, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR). One or more of three specific findings in direct response to CEQA Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, as well as a summary of the reasons for the finding(s), is also stated for each significant impact. Finally, notations on the specific section in the Final EIR which includes the evidence and discussion of the identified significant impact have been included.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT

The mission of the Autry National Center is to "explore the experiences and perceptions of the diverse peoples of the American West," and the Project would help to fulfill this mission through the renovation, modernization and expansion of its Griffith Park Campus.[3] The Griffith Park Campus consists of 161,271 gross square feet[4] located on 11.93 acres of land in the northeast portion of Griffith Park (the "Park"). As part of the Project, the building area within the Campus would be expanded by approximately 129,000 gross square feet in two phases, portions of the Campus Building would be renovated, exterior landscape areas would be renovated and enhanced, vehicle and pedestrian circulation would be improved, and additional parking would be provided. These improvements would allow the Autry National Center to store its collections in a location with museum standard-of-care controls and appropriate physical storage conditions; to showcase the internal workings of the Campus (e.g., visible storage of collections and staff areas); to provide additional display and presentation areas for the public; to enhance its research and education programs; to enhance the Campus as a cultural resource; and to create and further establish a setting that represents the history of the American West. The Project does not propose any physical changes to the Arroyo Campus located in Mount Washington, which will continue to provide various exhibitions for the public at that location. The proposed improvements would be implemented in two development phases as described below.

---

[3] Autry National Center website, http://www.autrynationalcenter.org/about.php, accessed November 14, 2007.

[4] The Draft EIR for the Project provides that the Griffith Park Campus consists of 142,880 square feet, however, this has been revised to reflect that the existing Campus Building as originally built is larger, in fact, than the City records indicated.

A. Phase 1

Phase 1 of the Project would renovate much of the interior of the Campus Building with up to 79,000 gross square feet of new building space (as currently designed, Phase 1 would add approximately 76,656 gross square feet), by expanding the building footprint outward towards the east and west. The Project would not include additional levels; rather, the Project would integrate the Campus Building into the new design for the site. A renovated centralized space would connect key existing and expanded program components of the Campus Building including the galleries, theater, community room, outdoor spaces, and educational spaces. Collections storage and management facilities and temporary exhibition galleries would encompass the majority of the lower level. The main level galleries and lower level storage areas would account for the largest increase in new building area. The new area for collections storage would provide a long-term solution for proper storage, as well as space for education, conservation, collections management and curatorial functions.

Additional and renovated gallery and exhibition areas would also be provided within the main and lower levels of the Campus Building. The new and reconfigured exhibition spaces would provide for permanent and temporary exhibitions along with visual access to storage. These spaces would also have the light, temperature and humidity controls required for the artifacts, while being flexible enough to allow for a variety of exhibitions. On the main level, the existing 230 seat theater would remain as is and the café area would be relocated to the eastern side of the Campus Building. A new community room would be added above the relocated café. The education classrooms would be relocated to the lower level and expanded, with enhanced access to outdoor education spaces. The Project would also incorporate a new entrance area to the southern side of the Campus Building, north of the South Lawn area. The upper level of the Campus Building would also retain and expand the research/library and general administrative spaces.

To provide for the new building areas, modification to the existing features of the Campus Building would be necessary. Such modifications would include removal of the café kitchen and arcade of columns within the existing plaza area. Removal of the interior and exterior finishes on the main level would be necessary to reconfigure the gallery spaces.

Based on the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) definition of building height, which measures height from the lowest point of the existing site grade five feet from the building, the existing Campus Building measures approximately 56.75 feet in height along the lower side of the Project site, with a tower that measures approximately 110 feet in height. When viewed from Griffith Park on the western side of the Campus, the front façade of the Campus Building measures approximately 39 feet in height. The height of the expanded Campus Building would increase slightly to approximately 63.5 feet (including raised roof elements), based on the LAMC definition of height. However, when viewed from the west, the expanded Campus Building would be approximately 43 feet in height, similar to existing conditions when viewed from a distance. In addition, the existing tower would include a slightly raised wall that would cover the peak of the tower. Upon completion of the Project, the tower will be approximately 112 feet tall. The Phase 2 Institute Building would be approximately 65 feet tall. The new and renovated portions of the Campus Building are anticipated to be constructed with materials such as concrete, plaster, metal, and glass.

As part of the proposed improvements, parking would be expanded at its current locations east and north of the Campus Building. In addition, the surface parking areas adjacent to Western Heritage Way would be removed and new surface parking areas would instead be developed on the southeastern portions of the existing South Lawn. With these improvements, there would be a total of 311 parking spaces upon completion of Phase 1 of the Project. In addition, the existing surface parking area along the west side of the Campus Building would be replaced with attractive landscaping, thus improving visitor views of the Campus off of Western Heritage Way and the Los Angeles Zoo.

Vehicle access to the Project site would continue to be provided from Western Heritage Way. Specifically, access to the Project site would be provided from a south entrance from Western Heritage Way with a new internal access road that would provide access to the visitor parking areas within the southern and southeastern portions of the site. In addition, a bus-only driveway would be provided for bus turnarounds at the southern access point to the site. One curb cut for bus loading would be located along Western Heritage Way between the two driveways. In addition, the existing service road within the northern portion of the site would be retained to provide access to the staff and visitor parking lots within the eastern and northern portions of the site, respectively. Expanded truck access and turnaround areas would also be provided at the east side of the Campus Building with access to the loading dock.

Pedestrian access would be available from both west and south of the Project site through a new garden and plaza feature with interconnecting walkways to the Los Angeles Zoo and Griffith Park. In addition, a new pathway would run parallel to Western Heritage Way between the bus loading area and the remainder of the Campus.

The existing equestrian trail located in the Project vicinity would not be disturbed along the segments adjacent to the freeway and golf courses or along the segment located to the north of the Zoo wastewater treatment facility. Landscaping would provide screening between the new staff parking area and the equestrian trail. In addition, the new entry road within the southern portion of the site, that would roughly parallel the existing equestrian trail, would also be screened from the trail by new landscaping. Fencing may also be installed to prevent errant golf shots from reaching the Project site.

The portion of the existing equestrian trail that runs immediately west of the Zoo wastewater treatment facility may require some minor realignment so that it would not be too close to the new visitor parking area to be built west of the existing trail as part of Phase 1 of the Project. Modified portions of the trail would be the same width as the existing trail. In order to build the new parking area and realign the trail, portions of the existing vegetation in this area would be removed and replaced with new landscaping intended to screen the trail from both the new parking area and the existing Zoo wastewater treatment facility. The existing corral, which is used mainly by visitors to the Campus, will need to be relocated. However, the new corral would be within a short distance from its current location and would be the same total size and have the same features and amenities as the existing corral. At its closest point, the new parking area would be approximately 37 feet from the Zoo wastewater treatment facility. Since the trail varies between 13 and 15 feet in width, there would be ample room for landscaping on both sides of the trail.

As described above, during Phase 1 of the Project, the existing surface parking area along the west side of the Campus would be removed. In its place, attractive landscaping would be planted. This would improve public views of the Campus from Western Heritage Way and the Los Angeles Zoo. New surface parking areas would be constructed within the southeastern portion of the site near the Zoo wastewater treatment facility and along the southernmost portion of the site. The South Lawn, which is used as an outdoor gathering and events area, would be shifted toward Western Heritage Way. This improvement is discussed in more detail in the Phase 2 section below. Upon completion of the Project, the amount of open space area visible to the public would remain approximately the same as what exists today. In addition, an expansive interpretive landscape area would provide access between the new visitor parking areas and the Campus Building.

As part of construction of the proposed improvements, the existing stormwater line that crosses through the Project site connecting the Zoo wastewater treatment facility settlement pond to the Los Angeles Zoo may be relocated. Existing mechanical equipment such as chillers and boilers would be retained or upgraded as necessary. Upgrades to other utilities such as the on-site electrical supply system may also be necessary.

Lighting within the Project site would include light emitted from the windows and clearstory areas with limited exterior lighting provided to highlight the architectural features of the building. Outdoor lighting would include low-level landscape lighting and lighting for special events, way finding and security.

B. Phase 2

Phase 2 of the Project involves the construction of an Institute Building south of the Campus Building that would house a reading room, collection storage rooms, and staff work areas. This approximately 50,000 gross square foot structure would be connected to the southern portion of the Campus Building via the new interpretive landscape area. The Institute Building may also be connected to the lower or upper level of the Campus Building. The Phase 2 program would include several public areas, including the Institute Reading Room, seminar rooms, and an exhibition space. Upon completion of the proposed Project, the Griffith Park Campus would have a total of approximately 159 employees. In addition, there would be approximately 35 volunteers on-site at one time during peak hours.

Phase 2 of the Project would replace the surface parking area that was constructed on the southeastern portion of the South Lawn during Phase 1 with a new two-level semi-subterranean parking facility beneath the Institute Building. By taking advantage of the existing 15-foot grade drop that occurs within the southern portion of the site, this parking facility would be virtually screened from sight. The surface parking area within the southernmost portion of the site would remain. Upon completion of the proposed parking improvements, the Project site would include a total of 380 on-site parking spaces to accommodate both visitors and staff.

Upon completion of Phase 2, the equestrian trail would remain in essentially the same location as after Phase 1 construction. The equestrian trail would pass between the new Institute Building/semi-subterranean parking facility and the existing Zoo wastewater treatment facility. The new Institute Building and semi-subterranean parking facility would be screened with

landscaping and no building or garage ventilation would be directed towards the trail. In addition, landscaped drainage swales would be constructed between the parking areas and the equestrian trail to help improve storm water quality and prevent drainage onto the trail. City of Los Angeles and Department of Recreation and Parks maintenance equipment would continue to have access to the equestrian trail and Zoo wastewater treatment facility.

C. Green Building Design

The Project would incorporate green building techniques and sustainability features. The proposed Project would be designed and built to include Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) aspects, such as maximizing operational efficiency through the reduction of energy consumption and vehicles miles traveled so as to achieve certification under the LEED Green Building Rating System. Specific aspects identified by the LEED Green Building Rating System to be included in the Project are described in Corrections and Additions of the Final EIR (additional information added to Section II, Project Description). The balance of required points to achieve LEED Certification will be evaluated and selected from a number of options, listed in Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR (additional information added to Section II, Project Description), during the building design process.

The proposed Project would promote alternative transportation and implement other improvements to promote alternative transportation methods aimed at reducing the amount of employee vehicle miles traveled when commuting to the Campus. Convenient access to nearby public transportation lines, passenger bus shelters, and enhanced bus lanes would also be provided to further promote the use of alternative transportation methods by both employees and visitors. Energy performance at the Campus would be optimized to maximize energy efficiency through the use of compact fluorescent light bulbs (CFL), other low energy lighting fixtures and lighting control systems, the use of skylights and daylight to reduce lighting requirements, the use of low water flow devices within restroom and kitchen areas and the use of Low-E windows. In addition, existing on-site equipment improvements would include the replacement of chillers and boilers with new energy efficient equipment to reduce electricity and natural gas demands, commissioning of the heating and cooling systems to maximize energy efficiency, and the use of an integrated building controls system to manage and monitor building systems efficiency. The landscaping of the Project site would also promote environmental sustainability by including plants that are "drought tolerant" in order to lower water demand, the use of recycled water for landscape watering, and the use of landscaped bioswales for treating stormwater run-off.

D. Anticipated Project Development Schedule and Construction Phasing

Construction of Phase 1 of the proposed Project is expected to commence in 2010 and be completed in 2012. This phase is expected to include the creation of the Convergence Hall, expansion of the galleries to the west and east, interior renovations, renovation of the main entrance, expanded collection and storage areas, relocated café and expanded community room, and creation of new landscape areas and new and interim surface parking areas. Phase 2 is expected to commence in 2015 and be completed by 2016 with the opening of the Institute Building.

Construction hours would occur in accordance with LAMC requirements, which prohibit construction between the hours of 9:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. Monday through Friday, 6:00 P.M. and 8:00 A.M. on Saturday, and at any time on Sunday. Construction activities associated with the proposed Project would result in approximately 83,930 cubic yards of grading for the building additions and the semi-subterranean parking facility (21,330 cubic yards in Phase 1 and 62,600 cubic yards in Phase 2), of which 70,880 cubic yards is anticipated to be exported (15,680 cubic yards in Phase 1 and 55,200 cubic yards in Phase 2).

During the Phase 1 construction period, the Autry intends to provide temporary facilities on-site so that it can continue with museum activities on an interim basis. The Autry would present a series of programs designed to preserve the loyalty of the public while the existing Campus building is closed. These facilities would include a modified museum store, grab-and-go café and visitor center. These programs would be accommodated by temporary on-site facilities similar to those the Autry has historically used on the site. Additionally, on-site trailers would provide office space for approximately 50 staff members. The balance of the staff would be temporarily accommodated in existing facilities off-site. During construction of Phase 2, the completed Phase 1 facility would remain operational and open to the public.

E. Parking Reduction Variance

One of the primary goals of the Project design has been to remove parking from the front of the existing Campus Building and replace it with landscaping in order to enhance the park setting of the site and to minimize the visual impact of any additional parking. A number of comments on the Draft EIR suggested that the on-site parking at the Autry should be reduced and expressed concern about the setting of the Campus.[5] In response to these comments, following the Draft EIR comment period, the proposed Project was refined to remove surface parking and thus increase the amount of landscaped open space provided by the Project. This reduction in parking is supported by data in Appendix 13 of the Final EIR that demonstrates that the Code-required parking substantially exceeds the demand for on-site parking and that the number of parking spaces now proposed upon completion of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Project can adequately accommodate peak parking demand during the weekday and weekend. Specifically, to accommodate the demand for parking generated by the proposed uses while reserving as much open space as possible, the Project would have 311 parking spaces upon completion of Phase 1 and 380 parking spaces upon completion of Phase 2. In accordance with the LAMC, this reduction in on-site parking will require a parking variance.

The parking variance would not result in any new or greater impacts than those of the proposed Project. Rather, if granted, the variance would have the benefit of providing additional landscaped open space (approximately one-half acre) in the place of paved surface parking. It would also allow the Autry visitor entry road to be configured with a direct connection to Western Heritage Way via an existing curb cut, rather than off the existing access road to the Zoo overflow lot to the south. It would allow the preservation of several prominent trees at the southwest corner of the site which would otherwise be removed to provide for the surface parking lot. The variance would also allow a significant portion of visitor parking at the Autry to

[5] *See* Comment Nos. 11.20, 17.7, 28.10, 28.12, 31,190, 45.14 and 27.4, Section III, Responses to Written Comments, Final EIR.

be shifted from the new surface lot currently proposed to be constructed at the southern area of the lawn to the eastern part of the site in an area that is currently proposed for staff parking.

F. Signage Variance

Existing signage within the Griffith Park Campus includes 15 pole signs, 4 wall signs, and a number of small information signs. With the exception of one pole sign, which is located on the fence facing Western Heritage Way, all of the existing signage would be removed as part of the proposed Project and would be replaced with new signage that would complement the architecture of the new buildings and respect the location of the Project site within Griffith Park. Specifically, the Project is anticipated to include 4 wall signs, a monument sign, 11 pole signs and several small information signs. Thus, the Project would decrease the number of pole signs that would be located on-site.

The Autry will request a variance to allow the construction of one monument sign with a total sign face of more than the maximum amount allowed for monument signs according to the LAMC. The LAMC limits monument sign area to 75 square feet. The proposed monument sign is a wing-shaped structure with one side oriented toward drivers approaching the museum from Western Heritage Way heading north and the other side oriented drivers approaching from the south. Each side of the monument sign is anticipated to measure 5 feet by 20 feet, or 100 square feet, for a total sign area of 200 square feet The monument sign is necessary to insure that the museum is adequately identified to Park visitors heading north and south along Western Heritage Way. The double-sided sign would insure appropriate visibility by persons seeking to locate the Project, a function that is currently served by the existing wall signs and, to a lesser extent, by the wide swath of parking area that will be moved to the back of the building as part of the Project. The unique orientation of the sign, as well as its double-sided design, allows cars traveling north and south on Western Heritage Way to see the same valuable information, but permits only one side to be visible from the street at any given time. The size of the monument sign is in proportion to the expanded Campus Building and is appropriate in relation to the total amount of existing sign area that now faces Western Heritage Way.

The variance request will also allow a total of 11 pole signs. Pursuant to LAMC Section 14.4.12.A, "[l]ots having a street frontage of at least 50 feet may have a pole sign for each 200 feet or fraction of that area of street frontage, if the street frontage does not contain an existing pole sign or projecting sign." As stated, the Project site has a street frontage along Western Heritage Way of 1,173 feet. This would allow five pole signs. The Project site also has a street frontage along the freeway of approximately 1,105 feet. The two frontages added together total 2,278 lineal feet of street frontage, sufficient to allow 11 pole signs as a matter of right. Nevertheless, and in an abundance of caution, the Autry is requesting relief from the LAMC signage requirements so that if only Western Heritage Way is treated as street frontage under the Municipal Code, 6 additional pole signs may be allowed. The setbacks and location of the signs would respect the location of the Project site within Griffith Park and would be complemented by landscaping and mature trees. Several of the signs would serve valuable informational and wayfinding purposes for visitors approaching the museum from the north and south along Western Heritage Way. None of the signs would introduce off-site advertising, and the total aggregate area of signage proposed would be substantially less than the amount that would be

permitted by the City's sign regulations. Lighting of the proposed signs would be minimal, with no significant introduction of new light sources. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

V. IMPACTS DETERMINED IN THE INITIAL STUDY NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The Lead Agency prepared an Initial Study for the proposed Project, which determined that the Project would not have the potential to cause significant impacts in the following areas: agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources,[6] geology and soils, hazards, mineral resources, population and housing, public services (police protection, schools and libraries), and public utilities.[7] The rationale for the conclusion that each of these issue areas does not have the potential to cause significant impacts is summarized below.

A. Agricultural Resources

As identified in the Initial Study, included in Appendix A of Volume II of the Draft EIR, no agricultural uses or related operations are present within the site or surrounding area. There is no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, nor lands under Williamson Act contract, within the area. The Project site is zoned for open space parkland and related recreational uses established by the City of Los Angeles. Specifically, the Project site is zoned OS-1XL. Pursuant to the City of Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code, agricultural uses are not permitted under this zoning designation. As such, the proposed Project would not involve the conversion of farmland to other uses, either directly or indirectly, and no impacts to agricultural land or uses would occur.

B. Biological Resources

Griffith Park is designated as a Significant Ecological Area (SEA) within the County of Los Angeles General Plan, as the County of Los Angeles considers Griffith Park and the Santa Monica Mountains an annual rest-stop for migratory birds. However, the areas of the Project site to be developed are already developed with buildings, surface parking and ornamental landscaping. In addition, the Project site is directly adjacent to the heavily traveled I-5 Freeway to the east, the Los Angeles Zoo to the west and surface parking areas to the south. In addition, the site is not designated in the revised draft of the Griffith Park Master Plan (the Draft Plan) as a Habitat Enhancement Area, Exotic Removal Area, Restoration Area, or an Endangered Species Protection Area.[8] Due to the developed nature of the site and surrounding area, the Project site is not known to contain any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The site does not function as a migratory wildlife corridor. In

---

6 Although, as indicated in the Initial Study, the Project would not have the potential to cause significant impacts in the area of cultural resources, in response to NOP comments, an analysis of cultural resources is provided in the EIR.

7 Potentially significant impacts related to drainage facilities (utilities) were studied as part of the Hydrology section.

8 City of Los Angeles, Department of Recreation and Parks, Griffith Park Master Plan Draft.

addition, no bodies of water exist on-site to provide habitat for fish. No riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities are known to exist on-site and no Habitat Conservation Plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans apply to the Project site. Furthermore, the area does not contain any Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Thus, the Project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Project impacts on candidate sensitive or special status species, riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities, including federally protected wetlands or wildlife corridors and native wildlife nursery sites, would be less than significant.

The May 8, 2007 Griffith Park fire began approximately 1.5 miles southwest of the Griffith Park Campus and burned approximately 817 acres. While wildlife was temporarily displaced as a result of the fire, the biologist with the Project's environmental consulting firm, PCR, is of the opinion that the long-term displacement of wildlife into primarily developed areas such as the Project site is not expected due to the lack of appropriate habitat, predation by domesticated animals, poor availability of food, and motor vehicle-related mortality. In addition, the burned area consisted primarily of native chaparral, which is accustomed to regular fire events and is typically quick to recover. As a result, while a recovery plan is scheduled, ecologically the burn area is already beginning to recover on its own, which would further encourage wildlife to remain in the undeveloped portions of Griffith Park, south of the Griffith Park Campus. Furthermore, as stated above, the Griffith Park Campus is directly adjacent to the heavily traveled I-5 freeway to the east, the Los Angeles Zoo to the west, and surface parking areas to the south, making it unsuitable as a long-term relocation area for displaced wildlife. The high human traffic, adjacent development, and ornamental landscaping in and around the Griffith Park Campus would discourage major use of the Project site by wildlife, aside from common small and medium mammals, birds, and reptiles. Therefore, Project impacts on biological resources would continue to be less than significant.

The Project site is located in the City of Los Angeles and is subject to the Los Angeles Protected Tree Ordinance (L.A. Municipal Code Section 46.00; Ordinance No. 153,478). No trees on the Project site are considered protected specimens because they were planted as part of Project planting or landscape program, although some tree species would otherwise be characterized as protected under the City's Tree Ordinance if they were not planted. Nonetheless, the Autry has volunteered to implement the mitigation measures specified in the Initial Study, which was included as Appendix A of the Draft EIR, as updated by the Errata to the Final EIR, which are based on the requirements for replacement of "protected" trees as set forth in the Tree Ordinance. As part of these mitigation measures, any tree of the quercus genus (excluding scrub oak), southern California black walnut trees, western sycamore trees, and California bay trees that will be removed will be replaced within the property by at least two trees of species that are protected by the Tree Ordinance. Each replacement tree will be a 15-gallon, or larger specimen in size, measuring one inch or more in diameter at a point one foot above the base, and not less than seven feet in height measured from the base. The size and number of replacement trees will approximate the value of the tree to be replaced. With implementation of the mitigation measures, impacts to protected trees would be reduced to a less than significant level.

C. Cultural Resources

Even though the Project would not result in significant impacts regarding Cultural Resources, in response to Notice of Preparation comments, an analysis of Cultural Resources is provided in the Draft EIR. A summary of that analysis is provided in Sections VI. and VII.

D. Geology

The Project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Fault Study Zone, and neither active nor potentially active faults cross the Project site.[9] The closest Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone to the site has been identified as the active Raymond Fault located approximately 4.5 miles to the southeast.[10] In addition, the closest mapped fault is the easterly trending Griffith Fault located just south of the site. The Griffith Fault is not defined as active or potentially active by State Geologists. In addition, no structures are planned within 50 feet of the southern site boundary. Therefore, the potential for surface rupture due to fault plane displacement propagating to the ground surface at the site is considered low.

The Project site is located within the seismically active region of southern California. Thus, as with other developments in the vicinity, the Project would be subject to strong seismic ground shaking during a seismic event. However, the Project would adhere to current engineering standards, the seismic safety requirements provided in the Uniform Building Code and the City of LAMC, and design recommendations set forth in the Geotechnical Report. Furthermore, the Project would comply with the *California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) Special Publications 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California (1997)*, which provides guidance for reducing seismic-related hazards. With adherence to the above seismic safety requirements and guidelines, the Project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects during a seismic event. Impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

The Project site is located within a State of California designated Liquefaction Hazard Zone and within a City of Los Angeles designated liquefiable area. However, according to the Geotechnical Report, the potential for liquefaction at the site is low. Furthermore, the site is geologically stable and would not be affected by landslides, slippage, settlement, lateral spreading, or collapse. As indicated above, the Project would comply with the CGS Special Publications 117, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California* (1997), State and local building and safety codes including the LABC and the LAMC, as well as those recommendations set forth in the Geotechnical Report including the use of shallow, spread-type footings established in undisturbed natural soils or properly compacted fill. Compliance with the applicable regulations as well as implementation of the recommendations of the

---

[9] California Department of Conservation, California Geologic Survey, Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazard Zones, Beverly Hills Quadrangle, Revised 1986. http://www.consrv.ca.gov/CGS/rghm/ap/Map_index/F4D.htm

[10] MACTEC (2007) Geotechnical Investigation Report Update Proposed Museum Building Additions Autry National Center. MACTEC Project 4953-07-1651.

Geotechnical Report would ensure that impacts associated with seismic-related ground failure would be less than significant.

Construction activities associated with the Project have the potential to result in minor soil erosion during grading and soil stockpiling, subsequent siltation, and conveyance of other pollutants into municipal storm drains. However, Project construction would comply with the requirements of the Municipal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction Permit and would implement City grading permit regulations, including City Building Code Chapter IX. The Project would implement an erosion control plan and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) subject to approval by the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety. Furthermore, as part of these requirements, Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be implemented during construction to reduce soil erosion to the maximum extent possible.

During operation of the Project, the potential for soil erosion to occur within the areas of the Project site to be developed is very limited due to the generally level topography and the presence of on- and off-site drainage facilities. Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) provisions would be implemented throughout the operational life of the Project that would assist in reducing on-site erosion. In addition, mitigation measures included in the Initial Study, attached as Appendix A of Volume II of the Draft EIR, and in Section VI, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, of the Final EIR would ensure that potential Project impacts related to soil erosion would be less than significant.

The Project site would be served by existing sewer infrastructure and no septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would be required. As such, no impacts associated with the ability of the soils to adequately support such systems would occur.

E. Hazards/ Hazardous Materials

As indicated in the Initial Study, attached as Appendix A of Volume II of the Draft EIR, the type and amount of hazardous materials to be used for the Project would be typical of those used in museums and similar to hazardous materials currently used within the Campus. Specifically, operation of the Project would involve the use and storage of small quantities of potentially hazardous materials in the form of cleaning solvents, painting supplies, pesticides for landscaping, photo-developing and printing chemicals, conservation treatment solvents and petroleum products. In addition, construction of the Project would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. Different aspects of hazardous materials management, including utilization, storage and disposal, are regulated by legislation administered by Federal and State agencies including the Federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) through the County of Los Angeles Health Department, the Los Angeles County Fire Department, and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). With continued compliance with these regulations, any associated risk would be adequately reduced to a less than significant level. As such, construction and operation of the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

The proposed Project would not result in a known danger related to the release of hazardous materials into the environment. In addition, the Project site is not located within an area designated as a methane zone by the City of Los Angeles. Furthermore, implementation of the Project would not result in the exposure to asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) or lead-based paint, since the Campus Building was constructed in 1988, after ACMs and lead-based paint were no longer permitted for use in building construction. Therefore, impacts associated with the release of hazardous materials into the environment would be less than significant.

Although the Project site is located in an area that has been developed with buildings, paving and landscaping, the Project site is located within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone as defined in the LAMC. Much of the hillside areas that are within Griffith Park and the Santa Monica Mountains are also within this zone. Due to the Project's location in the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, the site is subject to certain requirements such as brush clearing regulations, greenbelt requirements, and the use of fire resistant plants and materials to reduce the risk of wildland fires. Furthermore, the Municipal Code outlines safety standards to further reduce any potential impacts associated with wildland fires. Standard fire protection devices, including existing and proposed fire hydrants and sprinklers, would be incorporated as part of the Project, and appropriate emergency evacuation procedures would be continued to ensure the safety of Campus staff and visitors. Therefore, the Project would not subject people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of exposure to wildland fires.

F. Mineral Resources

The Project site is not located within a City-designated Mineral Resource Zone where significant mineral deposits are known to be present, nor is the site classified by the California Geological Survey as a mineral producing area.[11,12] No mineral extraction activities occur on the site or in the vicinity. Thus, the proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource zone or a mineral resource recovery site.

G. Population/ Housing

The Project does not propose the development of new residential units. Thus, the Project would not directly generate an increase in the residential population to the area. With implementation of the Project, up to approximately 50 new full-time equivalent (FTE) employees may be generated. This modest increase in employment would be well within the employment forecast set forth by SCAG. In addition, any potential induced residential growth resulting from the new employment opportunities would be inconsequential. Furthermore, no new roadways or other major infrastructure that would serve an area beyond the Project site would be constructed as part of the Project. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly.

---

[11] City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, Los Angeles Citywide General Plan Framework, Draft Environmental Impact Report, January 19, 1995.

[12] State of California Department of Conservation, California Geologic Survey, Map of California Principal Mineral-Producing Localities 1990-2000.

H. Public Services (Police Protection, Schools and Recreation)

Police protection service is provided to the site by the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD). The site is located within the LAPD's Central Bureau service area. The closest police station is the Northeast Community Police Station, located at 3353 San Fernando Road, approximately 4.5 miles to the southeast. However, the proposed Project provides its own security and would increase security as needed to account for any increase in the number of visitors. Therefore, any Project increase in daytime population resulting in greater demand for security services would be met through the Project's private security force. As such, impacts to police protection services would be less than significant.

Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) provides public school services in the Project area. Since the Project does not involve the construction of new dwelling units, a direct impact on the demand for additional classroom space within LAUSD or any other school district would not occur. The Project would not result in a new residential population, nor would the Project generate new students to the Project area. Any potential indirect impact on public school facilities resulting from new Campus employees relocating to the area and generating a need for additional public school facilities would be inconsequential. As such, the Project would not result in a need for new or altered public school facilities and no significant impacts would occur.

The City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks is responsible for the maintenance and operation of Griffith Park and other public recreational facilities in the City of Los Angeles. Implementation of the Project would result in an increase in the number of Campus visitors annually. As the Project site is located in Griffith Park, a small proportion of the visitors may utilize the existing park facilities prior to or after their visit to the Griffith Park Campus. However, it is not anticipated that these visitors would have a substantial impact on park facilities since use of these facilities would be secondary to the Campus. Furthermore, the expanded and renovated Campus would provide additional community amenities within Griffith Park. The Project does not include the construction of new residences, which typically generate a direct demand for parks. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact on parks.

I. Utilities

1. Wastewater

Wastewater Services are provided by the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works (LADPW) via an existing 6-inch sewer line. Construction of the proposed Project would include all necessary sewer line improvements and connections in order to adequately connect to the existing sewer systems. The Project would be required to demonstrate that adequate pumping capacity exists at the Zoo pumping station, or support enhancement of pumping capacity. Should any enhancements be required, they would consist of minor modifications to the existing infrastructure system. Site-generated wastewater is treated at Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP), which is designed to treat 450 million gallons per day (mgd), with annual increases in wastewater flows limited to 5 mgd by City Ordinance No. 166,060. The HTP currently processes an average of 340 mgd, with excess capacity of approximately 110 mgd. As discussed

in Section IV.D., Hydrology, of the Draft EIR, the Project is estimated to generate 14,601 gallon per day (gpd) of wastewater, a net increase of approximately 8,031 gpd of wastewater, representing approximately .01 percent of HTP's total remaining capacity. Implementation of water conservation measures such as those required by Titles 20 and 24 of the California Administrative Code would ultimately reduce wastewater flows below these anticipated levels. As such, impact to wastewater services would be less than significant.

2. Water

Water service is provided to the Project site by the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (DWP). The DWP is currently in the process of upgrading the water supply to the area and have recently placed a new pipe in Western Heritage Way with an 8-inch connection to the proposed Project site. DWP also proposes to add additional reservoirs/water pumps that would enhance the water supply system serving the Project site. The proposed Project would be required to demonstrate sufficient water flow at the Project site to meet fire fighting needs. Such water flow would also be sufficient to meet the lesser flow requirements for the other museum uses. If at the time the Project is implemented there is insufficient water flow to meet the Project's needs, the Project would be required to modify the local system to meet the flow requirements. Such infrastructure enhancements, if they are needed, would be consistent with other proposed improvements in the area, such as an upgrade to existing pumps and pipe fittings. The new Project components are estimated to generate a peak water demand of approximately 18,251 gpd. Projected water demand would be reduced by compliance with water conservation measures such as those required by Titles 20 and 24 of the California Administrative Code. The Project's increase in water consumption is negligible. As such, impact to water services would be less than significant.

3. Solid Waste

The Project would generate solid waste during construction due to the demolition of existing materials. Materials that could be recycled or salvaged include asphalt, glass, concrete, steel, and doors. Demolition debris not recycled or reused could be accepted at one of several unclassified landfills within Los Angeles County. Inert landfills serving the site would have sufficient capacity to accommodate Project construction solid waste disposal needs. Project-generated solid waste would be disposed of at one of the 12 major Class III landfills, which accept all types of non-hazardous solid waste within Los Angeles County. Aggressive waste reduction and diversion programs are implemented on a countywide level per the provisions of the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939). The Campus is expected to generate approximately 1,548 tons of solid waste per year after buildout, or an increase of approximately 734 tons per year, which is an extremely small fraction of the regional solid waste generated and an amount that would not exceed the available landfill capacity. Notwithstanding, the Initial Study, attached as Appendix A of Volume II of the Draft EIR, and Section VI, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, of the Final EIR, have included a mitigation measure that requires the provision of recycling bins at appropriate locations to promote recycling of paper, metal, glass, and other recyclable materials.

4. Electricity and Natural Gas

Electricity power to the Project site is provided and maintained by LADWP. As discussed in detail in the Initial Study, attached as Appendix A of Volume II of the Draft EIR, based on the proposed Campus Building expansion, the Project would consume approximately 14,000 megawatt hours (MWh) of electricity per year, a net increase of approximately 4,000 MWh. The existing electrical service to the Campus Building would be adequate to supply the increase demand of the building's expansion due to the installation of energy efficient equipment and lighting. By 2012, LADWP projects an annual demand of 27,487,000 MWh of electricity per year in its service area.[13] The Project's demand is a small increment of the expected excess capacity of LADWP, and is therefore within the anticipated service capabilities of LADWP. Natural gas is provided to the Project site by the Southern California Gas Company (SCGC). The Project currently consumes 1.4 million cubic feet/year of natural gas. The Campus Building expansion is anticipated to consume approximately 1.55 million cubic feet/year of natural gas for the entire facility. Relative to a projected annual demand of 902 billion cubic feet within the entire SCGC service area in 2010, the annual consumption of natural gas associated with the proposed Project would be negligible and would be within the service capabilities of SCGC.

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOUND IN THE EIR NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The Department of Recreation and Parks prepared an Initial Study for the Project, in which it required analysis of the following environmental impact areas in the Draft EIR: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Hydrology/Surface Water Quality, Land Use, Noise, Fire Protection, and Traffic, Parking and Access. In addition, even though the Project would not result in significant impacts regarding Cultural Resources, in response to Notice of Preparation comments, an analysis of Cultural Resources is provided in the Draft EIR. The following impacts areas were determined to be not significant.

A. Aesthetics

1. Visual Character/Aesthetics

The proposed Project overall would not result in the displacement or loss of existing amounts of open space. The proposed construction is designed to make use of previously developed areas of the site, thus integrating new structures with existing development and minimizing effects on the natural vegetation and existing open space areas. Specifically, the conversion of the existing parking lot in the western portion of the site to landscaped areas would visually improve off-site views from Western Heritage Way while maintaining the openness of this area. Further, the new Institute Building that would be developed in Phase 2 would be located on the back half of the site, beyond the South Lawn, and, therefore, would not break up the continuity of the open area fronting Western Heritage Way.

---

[13] California Energy Commission, Staff Proposed California Energy Demand 2002-2012 Forecast Attachment A for October 12, 2001 Committee Workshop.

The Project would not contrast with the area's valued aesthetic image. The proposed development would be similar in terms of land use and site layout to the existing site, and the new building architecture would represent updated designs. The expanded Campus Building would have generally similar perceived heights (*i.e.*, relative to finished grade) as the existing development. The design of the Project promotes the reuse of existing developed areas and the integration of new construction with existing topography, vegetation, and structures. The proposed building design would build upon the architectural elements of the original building, and landscaping and other green and natural features would be introduced. The end result would be a visually unified Project that harmonizes structures and landscaping. In addition, Project elements such as mechanical equipment and trash receptacles would be screened from view. Furthermore, none of the proposed improvements would substantially alter or introduce contrasting features within views from the Interstate-5 (I-5) Freeway or Western Heritage Way.

The Project is located in an active area of Griffith Park with nearby freeway infrastructure. Nearby uses include the Los Angeles Zoo; a surface parking area that contains the Griffith Park Observatory shuttle reservations center building, the temporary shuttle station for the Griffith Park Observatory, the Los Angeles Unified School District's (LAUSD's) Zoo Magnet Center, and the DWP Fuel Cell Demonstration Project; and the Woodrow Wilson and Harding Municipal Golf Courses. There are no buildings adjacent to the Project site. As such, there is no potential to have a conflicting contrast with buildings of differing massing or architectural characteristics.

With regard to construction activities, the short-term changes in existing on-site structures and exterior areas would result in a noticeable change in the site's appearance. However, these construction activities would be of short duration and would generally be screened from view by mesh-covered fencing.

Similar to existing conditions, the Project would include a number of wall, monument, informational, and pole signs. The proposed signage would complement the architecture of the new buildings and would respect the location of the Project site within Griffith Park. Several of the signs would serve valuable informational and wayfinding purposes for visitors approaching the Campus from the north and south along Western Heritage Way. The setbacks and location of the signs would be appropriate for the park setting, and would be complemented by landscaping and mature trees. None of the signs would introduce off-site advertising, and the total aggregate area of signage proposed is substantially less than the amount that would be permitted by the sign regulations. Lighting of the proposed signs would be minimal, with no significant introduction of new light sources. Thus, proposed signage would not result in any significant aesthetics impacts. Refer to Section II. Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR, for a discussion of the variance necessary for the proposed monument sign and the request for relief from the LAMC signage requirements in the event that if only Western Heritage Way is treated as street frontage under the Municipal Code, 6 additional pole signs may be allowed.

Based on the above, the Project would not alter, degrade or eliminate the existing visual character of the area, including existing visually prominent features, or valued resources through the conversion of large areas of natural open space; it would not substantially contrast with the visual character of the surrounding areas and its aesthetic image; and it would not preclude the

attainment of the general aesthetic intent of regulations or applicable plans. Therefore, Project impacts with regard to aesthetic character would be less than significant.

The Project would also be consistent with and supportive of the aesthetic guidelines of plans and regulations that are applicable to the Project site. This includes the Hollywood Community Plan and the 1978 Griffith Park Master Plan.

The parking reduction variance would provide additional landscaped open space (approximately one-half acre) in the place of paved surface parking, which would improve off-site views of the Project site from Western Heritage Way and further enhance the natural setting and openness of the area. The parking reduction variance would also allow the preservation of several prominent trees at the southwest corner of the site which would otherwise be removed to provide for the surface parking lot. Furthermore, the amount of nighttime exterior lighting would be reduced as there would be less surface parking area to illuminate. Thus the impact of the parking reduction variance on aesthetics would remain less than significant.

2. Views

As one approaches the Project site from the north along Zoo Drive, the street ultimately becomes Western Heritage Way. Views to the south and southwest along Western Heritage Way offer expansive views of the Santa Monica Mountains. The Campus Building sits to the side of Western Heritage Way and has no effect on the long range view of the hillside. Upon completion of the proposed Project, the Campus Building would be set back approximately 101 feet from Western Heritage Way.

As one approaches the Project site from the south along Crystal Springs Drive, the street turns into Western Heritage Way. Views from the south along Crystal Springs Drive are of the Verdugo Mountains to the north. In addition, broad views of the Verdugo Mountain are prominent from several other locations in the Project vicinity. When viewed from the south, the Campus Building nestles into the foot of the mountain visually, and the expanded Campus Building's effect on the view would be essentially the same. The new Institute Building to be constructed in Phase 2 would be located south and outside of the existing view corridor. As travelers head further north on Western Heritage Way the Campus Building is set back off the road and has no substantial effects on long range views.

Generally, travelers along Western Heritage Way have a view that includes expanses of the park's open space, with intermittent views of facilities such as the Campus Building, the Zoo and its parking lot and landscape with the mountains acting as backdrops. These general view conditions would not be altered by the Project's implementation. Further, the Project would not change view conditions from those of the Campus Building, nor substantially obstruct or interfere with existing view resources. Therefore, Project impacts on views along Western Heritage Way would be less than significant.

The Campus Building is visible to travelers on the northbound I-5 and the westbound State Route-134 (SR-134) Freeways. For travelers on the I-5, the Project site is situated off of Western Heritage Way amidst mature landscaping, and does not obstruct the long range views of travelers along the freeway. Therefore, the additional building volume would not substantially

alter view conditions from this location. Travelers on the SR-134 Freeway have clear views of the Campus Building as they head west. The expansion of the Campus Building in Phase 1 would slightly increase the building volume and bring its eastern edge slightly closer to the freeway. This would not cause a notable change in the site appearance. The Institute Building that is proposed to be constructed in Phase 2 would cause the most notable change in building volume within the site. However, this building would be screened from the freeways by the intervening Zoo wastewater treatment facility and mature trees and vegetation. Thus, the Project would not substantially block or obstruct valued view resources from SR-134. Travelers on SR-134 would see a slightly larger building set into the landscape, and an overall panoramic view that would be largely unchanged; therefore, impacts from this location would be less than significant.

Views of the Project site are also available from nearby uses in the Project vicinity such as the Zoo parking lot and the Woodrow Wilson and Harding Municipal Golf Courses. However, due to its location, the Project site does not adversely affect views of the Verdugo or Santa Monica Mountains to the north or south of the Zoo parking area. In addition, the SR-134 Freeway, the existing Campus Building within the Project site, and the mature trees within the golf courses and Project site obstruct views of the Verdugo Mountains to the north from certain vantage points on the golf courses. As proposed building areas would be integrated with existing on-site buildings, the Project would not substantially alter the intermittent views of the Verdugo Mountains from the golf courses. Views of the site are generally less obstructed from higher elevations such as the Verdugo and Santa Monica Mountains. However, given their distance from the site, any such views would be of a large viewshed and, consequently, the Project site would be a small element of the view that would blend in with its surroundings. In addition, the Project would not substantially obstruct or alter existing views of the surrounding Griffith Park area since the Project site is already developed and new building additions and structures would be consistent with the architectural style and scale of the Campus Building. Overall, the Project would not substantially obstruct or alter existing views.

3. Light and Glare

Implementation of the proposed Project would not substantially increase ambient light levels on the Project site and in the immediately surrounding vicinity. Similar to existing conditions, Project-related lighting would consist of point light sources. Nighttime exterior lighting would consist primarily of public safety and security lighting fixtures along pedestrian walkways and in the parking areas as well as accent lighting of the building exterior. Such fixtures would continue to be directed inwards and downward with shielding as appropriate, in order to minimize light spillover. Lighting of the proposed signs would be minimal, with no significant introduction of new light sources. Existing and proposed landscaping on-site would also serve to limit the visibility of Campus lighting from off-site. Thus, the Project would not introduce significant new sources of light that would substantially affect nighttime views or substantially illuminate or alter the character of adjacent, off-site, light-sensitive uses; therefore, lighting impacts would be less than significant.

Glare effects also would not be expected to increase under the Project. With removal of parking lots from along Western Heritage Way and introduction of enclosed parking in Phase 2, glare reflected from parked vehicles on-site would be reduced. As metal roofing and highly

reflective glass materials would not be introduced on-site, sunlight reflected from Project building windows would not be expected to generate substantial glare during most of the year, similar to existing conditions. Since the proposed Project would not include highly reflective surfaces, lighting would not substantially interfere with off-site activities, and glare impacts would be less than significant.

4. Shade and Shadow

The Campus Building is comprised of a main floor level, a lower level and an upper floor level and appears as two-stories from most vantage points. Other than the golf courses to the south and the Zoo Magnet Center to the southwest, there are no shadow-sensitive uses in the immediate Project vicinity. The golf courses are separated from the Campus Building by the South Lawn and a service road. The LAUSD Zoo Magnet Center is located approximately 950 feet southwest of the Project site. During the hours of concern specified by the City's significance threshold criteria (three hours between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M. Pacific Standard Time between late October and early April or more than four hours between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time between early April and late October), site shadows would generally be cast within the Project site itself. In addition, new shadows would generally extend from the northwest and then move towards the northeast throughout the day. Thus, the shadow-sensitive uses to the south of the Project site would not be significantly impacted by the proposed Project. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures would be required.

5. Analysis of Parking Reduction Variance

The parking reduction variance would provide additional landscaped open space (approximately one-half acre) in the place of paved surface parking, which would improve off-site views of the project site from Western Heritage Way and further enhance the natural setting and openness of the area. The parking reduction variance would also allow the preservation of several prominent trees at the southwest corner of the site which would otherwise be removed to provide for the surface parking lot. Furthermore, under this option the amount of nighttime exterior lighting would be reduced as there would be less surface parking area to illuminate. Thus the parking reduction variance's impact on aesthetics would remain less than significant.

6. Cumulative Impacts

The closest related projects within the site vicinity include the Los Angeles Zoo Parking Lot's Demonstration on Environmental Sustainability Project, DWP's Lower Reach River Supply Conduit Project and the IRP Facilities Plan. The Los Angeles Zoo Sustainability Project will include BMPs for surface parking lot water run-off, planting of drought tolerant landscaping, and free standing photovoltaic panels. These improvements would not be expected to detract from the visual character of the area or result in significant impacts to views. In addition, the Lower Reach River Supply Conduit Project and the IRP Facilities Plan are utility improvement projects that include utility lines below Western Heritage Way and beyond. Upon completion of construction, these utility improvement projects would also not substantially detract from the visual character of the environment or impact views. All of the remaining

related projects are located at some distance beyond the freeways to the north and east of the Project site. Therefore, no cumulative aesthetic impacts from these projects would occur.

The Project includes numerous design features that would reduce potential adverse impacts and that would enhance the aesthetic quality of the Project site. With implementation of the Project design features and compliance with regulations, impacts of the Project would be less than significant with regard to aesthetic character, views, light and glare, and shading. Mitigation measures would not be required.

B. Air Quality

1. Localized Construction Impacts

As detailed in Section IV.B., Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, and pp. I-3-4 of the Errata to the Final EIR, with regard to local construction impacts, maximum localized construction emissions for off-site sensitive receptors would not exceed the localized screening thresholds for NOx, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$ and CO. Therefore, with respect to localized emissions from construction activities, impacts would be less than significant.

In addition, the proposed Project would not result in a long-term (*i.e.*, 70 years) substantial source of Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) emissions. There would be no residual emissions after construction and corresponding individual cancer risk. As such, Project-related toxic emission impacts during construction would be less than significant.

Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include the use of architectural coatings and solvents. South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1113 limits the amount of volatile organic compounds from architectural coatings and solvents. Via mandatory compliance with SCAQMD Rules, no construction activities or materials are proposed which would create objectionable odors. Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

2. Operational Impacts

Regional air pollutant emissions associated with proposed Project operations would be generated by the consumption of electricity and natural gas, and by the operation of on-road vehicles. Since it is not possible to isolate where electricity is produced, these emissions are conservatively considered to occur within the Basin and are regional in nature. Criteria pollutant emissions associated with the production and consumption of energy were calculated using emission factors from the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook (Appendix to Chapter 9).

Mobile-source emissions were calculated using the URBEMIS 2007 emissions inventory model. Based on the URBEMIS 2007 model output and worksheets for calculating regional operational daily emissions, the increase in regional emissions resulting from operation of the Project are expected to be below the SCAQMD thresholds for all criteria pollutants.

With regard to local CO impacts, Project-generated traffic volumes are forecast to have a negligible effect on the projected 1-hour and 8-hour CO concentrations at the intersections studied. Since a significant impact would not occur at the intersections operating at the highest

V/C ratio, no significant impacts would occur at any other analyzed roadway intersection as a result of Project-generated traffic volumes.

The primary source of potential air toxics associated with proposed Project operations include diesel PM_{10} from delivery trucks (*e.g.*, truck traffic on local streets and on-site truck idling) and emergency backup generators. The proposed Project operations would not substantially change the locations or intensity in use of loading docks on the Project site. As such, the proposed Project would not be considered a substantial source of diesel PM_{10} and a significant regional air quality impact would not occur.

The proposed Project would not include any sources of acutely and chronically hazardous toxic air contaminant sources, although minimal emissions may result from the use of consumer products for maintenance purposes. As such, the proposed Project would not release substantial amounts of toxic contaminants, and no significant impacts on human health would occur. Based on the limited activity of the toxic air contaminant sources, the proposed Project does not warrant the need for a health risk assessment, and potential air toxic impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed Project would likely include the installation and operation of diesel-fired generators for emergency power generation. Unless a blackout occurs, these generators would be operated for only a few hours per month for routine testing and maintenance purposes. Compliance with SCAQMD Rules and Regulations regarding stationary-source combustion equipment would ensure that contributions to localized PM_{10} concentrations remain below the 2.5 $\mu g/m^3$ significance threshold. As such, any potential impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed Project does not include any uses identified by the SCAQMD as being associated with odors. Thus, potential odor impacts would be less than significant.

Project development would not have a long-term impact on the region's ability to meet State and Federal air quality standards. The Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 and would implement all feasible mitigation measures for control of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. Also, the Project would be consistent with the goals and policies of the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for control of fugitive dust. As discussed above, the Project's long-term influence would also be consistent with the goals and policies of the AQMP and is, therefore, considered consistent with the SCAQMD's AQMP.

Further, as discussed in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, it is concluded that the proposed Project would be consistent with City of Los Angeles air quality policies as it implements the air quality goals and policies set forth in the City's General Plan.

Overall, no significant impacts would occur as a result of Project development with respect to compatibility with applicable air quality policies as set forth in the City's General Plan Air Quality Element.

Emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) were calculated for the existing and projected future uses with implementation of the proposed Project. Results are presented in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. Also included therein is the California Energy Commission's estimated 2004 State-wide inventory, the latest year for which data are available. As shown, the

net increase in GHG emissions from vehicle, electrical, and natural gas usage associated with the proposed Project is approximately 0.0009 percent (3,269 million metric tons CO_2) of the 2004 emission inventory of 391 million metric tons CO_2.

There are many uncertainties involved in the quantification of GHGs from any individual project. Newer construction materials and practices, current energy efficiency requirements, and newer appliances tend to emit lower levels of air pollutant emissions, including GHGs, as compared to those built years ago, but the net effect is difficult to quantify. Thus, the estimated net increase in emissions resulting from implementation of the proposed Project may be an over- or under-estimation. These same uncertainties and assumptions exist throughout the accepted analytical methodologies for performing criteria air pollutant assessments. This GHG analysis was performed in accordance with existing non-GHG specific SCAQMD and CARB guidance.

As discussed above, the calculation of GHG emissions does not take into account implementation of planned lower GHG emission standards from passenger vehicles and power plants within the State of California, as these rules are yet to be finalized and promulgated. There are several planned City actions, as presented in the LA Green Plan, that when implemented, may further decrease emissions of GHGs from the proposed Project. In addition, the Project is designed with a number of features which is consistent with the following City of Los Angeles goal:

- Increasing the use of energy efficient appliances and equipment;
- Reducing water consumption;
- Promoting ridesharing, walking and biking to large events and venues;
- Planting trees

The proposed Project would also promote the City'g goal of collaborating with the private sector to foster public-private partnerships to reduce CO_2 emission beyond the City's jurisdiction as part of the "Green LA" plan.

In addition, the calculations do not take into account the effect of the specified Project features. The effectiveness in reducing GHG emissions of each of the Project features varies. For example, Energy Star CFLs can reduce lighting energy demands by 75 percent, and Energy Star appliances use up to 50 percent less energy than their non Energy Star counterparts. Trees are able to sequester more carbon dioxide as they age and the average tree can sequester 330 pounds of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere every year. Reducing water consumption results in a reduction of GHG emissions from energy generation to operate water pumps and wastewater treatment facilities, which have been identified as major sources of GHGs statewide. Overall, these Project features would reduce both energy demand and VMT associated with the proposed Project, resulting in a reduction of GHG emissions from those presented in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR.

Emitting GHGs into the atmosphere is not itself an adverse environmental effect. Rather, it is the increased accumulation of GHGs in the atmosphere that may result in global climate

change. The resultant consequences of that climate change can cause adverse environmental effects. While it is not possible at this time to quantify the exact reductions in greenhouse gas emissions anticipated from the above-listed features, the proposed Project would be consistent with the goals of California's AB 32. The Project would be designed and built to incorporate LEED aspects such as maximizing operational efficiency through the reduction of energy consumption and reducing vehicle miles traveled. For example, the Project would promote alternative transportation and implement other improvements to promote alternative transportation methods. Energy performance would be optimized through the use of CFL bulbs, energy efficient equipment, Energy Star appliances and use of Low-E windows. In addition, the Project would also include features such as low-flow toilets and fixtures and drought tolerant landscaping. Thus, the Project would result in lower GHG emission rates compared to current standards and practices. In the absence of numeric thresholds and given the consistency of the proposed Project features with the State and City's goals, the contribution from the Project to global climate change is considered less than significant. As such, no mitigation is required.

3. Cumulative Impacts

The SCAQMD's approach for assessing cumulative impacts is based on its Air Quality Management Plan forecasts of attainment of ambient air quality standards in accordance with the requirements of the Federal and State Clean Air Acts, taking into account the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) forecasted future regional growth and determining whether the Project is consistent with the forecasted future regional growth. Therefore, if all cumulative projects are individually consistent with the growth assumptions upon which the SCAQMD's AQMP is based, then future development would not impede the attainment of ambient air quality standards and a significant cumulative air quality impact would not occur. Cumulative air quality impacts for the Project were evaluated in the context of Los Angeles County as a whole for the projected operational buildout year of 2014, consistent with the SCAQMD's methodology.

Based on the SCAQMD's methodology (presented in Chapter 9 of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook), a project would have a significant cumulative air quality impact if the ratio of daily project-related employee or population vehicle miles traveled (VMT) to daily countywide VMT exceeds the ratio of daily project-related employee or population growth to daily countywide employees. This Project does not contain any residential elements, and therefore a population-related VMT increment was not calculated. However, the Project does result in an increase in employees. As discussed in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, the Project's VMT ratio does not exceed the employee ratio. Based on these criteria, development of the proposed Project would have a less than significant air quality impact. In addition, as previously shown in localized CO impact analyses conducted for cumulative traffic (*i.e.*, related projects and ambient growth for both 2010 and 2014) no local CO violations would occur at any of the studied intersections. As stated on pp. I-3-4 of the Errata to the Final EIR, analysis of operational buildout years of 2012 and 2016 did not affect these impact conclusions.

Similar to the proposed Project, the greatest potential for TAC emissions at each related project would involve diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during grading and excavation activities. Given that the proposed Project's contribution to cancer risk from construction activities would be less than significant and is a localized impact,

related projects that have not already been built would not result in a long-term (*i.e.*, 70 years) substantial source of TAC emissions with no residual emissions after construction and corresponding individual cancer risk. Thus, TAC emissions from the related projects are anticipated to be less than significant individually and cumulatively.

Also similar to the proposed Project, potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities at each related project would include the use of architectural coatings and solvents. However, via mandatory compliance with SCAQMD Rules, it is anticipated that construction activities or materials used in the construction of the related projects would not create objectionable odors. Thus, odor impacts from the related projects are anticipated to be less than significant individually, as well as cumulatively.

With regard to cumulative GHG emissions, as stated above, an increase in the generation and emission of GHGs is not itself an adverse environmental effect. Rather, it is the increased accumulation of GHGs in the atmosphere that may result in global climate change that causes adverse environmental effects. The State has mandated a goal of reducing state-wide emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, even though State-wide population and commerce is predicted to continue to expand. In order to achieve this goal, CARB is in the process of establishing and implementing regulations to reduce Statewide GHG emissions. However, currently there are no significance thresholds, no specific reduction targets, and no approved policy or guidance to assist in determining significance at the Project or cumulative impact level. Additionally, there is currently no generally accepted methodology to determine whether GHG emissions associated with a specific project represents new emissions or existing, displaced emissions.

The baseline for AB 32 is considered to be "business as usual." For the purposes of the proposed Project and the related projects, "business as usual" would be development according to the energy efficiency standards established in Title 24, California's energy efficiency standards for residential and non-residential buildings. However, the proposed Project would be constructed to exceed the reduction goals of Title 24 by implementing energy efficient equipment and Energy Star appliances, drought-tolerant landscaping, and water conservation measures. In addition, the proposed Project intends to achieve certification within the LEED Green Building Rating System. The LEED program integrates the principals of smart growth and green building design. As described above, specific to reducing carbon emissions, the proposed Project would: promote alternative transportation, provide shower facilities for employees biking to work; install water-conserving plumbing and fixtures; and install energy efficient lighting, appliances, and onsite equipment. Overall, these features would reduce both energy demand and VMT associated with the proposed Project, resulting in a reduction of GHG emissions.

The following planned City actions, as presented in the *LA Green Plan*, when implemented, will further decrease emissions of GHGs from the proposed Project:

- Decreasing emissions from Department of Water and Power electrical generation and import activities;

- Providing compact fluorescent light bulbs (CFL) to encourage acceptance and use of CFLs;

- Expanding the regional rail network to reduce VMT; and

- Increasing the use of alternative fuels in the City and MTA transportation fleets.

In June 2005, Governor Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-3-05, which established GHG emissions targets for the state, as well as a process to ensure the targets are met. As a result of this executive order, the California Climate Action Team (CAT), led by the Secretary of the California EPA, was formed. The CAT published its report in March 2006, in which it laid out several recommendations and strategies for reducing GHG emissions and reaching the targets established in the executive order.[14] Table 13 in the Final EIR illustrates the Project's consistency with those recommendations and strategies presented in the CAT report. The features listed in Table 13 apply directly to CAT strategies for reducing GHG emissions.

The proposed Project, by implementing the Project features and GHG reducing measures described above, results in a GHG emission profile which is better (lower) than business as usual. In addition, the City of Los Angeles is also taking direct action to reduce emissions from all utility users and improve transportation citywide. The Project's features and GHG reduction measures, coupled with the City's initiatives, make the Project consistent with the goals of AB32. Thus, the Project does not result in a cumulatively significant impact. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

C. Cultural Resources

1. Historical Resources

a. Griffith Park Campus

A historic records search was conducted through the California Historical Resources Information System South Central Coastal Information Center (CHRIS-SCCIC) housed at California State University, Fullerton indicates that there are no recorded historic resources within the Project site. In addition, while there are historic resources within the 4,107-acre Griffith Park (e.g., the Greek Theater, the Griffith Park Observatory, etc.), there are no historic resources within the immediate vicinity of the Project site.

On January 27, 2009, the Los Angeles City Council adopted the findings of the Los Angeles Cultural Heritage Commission to designate Griffith Park as an Historic-Cultural Monument. The Autry's Griffith Park Campus is located within the Griffith Park Historic-Cultural Monument boundary (the Boundary). There is no evidence that the Project has the potential to adversely impact the historic significance of Griffith Park within the meaning of CEQA.

[14] California Climate Action Team. Climate Action Team Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the Legislature, 2006.

In accordance with Section 21084.1 of the California Public Resources Code, Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines, and the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide (2006), a project has a significant impact on a historical resource if it would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 provides that "[s]ubstantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired."[15] Material impairment occurs when a project alters or demolishes in an adverse manner "those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion" in a state or local historic registry.[16] In effect, the CEQA standard provides that a significant impact to a historical resource occurs when a property would be rendered ineligible. There is no evidence or allegation, and there is nothing to demonstrate, that the proposed Project would in any way "materially impact" Griffith Park such that it would threaten Griffith Park's status as a historic resource.

That the proposed Project would not have a significant impact on Griffith Park's designation as an Historic-Cultural Monument is supported by the fact that the Autry National Center did not contribute to the designation of Griffith Park as an Historic-Cultural Monument. While located within the Boundary, the City concluded in the dedication of Griffith Park as an Historic-Cultural Monument that the Autry National Center is a non-contributing element of Griffith Park. The Office of Historic Resource's Staff Report for the Cultural Heritage Commission hearing on October 30, 2008, concluded that the portion of Griffith Park occupied by the Los Angeles Zoo, the Autry National Center, and associated uses such as the parking areas, does not include character-defining features or contributing elements to Griffith Park's historic significance. The Cultural Heritage Commission Recommendation Report approved by the City Council in the designation stated that the Autry National Center is not a character defining feature / contributing element of Griffith Park, noting that the Autry National Center is outside the Monument's period of significance. The City Council's Planning & Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee Report, adopted by the City Council, also identified the Autry National Center, along with four other areas of Griffith Park, as non-contributing elements that do not contribute to the historical significance of Griffith Park.

The City's conclusion that the Autry National Center is a non-contributing element was based in part on The Griffith J. Griffith Charitable Trust's application to declare Griffith Park an Historic-Cultural Monument (the Application), which identifies the Autry National Center as a "Non-Contributing or Altered Component" of the Park's historic-cultural significance, and includes the Autry's Griffith Park Campus within the "Non-Contributing or Altered Component" portion of the Boundary map. The Autry National Center and the Los Angeles Zoo were also described as non-contributing features in the State Department of Parks and Recreation survey of Griffith Park following the Northridge Earthquake in 1994. As explained in the Application, there are two primary reasons why Griffith Park is historically significant. One reason is that Colonel Griffith J. Griffith donated the property to the City of Los Angeles for use as Griffith Park. The other reason is that Griffith Park is a "mostly untouched" interurban wilderness park.

[15] California Code of Regulations, tit. 14, Section 15064.5(b)(1).

[16] California Code of Regulations, tit. 14, Section 15064.5(b)(2)(A)-(C).

However, the Autry's Griffith Park Campus, located in the 351-acre Griffith Reservation portion of Griffith Park, was not part of Colonel Griffith's 1898 donation to the City of Los Angeles of the original 3,015 acres of Griffith Park. Rather, it was sold to the City by Colonel Griffith's son in 1921.[17] The Autry's Griffith Park Campus, located within the developed are of the Griffith Reservation, has never been an interurban wilderness park. During the period of significance (1896 – 1958), the Griffith Reservation was used as an airfield, for housing, and as part of the Golden State Freeway. Specifically, between 1912 and 1916, before the sale to the City of Los Angeles, the Griffith Reservation included the Griffith Aviation Park (which is today in the general vicinity of the Los Angeles Zoo). The airfield was reopened from 1925 to 1941 as the home to the California National Guard: 115th Observation Squadron, 40th Division Air Service. From 1945 to the early 1950s, Griffith Reservation was used as a housing area called Rodger Young Village for World War II veterans. The Los Angeles River is located near the eastern edge of the Griffith Reservation. In 1938, the City Bureau of Engineering concreted the Los Angeles River, which had been prone to serious flooding, including two large floods in the later 1930s that damaged the Griffith Park flatlands. In 1957, Griffith Park was severed from the Los Angeles River by construction of Interstate 5 through Griffith Reservation. Today, the Griffith Reservation includes the Autry's Griffith Park Campus, the Los Angeles Zoo, and two golf courses. The Autry National Center was constructed 20 years ago, post-dating the period of significance for Griffith Park, which ended in 1958. In fact, when the Center was approved in 1986, the City of Los Angeles, in conjunction with the approval of a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the museum, concluded that the area was not "urban wilderness" and that from an environmental perspective, the site "has little ecological sensitivity and value." The City added that "[t]he point being made is that [Autry's Griffith Park Campus] cannot be considered a natural area in light of its history of adverse land impacts and modifications." As the Autry's Griffith Park Campus does not contribute to Griffith Park's historical significance, the Project would not result in any impact on Griffith Park.

Moreover, there is no evidence to suggest that the proposed Project would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of Griffith Park. To the contrary, there is direct evidence that Griffith Park would remain eligible as an Historic-Cultural Monument. The Cultural Heritage Commission Recommendation Report approved by the City Council in the designation stated that the Autry National Center "would be excluded from Cultural Heritage Commission review." The PLUM Committee Report, adopted by the City Council, expressly provided that the proposed Project is exempt from review or approval under the Cultural Heritage Ordinance. There is no evidence or assertion that the Project would render Griffith Park ineligible. Since there is nothing in the record to demonstrate that the Project would in any way "materially impair" Griffith Park, no potential impacts would occur. To the contrary, the only evidence in the record is that Griffith Park would remain an Historic-Cultural Monument.

Therefore, as the Autry's Griffith Park Campus does not contribute to Griffith Park's historic significance, the Project would not result in any impact to the designation of Griffith Park as an Historic-Cultural Monument.

---

[17] Application, Attachment D: Griffith Park Significance, pp. 23 – 25 (citing Mike Eberts, Griffith Park: A Centennial History (Los Angeles: The Historical Society of Southern California 1996), 86.

b. Arroyo Campus

The Arroyo Campus is located on a 12-acre site in the Mount Washington community. Since 1914, the Arroyo Campus has been located in its current location midway between downtown Los Angeles and Pasadena, near the intersection of Highway 110 and Avenue 43. The site includes the Southwest Museum Building, the Casa de Adobe, and the Braun Library. The site is listed as a landmark of significant historic value on the National Registry of Historic Places. It has been designated City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument # 283 and is listed in the California Register of Historic Resources.

The Arroyo Campus is not part of the Project, nor is it a "Project" for purposes of CEQA. Rather, the Autry National Center's decision to expand its Griffith Park Campus is independent of any decision as to how to reuse the Arroyo Campus. The Autry's Board has previously resolved to move the Southwest Collection, regardless of whether the expansion occurs at the Griffith Park Campus.

As for the Arroyo Campus, a reuse report for the site was prepared in September 2004. Since that time and on an unrelated path, the Autry National Center has been exploring options for use of the site, and this exploration is ongoing. Therefore, the Autry National Center does not have a specific proposal related to the Arroyo Campus and, as such, any analysis of such environmental impacts would be speculative. Thus, while the Arroyo Campus does include known historic resources, such as the Southwest Museum Building and the Casa de Adobe, in accordance with the Public Resource Code and the CEQA Guidelines, these resources would not be impacted by the Project.

In accordance with Section 21084.1 of the California Public Resources Code, Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines, and the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide (2006), a project has a significant impact on a historical resource if it would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource. "Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition" or other adverse effects, such that the significance of the historic resource "would be materially impaired." Material impairment occurs when a project alters or destroys "those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion" in a State or local historic registry. Since there is nothing to demonstrate that the proposed Project would in any way "materially impair" the known historic resources at the Arroyo Campus, no potential impacts would occur.

On the contrary, the Autry National Center has taken steps towards restoring the Southwest Museum Building, which was in disrepair due to deferred maintenance, age, and general building deterioration. Among its first actions, the Autry National Center completed the National Register application process in 2004, which resulted in the formal listing of the Southwest Museum Building as a landmark of significant historic value on the National Registry of Historic Places. In December 2005, the Autry National Center secured nearly $1 million in state funding from the California Culture and Historical Endowment to undertake building rehabilitation projects including waterproofing, electrical upgrades, and mechanical upgrades. The Autry National Center also secured a FEMA grant to enable long-overdue repair and

stabilization of the Caracol Tower due to damage sustained in the Northridge Earthquake. As a nationally registered historic structure, the Southwest Museum Building is being rehabilitated in accordance with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Structures. In accordance with CEQA, compliance with these standards ensures that no significant impacts will occur.

With regard to the Southwest Collection within the Arroyo Campus site, the movement of the Collection is not a "Project" under CEQA, nor is it part of the Autry National Center's Griffith Park Improvements Project. Furthermore, even if the Southwest Collection could be considered part of a project's environment, the proposed Project would not significantly impact the Southwest Collection. Specifically, the proposed Project would not in any way "materially impair" the Southwest Collection. As such, no significant impacts would occur.

If anything, the proposed Project demonstrates the Autry's commitment to preservation of the Southwest Collection by providing a state-of-the-art facility in which the Collection can be properly cared for while providing greater public access to the Collection – most of which has been hidden from public view for decades due to a lack of space in which to properly display and care for these artifacts. Currently, the inadequate exhibit space in the Southwest Museum Building requires 98 percent of the 250,000 items in the Collection to remain in storage at any given time. The Collection is largely stored in the seven-story Caracol Tower, which is inappropriate in size and condition for the conservation, documentation, and scholarly requirements of the Collection. These deficiencies put the stored collections at risk. By placing the Southwest Collection in a state-of-the-art facility, these historic resources will receive the best care available while achieving a higher public display value than if they were to remain at the Arroyo Campus.

2. Cumulative Impacts

From a cumulative impact perspective, grading, excavation, and other construction activities associated with the Project in combination with other related projects in the Project vicinity could have a cumulatively adverse impact on archaeological and paleontological resources. However, compliance with regulatory requirements would ensure that potential cumulative impacts associated with archaeological resources would be less than significant. In addition, as described below, implementation of the proposed mitigation measure would ensure that potential cumulative impacts associated with paleontological resources would be less than significant. It would also be expected that other related projects would implement mitigation measures on a case-by-case basis if deemed appropriate as part of their environmental review. The Project would not result in any impacts to historic resources, and thus no cumulatively considerable impacts would occur. Thus, cumulative impacts associated with cultural resources would be less than significant.

D. Hydrology

1. Construction Impacts

During construction, portions of existing buildings and landscaping would be removed and expanded. As a result, underlying soils would be exposed making the site temporarily more

permeable and susceptible for conveyance into nearby storm drains. However, this increase in permeability would not have a substantial impact on existing drainage patterns and flows, particularly since grading and erosion control plans would be implemented along with appropriate BMPs. Furthermore, on-site water activities to reduce airborne dust which could contribute to pollutant loading in storm water runoff would be subject to the NPDES general permit requirements. In accordance with the NPDES, the Project would implement a SWPPP, which would specify BMPs and erosion control measures to be used during construction activities. These and other BMPs would eliminate or reduce pollutant levels in stormwater runoff during construction. Thus, with compliance of SWPPP guidelines including the implementation of BMPs, the Project would not violate water quality standards. Construction-related impacts to hydrology and surface water quality would be less than significant.

2. Operations Impacts

The proposed Project would result in a minor increase in impervious surfaces. With the proposed improvements, drainage would follow patterns that would be similar to existing drainage patterns, with the exception of increased impervious areas resulting from new building and surface parking areas. The proposed Project's approximate 5 percent increase in impervious area would result in a post-development storm water runoff flow of 23.30 cubic feet per second (cfs), which represents a 1 percent decrease in flow when compared to existing conditions of 23.62 cfs. As a result of the proposed bioswales and permeable pavement, storm water discharge rates from the development would be maintained at or below existing conditions. Therefore, no increase in flows during a 50-year storm condition would occur and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) requirements regarding peak flows would be met. Thus, impacts associated with drainage would be less than significant.

As the proposed uses would be the same, the Project would not generate any new sources of polluted runoff. In accordance with the SUSMP requirements, the Project would be required to implement BMPs during the operational phase of the Project to reduce the discharge of polluted runoff from the site. The final selection of BMPs would be completed through coordination with the City of Los Angeles. With compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements, impacts associated with water quality would be less than significant.

3. Cumulative Impacts

Other related projects could potentially increase the volume of stormwater runoff and contribute to pollutant loading, resulting in cumulative impacts to hydrology and surface water quality. However, as with the proposed Project, all of the related projects would also be subject to State NPDES permit requirements for both construction and operation. Each project would be required to develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and would be evaluated individually to determine appropriate BMPs and treatment measures to avoid impacts to surface water quality. In addition, the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works reviews all construction projects on a case-by-case basis to ensure that sufficient local and regional drainage capacity is available. Furthermore, the Los Angeles Zoo Parking Lot Sustainability Project would improve drainage and water quality. Thus, cumulative impacts to hydrology and surface water quality would be less than significant.

The proposed Project would be subject to the NPDES requirements described above, including preparation of a SWPPP and compliance with SUSMP requirements. Compliance with these requirements would ensure that impacts to hydrology and surface water quality are reduced to less than significant levels. As the proposed Project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts to hydrology and surface water quality, no mitigation measures would be required.

E. Land Use

The proposed Project development would be subject to numerous local and regional land use plans as well as applicable development standards set forth in the City's Municipal Code. The proposed Project's consistency with the policies of such plans including the Los Angeles General Plan Framework Element, the Hollywood Community Plan, and Regional Plans, as well as consistency with the LAMC and Do Real Planning, is addressed below.

1. Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies

The Project would be consistent with the Open Space and Conservation goals of the General Plan Framework. Framework Objective 3.1 is to "accommodate a diversity of uses that support the needs of the City's existing and future residents, businesses, and visitors." The Project would be consistent with this objective of the Land Use chapter in that the proposed Project serves the needs of existing and future residents for cultural uses as well as provides a destination for visitors and tourists. The site is well located, with access to two freeways and public transportation, to serve a regional population.

The Hollywood Community Plan includes Policy number three that states that "existing recreational sites and facilities be upgraded through site improvements, rehabilitation and reuse of sound structures, and replacement of obsolete structures, as funds become available." While the policy is not specifically directed at museums, it provides general guidance as to the preferred development characteristics in recreation and park facilities. The site improvements to be accomplished as part of the proposed Project would be consistent with the Community Plan policy. In addition, the Community Plan designation for the Project site is Open Space, a designation which allows museums. Therefore, the proposed Project would remain consistent with this designation.

The proposed Project would be consistent with the 1978 Griffith Park Master Plan. As described above, the 1978 Plan includes six primary goals. Two of these goals are intended to focus future park development in areas that are already developed and to improve the cultural and entertainment aspects of Griffith Park. The proposed Project would redevelop an existing Campus for cultural purposes, thus supporting these goals. Due to its location adjacent to the I-5 and SR-134 Freeways, the Project would continue to support activities within the area designated as the "Zoo Gateway Area" by the 1978 Plan, which is identified as an area for focused visitor activities.

Two additional goals of the 1978 Plan pertain to improving the natural beauty and visual and environmental qualities of the park. The Project's relocation of surface parking away from Western Heritage Way, with new landscaping in its place, will enhance the Project's relationship

to surrounding uses by providing a more natural setting for the building, and contribute to the natural beauty and environmental qualities of the park.

Other goals of the 1978 Plan pertain to the improvement of the park-wide transportation system, and the improvement of park operations. Attainment of these goals would not be adversely affected by the proposed Project.

At this time it is uncertain as to whether a new draft of the Griffith Park Master Plan (the Draft Plan) will be adopted or how it may be modified en-route to adoption. As such, the exact content of the Draft Plan cannot be known at this time. However, it can be noted that the Draft Plan defers to the Autry National Center's specific plan; therefore, the Project's proposed development is consistent with the future site use anticipated in the Draft Plan.

The Project site is zoned OS-1XL (Open Space, Height District 1, Extra Limited height restriction) by the City of Los Angeles and the Planning and Zoning Code (Chapter 1 of the LAMC). With a 1-XL designation, the highest point of the roof of any building or structure shall not exceed 30 feet in height.

Based on the LAMC definition of building height, which measures height from the lowest point of the existing site grade five feet from the building, the existing Campus Building measures approximately 56.75 feet in height along the lower side of the Project site, with a tower that measures approximately 110 feet in height. When viewed from Griffith Park on the western side of the Campus, the front façade of the Campus Building measures approximately 39 feet in height. The height of the expanded Campus Building would increase slightly to approximately 63.5 feet (including raised roof elements), based on the LAMC definition of height. However, when viewed from the west, the expanded Campus Building would be approximately 43 feet in height, similar to existing conditions when viewed from a distance. In addition, the existing tower would include a slightly raised wall that would cover its peak. Upon completion of the Project, the tower will be approximately 112 feet tall. The Phase 2 Institute Building would be approximately 65 feet tall. The OS zone does not include parking requirements, however Section 12.21 of the Municipal Code does provide such requirements, as discussed further in Section IV.H, Transportation and Circulation, of the Draft EIR.

Museum uses are allowed under the OS-1XL zoning designation, with CUPs to address individual site situations. Because the proposed Project would exceed 30 feet in height, it would require a CUP for the Museum use and expansion (LAMC § 12.23.U.19 allows museums by conditional use in the OS zone) and seek relief from the 30-foot height limit as part of the CUP under LAMC § 12.24.F, which allows the decision-maker, in connection with a CUP approval, to determine that the "height and area regulations" do not apply to the CUP. The proposed Project also requires Site Plan review.

As part of its CUP application, the Autry will seek to allow the on-site sale and dispensing of alcoholic beverages to continue in conjunction with food service at the café. Alcohol has been served at the Griffith Park Campus since the opening of the Museum, initially through independent caterers. In addition, the Autry itself has had the right to serve alcoholic beverages on-site at its Griffith Park Campus for the past 9 ½ years, pursuant to a 1999 Zoning Administrator approval. Currently, beer and wine are available for sale at the café upon request

by patrons of legal age, and hard liquor is not available for purchase. The beer and wine that is for sale is not listed on the menu, nor is it publicly displayed at the café. To the best of the Autry's knowledge, there have been no complaints to the Police Department, to any other City Departments or the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, regarding alcohol-related behavior at the Griffith Park Campus. The request is necessary to permit the relocation and limited expansion of the existing café that will occur as part of the Project.

The requested approval would not result in any new or greater impacts than those of the proposed Project. The continued on-site sale of alcoholic beverages is appropriate in relation to the Autry's existing approval and the relocated café. The request does not result in any changes to existing operations at the Griffith Park Campus. The Autry is not seeking to change the hours of operation of the café or increase the seating capacity of the café. As is currently the rule, no alcoholic beverages would be permitted to be consumed off-site.

Moreover, because the on-site sale of alcoholic beverages is a preexisting site condition, environmental impacts, if any were to exist, are properly accounted for in the Project's "baseline" conditions.

The requested height allowance is consistent with the general intent of the zoning height limits, given the particular conditions on the Project site. The site lies in a corner at the edge of Griffith Park and the Campus is situated in a manner that integrates with surrounding uses to the west and south, but lacks notable interrelationship with the adjacent area to the north and south. The proposed Project would not have an effect on the freeways to the north and south nor the golf courses. The Zoo facilities are well separated from the Project site by a large expanse of parking.

The impact of the additional building heights is negligible and is in keeping with the intent of the zoning ordinance. Specifically, the building heights proposed are not intended to add additional levels to the buildings, but rather to integrate the new building area into the existing Campus. Further, building heights would have negligible effects on aesthetic conditions, as compared to existing conditions. On the west side of the site, the side from which the Campus is approached and which is most visible to passersby visiting other park facilities, the building heights would be approximately the same as the existing Campus Building. The slight variation in heights would not be noticeable.

The east side of the site, which would contain the greater heights, forms the back side of the Campus Building and is not as visually accessible. The greater height at this location results from the site's steep slope and the City's method for measuring building heights. The general character of the Campus Building is that of a two-story building. The additional building height for the tower provides for an architectural treatment that adds articulation and interest to the site. The impact of the Project's building heights on aesthetics is also addressed in Section IV.A., Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. As indicated therein, the heights of the new buildings would not substantially alter existing aesthetic conditions and views, and would have a less than significant impact on those environmental factors. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the intent of the zoning ordinance as implemented through the CUP process, and would not be in substantial conflict with those provisions.

The Autry will seek a variance that it is not required to provide more than 311 parking spaces upon completion of Phase 1 and is not required to provide more than 380 spaces upon completion of Phase 2. The variance will allow the Autry to provide a number of on-site parking spaces that meets parking demand while minimizing parking on-site as suggested in public comments on the Draft EIR. Relatedly, the Autry intends to seek a variance to treat all storage on the lowest level of the existing and proposed Campus Building as excluded from floor area calculations, given the fact that such storage does not generate visitors or the need for parking. Based on the detailed analysis provided in Appendix 13 of the Final EIR, the proposed parking supply of 311 and 380 parking spaces upon completion of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Project, respectively, would adequately meet peak parking demand. In addition, goals associated with the preservation of open space would be better achieved by the parking reduction variance. By providing additional landscaped open space (approximately one-half acre) in the place of paved surface parking and preserving several prominent trees at the southwest corner of the site, the parking reduction variance would further enhance the Project's relationship to surrounding uses by providing a more natural setting for the building, and further contribute to the natural beauty and environmental qualities of the park. Thus, the impact of the parking variance on land use would be less than significant.

The Project also includes a sign variance. As proposed, the Project would include a number of wall, monument, informational, and pole signs. Section 14.4.8.A.2 of the Municipal Code provides that the combined sign area of monument signs, projecting signs, wall signs, illuminated architectural canopy signs, pole signs, roof signs and window signs shall not exceed four square feet for each foot of street frontage. The Project site has a street frontage along Western Heritage Way of approximately 1,173 feet. The frontage of the east-facing side of the property along the I-5 Freeway is approximately 1,105 feet. Together, the frontages equal 2,278 square feet and therefore would allow a maximum of 9,112 square feet of signage. LAMC Section 14.4.8.A.1 provides that "[t]he sign area of monument signs shall not exceed 1.5 feet per foot of street frontage nor a maximum of 75 square feet for the sign face visible to the same direction of traffic." This formula would permit over 3,400 square feet of monument sign area for the Project site. Total monument signage proposed is only 200 square feet. The variance would allow the development of a single monument sign with two sign faces of 100 square feet each, exceeding the maximum allowed sign area of 75 square feet for each sign face. Each face measures 5 feet by 20 feet. LAMC Section 14.4.12.A also provides that "[l]ots having a street frontage of at least 50 feet may have a pole sign for each 200 feet or fraction of that area of street frontage, if the street frontage does not contain an existing pole sign or projecting sign." With a total of 2,278 square feet of street frontage, 11 pole signs would be allowed. Nevertheless, and in an abundance of caution, the Autry is requesting relief from the LAMC signage requirements so that if only Western Heritage Way is treated as street frontage under the Municipal Code, 6 additional pole signs may be allowed.

The signage variance would not result in any new or greater impacts than those of the proposed Project. The proposed signage is appropriate in relation to existing signage and the expanded Campus Building. The signs which are the subject of the variance serve valuable informational and wayfinding purposes for visitors approaching the museum from the north and south along Western Heritage Way. The setbacks and location of the signs are appropriate for the natural Park setting, and are complemented by landscaping and mature trees. None of the

signs would introduce off-site advertising, and the total aggregate area of signage proposed is substantially less than the amount that would be permitted by the sign regulations. Lighting of the proposed signs would be minimal, with no significant introduction of new light sources. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

The ground lease agreement dated January 1987 between the City of Los Angeles and the Gene Autry Western Heritage Museum[18] would be amended as a Project action. The lease agreement would be implemented pursuant to an agreement between the City and the Autry National Center.

The Do Real Planning guidelines were prepared by the City Planning Commission, and are used by the Planning Department in implementing the Department's Strategic Plan. Do Real Planning includes fourteen points to guide planning activities for the City and help the City in implementing existing City Plans and Policies. They are intended to set the City on a course toward sustainability. These guidelines do not replace nor supersede any adopted policies.

Many of the fourteen points address procedures for the operations of the City Planning Department; some address large scale regional issues, and uses and/or settings than those of the proposed Project. The relationship of the Project to the Do Real Planning points of note include: demand a walkable city; smart parking requirements; require density around transit; produce green buildings; and landscape in abundance.

The Project is not a regionally significant project as defined by SCAG. In addition, many of the broad regional policies contained within Chapter 3, Growth Management, of SCAG's RCPG that regard land use and growth management are not relevant to the proposed Project. However, goal four which states that "the Growth Management goal is to develop urban forms that avoid economic and social polarization [and promote] the regional strategic goal of minimizing social and geographic disparities and of reaching equity among all segments of society" is applicable. The proposed Project, by being located in an area easily accessible by regionally connected freeways and public transportation, supports the goal of providing a cultural and educational facility that is accessible to all members of society of varying economic and cultural backgrounds.

Other regional plans applicable to the Project site include MTA's CMP and SCAQMD's AQMP. As discussed in Section IV.H, Transportation and Circulation, of the Draft EIR, implementation of the Project would not conflict with the CMP. In addition, as discussed in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, Project implementation would not interfere with the attainment of air quality standards, nor would it conflict with the Air Quality Management Plan for the South Coast Air Basin.

As described above, the Project would be consistent with relevant regional policies and general community policies established in existing plans, policies and other legal documents. Therefore, the Project would not be in substantial conflict with either the adopted Community

[18] The museum is now referred to as the Autry National Center.

Plan or with the whole of relevant policies in other applicable plans or policies. Impacts regarding the regulatory framework would be less than significant.

2. Land Use Compatibility

Hollywood, the community in which the proposed Project is located, contains a mix of office, retail, hotel, restaurant, entertainment, and residential uses more than two to three miles from the Project site. The Project site is isolated from other surrounding urban development, e.g. light industrial uses in the city of Glendale by the SR-134 Freeway to the north, the I-5 Freeway and Los Angeles River to the east, and the Griffith Park facilities on the west and south.

The Project's land use relationships are shaped by its location within a section of Griffith Park developed with the Zoo, the Griffith Park Observatory shuttle reservations center building and temporary shuttle station, the Zoo Magnet Center, the DWP Fuel Cell Demonstration Project, and golf courses. The Project is a visitor destination which is located at the edge of the park, away from the less intensive recreation facilities, and at an easily accessible gateway adjacent to two major freeways and public transportation.

The Project is an expansion of an existing visitor-serving facility. It would allow the Campus to expand its range of services with educational and research functions, etc., all of which are consistent with, and which would be integrated with, the site's existing uses. The Project would be contained within the existing site without encroaching into adjacent sites such as the Griffith Park Observatory shuttle reservations center building and temporary shuttle station, golf courses, Zoo Magnet Center, the DWP Fuel Cell Demonstration Project, or Zoo. In addition, as described in detail in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the adjacent equestrian trail and bicycle paths would remain upon completion of the Project. In addition, the Campus would continue to be consistent with the visitor-serving nature of the Zoo to the west. Therefore, there would be no short-term or long-term substantial or adverse changes to the existing land use relationships in the Project vicinity.

As part of its CUP application, the Autry will seek to allow the continued on-site sale and dispensing of alcoholic beverages to continue in conjunction with food service at the café. Alcohol has been served at the Griffith Park Campus since the opening of the Museum, initially through independent caterers. In addition, the Autry itself has had the right to serve alcoholic beverages on-site at its Griffith Park Campus for the past 9 ½ years, pursuant to a 1999 Zoning Administrator approval. To the best of the Autry's knowledge, there have been no complaints to the Police Department, to any other City Departments or the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, regarding alcohol-related behavior at the Griffith Park Campus. The request is necessary to permit the relocation and limited expansion of the existing café that will occur as part of the Project.

The requested approval would not result in any new or greater impacts than those of the proposed Project. The continued on-site sale of alcoholic beverages is appropriate in relation to the Autry's existing approval and the relocated café. The request does not result in any changes to existing operations at the Griffith Park Campus. The Autry is not seeking to change the hours of café or increase the seating capacity of the café. As is currently the rule, no alcoholic beverages would be permitted to be consumed off-site.

Moreover, because the on-site sale of alcoholic beverages is a preexisting site condition, environmental impacts, if any were to exist, are properly accounted for in the Project's "baseline" conditions.

Construction activities would be limited to the site, without interfering with the activities at surrounding off-site locations. Construction would be staged to minimize disruption to nearby streets and activities. In addition, sufficient parking and access would be provided on-site. Based on the above, the proposed Project would not substantially or adversely change the existing relationship between on- and off-site land uses and properties, or have the long-term effect of adversely altering a neighborhood or community through ongoing disruption, physical division, or isolation. Impacts on land use compatibility would be less than significant.

3. Cumulative Impacts

The 30 related projects in the Project vicinity generally consist of infill development and redevelopment of existing uses and parking and utility improvement projects. As with the proposed Project, related projects would be required to comply with relevant land use policies and regulations. Therefore, as the Project would generally be consistent with applicable land use plans, the Project would not incrementally contribute to cumulative inconsistencies with respect to land use plans. Cumulative impacts on the regulatory framework would be less than significant.

The closest related projects within the site vicinity include the Los Angeles Zoo Parking Lot's Demonstration on Environmental Sustainability Project, DWP's Lower Reach River Supply Conduit Project and the IRP Facilities Plan. The Los Angeles Zoo Sustainability Project will include BMPs, planting of drought tolerant landscaping, and free standing photovoltaic panels. These improvements would not be expected to alter existing land use relationships. Since the Los Angeles River is separated from the Project site by both the I-5 and SR-134 Freeways, the LA River Master Plan is not expected to result in impacts that would be cumulatively considerable. In addition, the Lower Reach River Supply Conduit Project and the IRP Facilities Plan are utility improvement projects that include utility lines below Western Heritage Way and beyond. Upon completion of construction, these utility improvement projects would also not alter existing land use relationships. All of the remaining related projects are located at some distance beyond the freeways to the north and east of the Project site. Therefore, the proposed Project in combination with related projects would not alter the existing land use relationships in the community. As such, the proposed Project would not contribute to a cumulative impact with respect to land use compatibility.

With implementation of the proposed approvals, the Project would generally be consistent with existing regulatory requirements and relevant land use polices. In addition, the Project would not disrupt or divide an established community. Thus, no mitigation measures would be required.

F. Noise

1. Operational Impacts

Potential noise impacts due to the increased Project-related off-site traffic volumes were analyzed by estimating the net increase in noise levels compared to the existing conditions. Current (year 2006) and future year (Phase 1 – 2010 and Phase 2 - 2014) traffic volumes at the roadway segments in the vicinity of the Project site were provided by the Project traffic consultant, Fehr & Peers/Kaku Associates, Inc. With respect to Project-related traffic increase, the change in noise levels are based on the change in traffic volumes, on a logarithmic basis. That is, a doubling in traffic volumes would result in an increase of 3 dBA. Based on the projected traffic volumes, there would be a slight increase in noise levels along Western Heritage Way of +0.3 dBA during weekdays as a result of the Project-related traffic. In addition, the largest cumulative traffic-related noise impact is anticipated to occur along the segments of Los Feliz Boulevard and Riverside Drive, where the roadway noise level increase would be 0.5 dBA CNEL However, as these levels fall below the 3 dBA CNEL significance threshold, both Project-level and cumulative roadway noise level increases would be less than significant.

Potential noise impacts due to the increased Project-related off-site traffic volumes also were analyzed for a delayed Phase I buildout of 2012 and a Phase II buildout of 2016. As indicated in the December 15, 2008 memo provided by Fehr & Peers, a two-year delay in Project construction would result in an approximately two percent increase in traffic volumes. A two percent increase in traffic volumes would represent an increase of less than 0.1 dBA in noise levels for the future baseline condition. This increase is negligible, as a 3.0 dBa increase in noise levels is typically the point at which noise is just perceptible. Therefore, the Project's traffic noise impacts with the delayed construction timeframes would remain less than significant.

The proposed Project would retain the existing mechanical and electrical equipment, which is located both inside and outside the Campus Building on the east side. Some limited additional equipment would likely be required to cool, heat, and ventilate the indoor air environment. This includes most of the existing and future mechanical and electrical equipment, including chillers, boilers, air handlers, transformers and electrical switchgear, would be located inside the buildings. Outdoor equipment currently includes cooling towers, kitchen exhaust fans, and general exhaust fans. The proposed Project would relocate the kitchen exhaust fans and scrubbers, and would result in ice storage tanks installed on the east side of the site together with the relocation of and other limited exhaust fans. However, the estimated maximum noise from mechanical equipment at the nearest sensitive noise receptor would be 44 dBA, which is well below the existing ambient noise levels. Therefore, significant noise impacts would not be expected due to the Project's stationary noise sources.

2. Cumulative Impacts

a. Long-Term Operations

Each of the identified related projects would also generate stationary-source and mobile-source noise due to ongoing day-to-day operations. Most of the related projects are of a residential, retail, commercial, or institutional nature, and these uses are not typically associated

with excessive exterior noise; however, each project would produce traffic volumes that are capable of generating a roadway noise impact. The Los Angeles Zoo Parking Lot, Integrated Resources Program, and Lower Reach River Supply Conduit Project (identified in the Draft EIR as related projects 3a, 3b, and 3c, respectively) would have negligible contributions to the off-site traffic volumes (a few vehicle trips per month for maintenance purposes). As discussed previously, traffic volumes from the proposed Project and related projects, combined with ambient growth traffic, were evaluated. Cumulative traffic volumes would result in a maximum increase of 0.5 dBA CNEL along the segments of Los Feliz Boulevard (west of Riverside Drive) and Riverside Drive (south of Los Feliz Boulevard), which include residential uses. Along the Western Heritage Way, where the Zoo Magnet Center is located, a maximum increase of 0.6 dBA CNEL is estimated (during weekday). As this noise level increase would be below the more conservative 3 dBA CNEL significance threshold, roadway noise impacts due to cumulative traffic volumes would be less than significant.

The Lower Reach RSC Project is not anticipated to have stationary noise sources in the vicinity of the Project site, as the new pipelines are underground. The proposed Phase II of the Los Angeles Zoo Parking Lot Project includes a storm water collection (cistern) system for the Zoo's irrigation, which would include pumps to convey the water for irrigation. Operational noise associated with the related IRP Facilities Plan includes air treatment facilities and would be limited to the area in close vicinity of those facilities. However, due to LAMC provisions that limit stationary-source noise from items such as mechanical equipment, noise levels would be less than significant at the property line for each related project. Furthermore, the other 27 related projects are over 2,200 feet from the proposed Project. Thus, when accounting for distance losses and intervening building structures between the related projects and noise sensitive receptors, on-site noise produced by these 27 related projects would not be additive to Project-related noise levels. Because the Project's composite stationary-source impacts would be less than significant, the composite stationary-source noise impacts attributable to cumulative development would also be less than significant.

G. Public Services - Fire

1. Construction Impacts

Construction activities are unlikely to increase the existing demand on fire protection and emergency medical services. However, construction activities may cause the occasional exposure of combustible materials, such as wood, plastics, sawdust, coverings and coatings, to heat sources including machinery and equipment sparking, exposed electrical lines, welding activities, chemical reactions in combustible materials and coatings, and lighted cigarettes. As such, fire suppression equipment specific to construction would be maintained on-site. The Project would comply with applicable existing codes and ordinances. Construction impacts on emergency vehicles traveling in the vicinity of the Project site would be limited. The Project site lends itself to performing most staging activities on site, with minimum effects on Western Heritage Way. If Western Heritage Way is affected for short durations, a construction management program would be implemented. Since emergency access to the site would remain clear and unobstructed during construction of the Project, impacts related to emergency access would be less than significant**.**

2. Operational Impacts

To the extent that the Project attracts additional visitors to the Project site, as well as a small increase in site employees, the demand for emergency medical services (EMS) at the local fire stations serving the Project site may result in a negligible increase, particularly for Fire Station No. 56. While the new facilities would increase the size of the Campus building area, the new buildings would have similar functions to the Campus Building and would meet current design standards, thus limiting any increase in the demand for fire services.

Pursuant to Division 9 of the Fire Code, the Project would comply with specific fire safety, access, and fire flow requirements. In addition, prior to the recordation of the final map or the approval of a building permit, the Project would submit a plot plan subject to approval by the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD). This includes compliance with Fire Code Section 57.09.08 regarding the provision of sprinkler systems as well as Fire Code Section 57.09.06 regarding the provision of fire hydrants. Based on communication with the LAFD, the fire flow required for the Project is estimated at 6,000 gallons per minute (gpm) from four hydrants flowing simultaneously.[19] This standard for fire flow would be met.

Fire Station No. 56 can locally access the Project site from Rowena Avenue where the station is located, and regionally through SR-134 and the I-5 Freeways. Potential impacts with regard to site accessibility would be further addressed through a mutual aid agreement between the LAFD and the Glendale Fire Department.

As described above, as part of its CUP application, the Autry will seek to allow the continued on-site sale and dispensing of alcoholic beverages to continue in conjunction with food service at the café. To the best of the Autry's knowledge, there have been no complaints to the Police Department, to any other City Departments or the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, regarding alcohol-related behavior at the Griffith Park Campus. The requested approval would not result in any new or greater impacts than those of the proposed Project, including those related to emergency services. Specifically, the request does not result in any changes to existing operations at the Griffith Park Campus. The Autry is not seeking to change the hours of operation of the café or increase the seating capacity of the café. As is currently the rule, no alcoholic beverages would be permitted to be consumed off-site. Moreover, because the on-site sale of alcoholic beverages is a preexisting site condition, environmental impacts, if any were to exist, are properly accounted for in the Project's "baseline" conditions.

The Project's increase in demand for fire protection services would be negligible, and would not exceed the staff and equipment capabilities of the LAFD to serve the Project site. Nor would the Project require the addition of a new fire station or the expansion, consolidation, or relocation of an existing station. As a result, the Project would result in less than significant impact relative to the additional demand for fire services. In addition, the Project would comply with applicable LAFD code and ordinance requirements for construction, fire safety facilities, fire flow, fire hydrants, and access. Accordingly, the Project would have a less than significant impact relative to fire safety, access, flow, and services.

---

[19] Email communication with Inspector Michael Theule, March 26, 2007.

3. Cumulative Impacts

The "first in" fire district for Fire Station No. 56 is generally bounded by the SR-134 Freeway on the north, the I-5 Freeway to the east, and as seen in the Draft EIR, the south and west boundaries are irregular in shape. Related projects within this "first in" district include related projects identified in the Draft EIR as 2 (Los Feliz & Perlita Ave. church), 3a (Los Angeles Zoo Parking Lot construction – parking lot), 3b (Integrated Resources Program construction – infrastructure), and 3c (Lower Reach River Supply Conduit Project construction – infrastructure). Related project 2 is a church, which like the Project would not introduce new population to the area, but would serve existing population. In addition, related projects 3a, 3b and 3c are all infrastructure improvements that would not generate additional permanent population within the vicinity. The remaining related projects that are located within the City of Los Angeles, related projects 3, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 29 are located in proximity to Fire Stations 35 and 50. These projects would add new population and employees to the area, which would incrementally increase the cumulative demand for fire services in the area in a manner that is consistent with general growth occurring in the region. In addition, all related projects would comply with LAMC Fire Code and Building Code regulations pertinent to fire safety, access, and fire flow. Such regulations would include requirements to ensure adequate emergency access is provided during construction of each project. Therefore, the Project combined with related projects would result in a less than significant impact relative to fire and EMS services.

H. Transportation and Circulation

1. Operational Impacts

The future 2010 "Without Project" conditions add the traffic to be generated as a result of ambient growth and related projects up to the year 2010 into the existing traffic volume. With the added traffic, it is expected that in 2010, six of the seven study intersections would operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS) (LOS D or better) during both Saturday and weekday peak periods. The intersection of Crystal Springs Drive/Riverside Drive & Los Feliz Boulevard is projected to operate at unacceptable LOS (LOS F) during the Saturday peak period.

Phase 1 would result in a net increase of 426 net new weekend trips and 282 net new weekday trips. These Phase 1 trips were added to the future 2010 "Without Project" conditions to determine the impacts of Phase 1 on traffic. With the additional Phase 1 traffic, five of the seven study intersections are projected to operate at acceptable LOS during both peak periods. The two intersections of Riverside Drive and Zoo Drive and Crystal Springs Drive/Riverside Drive and Los Feliz Boulevard would operate at unacceptable LOS during the Saturday peak period. However, based on the intersection impact criteria described in Section IV.H. of the Draft EIR, the Project would not significantly impact any of the study intersections for the future year 2010 during either of the peak periods.

The future 2014 "Without Project" traffic conditions would incorporate the traffic to be generated as a result of ambient growth and related projects up to the year 2014. The future 2014 "Without Project" conditions indicate that four of the seven intersections would operate at an acceptable LOS. However, the intersections of Riverside Drive and Zoo Drive and Western Heritage Way and North Zoo Drive would operate at LOS E during the Saturday peak period,

while the intersection of Crystal Springs Drive/Riverside Drive and Los Feliz Boulevard would operate at LOS F during the Saturday peak period and at LOS E during the weekday peak period.

Phase 2 of the Project would add a total of 270 daily vehicle trips during a typical weekend and 179 net new weekday trips. However, based on the significance criteria described in detail in Section IV.H. of the Draft EIR, the Project would not significantly impact any of the study intersections at full buildout in 2014 during either of the peak periods.

Based on the traffic study, the Project would add no more than 39 trips to the study intersections and freeways The Project would not exceed the County's Congestion Management Program (CMP) threshold criteria pertaining to impacts on the regional transportation system. Therefore, the Project would have no impact on the CMP system and no further CMP analysis is required.

As set forth in the Errata to the Final EIR, postponement of the Phase I and Phase II buildout years by up to two years does not affects these conclusions. As discussed in more detail in the traffic memorandum by Fehr & Peers dated December 15, 2008 attached at Appendix B to the Errata, to account for the two-year delay in the construction of the two phases of the Project and the associated growth in traffic volumes occurring over the two-year timeframes, an ambient growth factor was applied to the previous data. With application of the additional ambient growth, it is expected that traffic conditions at the study intersections would slightly degrade. However, the analysis within the traffic memorandum demonstrates that no significant impacts would be triggered. Thus, a two-year delay in construction of the proposed Project would not change any of the traffic impact conclusions in the EIR.

Public transit trips would be increased. During Phase 1, the increase would be four new transit trips in the weekend midday peak hour and two new trips in the weekday P.M. peak hour. During Phase 2, the increase would be for three new trips in the weekend midday peak period and one new trip during the weekday P.M. peak hour. The Project would not result in any physical or scheduling changes to existing transit services nor interfere with existing infrastructure supporting alternative transportation (*e.g.*, bus stops, bus lanes, etc). As such, the Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Project impacts to transit would be less than significant.

The two driveways for the proposed Project would be unsignalized and stop-controlled. The north driveway would continue to operate as it currently does. This includes one inbound lane and two outbound lanes, one for left turns and one for right turns, both stop-controlled. To access the driveway from the north, a dedicated left-turn lane would be available so as not to impede the flow of traffic.

The north driveway would be used mostly by employees directly accessing the employee parking lot behind the building. Like current conditions, at completion of Phase 2, the employee lot would be used heavily on weekdays between 8:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. when most Campus employees would be working on-site. This lot would seldom be used on weekends, so weekend access is expected to be minimal. On "peak event" days, the 129-space lot to the east of the Campus Building will be open, with access through the Phase 1 surface lot or the Phase 2 parking structure.

A majority of the vehicular traffic would access the site at the south driveway approximately 1,000 feet from the intersection. The south driveway would feed traffic into the Griffith Park Observatory shuttle reservations center building and temporary shuttle station site, which has an existing driveway. The configuration of this driveway at buildout would be one inbound lane and two outbound lanes, one for left turns and one for right turns. A dedicated left-turn lane would be provided to access the driveway from the north.

The configurations for both driveways are optimized so as not to increase queuing times on Western Heritage Way from existing conditions. The low speeds and traffic volumes in the park setting assist drivers into and out of the driveways. Therefore, using the established criteria, the Project would not create a significant impact on access.

One of the primary goals of the Project design has been to remove parking from the front of the existing Campus Building and replace it with landscaping in order to enhance the park setting of the site and to minimize the visual impact of any additional parking. A number of comments on the Draft EIR suggested that the on-site parking at the Autry should be reduced. In addition, numerous public comments also expressed concern about the setting of the Campus. In response to these comments, following the Draft EIR comment period, the proposed Project was refined to remove surface parking and thus increase the amount of landscaped open space provided by the Project. To provide for this reduction in parking, the parking demand analysis was updated and demonstrates that the expected demand for parking can be accommodated by the proposed parking supply of 311 parking spaces following Phase 1 and 380 parking spaces following Phase 2. That analysis is provided in Appendix 13 of the Final EIR and is summarized below.

Section 12.03 of LAMC defines "floor area" rather than gross area to reflect the fact that certain necessary components of any building, such as mechanical equipment and basement storage, do not generate parking demand.[20] Thus, in assessing floor area of both the existing Campus Building and the expansion phases, the parking analysis within the Draft EIR assumed that storage on the lowest level of the Campus Building would not be considered floor area for purposes of the Code-required parking analysis. As compared to other facilities, museums often include storage space as a large component of the building. However, as with buildings in general, the storage area does not generate trips or the need for parking. Nonetheless, as part of the refinement to the Project design, it was determined that due to the site slope and building orientation, the lowest level of the building does not technically fit within the definition of a basement.[21] Thus, the analysis in Section IV.H, Transportation and Circulation, of the Draft EIR is corrected to provide the Code-required parking without treating the storage areas as basement storage. As a result, that area has also been included in the revised calculations of floor area. With these clarifications, the resulting floor area of the proposed Project is 209,272 square feet

---

[20] The definition of "Floor Area" as found in LAMC Section 12.03: "Is that area in square feet confined within the exterior walls of a building, but not include the area of the following uses: exterior walls, stairways, shafts, rooms housing building-operating equipment or machinery, parking areas with associated driveways and ramps, space for the landing and storage of helicopters, and basement storage areas."

[21] *See* LAMC Section 12.03.

after Phase 1, and 254,272 square feet after Phase 2. The amount of Code-required parking, based upon these revised amounts, would be 456 spaces at the end of Phase 1 and 546 spaces at the end of Phase 2.

As described in the Draft EIR, based on a study conducted in 2006, the existing uses on the Project site generate a demand for 192 parking spaces on a Saturday peak and 182 parking spaces on a weekday peak. To further validate this demand information, an additional study was conducted during the same period during 2008. The additional study showed a similar demand for parking with a demand of 199 parking spaces on a Saturday peak and 199 parking spaces on a weekday peak based on the updated net floor area of 141,340 gross square feet. This demand number is conservative since the methodology used in the 2008 study conservatively assumed that the employee lot will be full at midday on a weekday and will have 37 cars parked in the early afternoon on a weekend, similar to the methodology used for calculating existing demand in the 2006 study. The 2006 study calculated future demand for parking by applying the parking space per square foot ratio of the existing net floor area to the new floor area upon completion of Phases 1 and 2 of the proposed Project and then applying a contingency factor. Using this same methodology, but with a more realistic contingency factor, the more recent demand analysis results in a demand for 311 parking spaces upon completion of Phase 1 of the Project and 377 parking spaces upon completion of Phase 2. Thus, the proposed supply of 311 parking spaces upon completion of Phase 1 and 380 parking spaces upon completion of Phase 2 is sufficient to accommodate the demand associated with the Project. Thus, as set forth in the Draft EIR, parking impacts associated with the Project would be less than significant. Furthermore, to ensure that the parking areas are effectively utilized on peak day events, the Autry will provide parking attendants, monitoring of available parking spaces and a validation program.

Implementation of the Project pedestrian access to the Campus would be provided by the new on-site parking areas, while truck access would be provided away from the public areas within the eastern portion of the site. An improved bus drop-off area would also be provided that would include direct access to the arrival plaza without the need to walk across a surface parking area. In addition, the existing crosswalk on Western Heritage Way to the Los Angeles Zoo would remain. As discussed above, Western Heritage Way has a 25 mph speed limit with various speed bumps. Thus, the potential for conflicts with vehicles and pedestrians would be low. Additionally, the Project would not introduce hazardous design features (*e.g.*, sharp curves, blind turns). Thus, impacts related to pedestrian /bicycle safety would be less than significant.

As analyzed above, the Project would not result in significant impacts to CMP arterial monitoring intersections or CMP freeway monitoring locations. Thus, the Project would be consistent with the CMP. Additionally, as analyzed above, the Project would not conflict with any adopted plans, policies, or programs supporting alternative transportation and would meet the parking requirements of the LAMC. Project impacts relative to consistency with transportation regulations would be less than significant.

2. Cumulative Impacts

The Project site is served by Metro Bus Route 96. The only related projects that are located within the route are the Los Angeles Zoo Parking Lot, Integrated Resources Program, and Lower Reach River Supply Conduit Project (identified in the Draft EIR as related projects

3a, 3b, and 3c, respectively). All of these related projects involve infrastructure improvements and do not include uses that would generate new daytime or resident population. In addition, none of the remaining 27 identified related projects are located along or nearby this bus route. Furthermore, as discussed above, the Project would produce four new transit trips in the weekend midday peak hour and two new transit trips in the weekday P.M. peak hour for Phase 1. For Phase 2, the Project would generate approximately three new transit trips in the weekend midday peak hour and one new transit trip in the weekday P.M. peak hour. Thus, cumulative impacts on transit would be less than significant.

Cumulative access impacts could occur if related projects impact the same access routes or access points (*i.e.*, street segments and intersections) as the proposed Project. The only related projects that are located within proximity to the Project site are related projects 3a, 3b and 3c. All of these related projects are infrastructure related and do not include uses that would generate new daytime or resident population. Thus, any trips associated with operation of these related projects would be due to maintenance activities and would be nominal. None of the remaining 27 identified related projects are located within proximity to the Project site. As such, related projects would not impact the same access routes or access points as the proposed Project. Thus, cumulative impacts relative to access would be less than significant.

VII. IMPACTS FOUND TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT AFTER MITIGATION

A. Cultural Resources

1. Archeological Resources

a. Description of Significant Effects

The Project site and much of the area surrounding the Project site has been previously disturbed through grading and development. No archaeological resources have been identified by 12 reported previous investigations within a one-mile radius of the Project site. On these bases, the archaeological sensitivity of the Project site is considered low. Following information provided by the Gabrielino/Tongva Tribal Council regarding potential location of a Native American village in the vicinity of the Project, however, the Draft EIR recommends several mitigation measures to ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

b. Mitigation Measures

The following measures are recommended to assure that should any archaeological, Native American, and paleontological resources be discovered during construction, they would not be significantly affected by the implementation of the proposed Project:

Mitigation Measure C-1: A qualified archaeologist shall be retained by the Applicant to review grading plans and geotechnical information and prepare a monitoring plan for all ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed sediments. A qualified archaeologist is defined as an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology. Ground-disturbing activities include primary construction-related activities and any associated secondary activities for support services

such as utilities. Any such monitoring of previously undisturbed sediments shall be conducted by an archaeological monitor and a Native American monitor. The Native American monitor shall be requested from a group identified by the Native American Heritage Commission as having affiliation with the project vicinity. On agreement between the qualified archaeologist and the Native American monitor, the archaeological monitor may also notify the Native American monitor in the event of an archaeological discovery. In the event that archaeological resources are identified during monitoring or unexpectedly during excavations in fill sediments, all work proximal to the discovery (estimated at 25 feet) shall halt until the qualified archaeologist has evaluated the find. If the archaeologist determines that the find is significant or may qualify as significant, the archaeologist shall prepare a treatment plan. If the find is prehistoric or includes Native American materials, affiliated Native American groups shall be invited to contribute to the treatment plan. Preservation in place shall be considered as a treatment. Results of monitoring and any archaeological treatment shall be reported in an appropriate technical report to be filed with the Applicant, the City, and the California Historical Resources Information System. Any artifacts recovered during monitoring or treatment shall be curated at an appropriate facility, such as the Autry National Center.

Mitigation Measure C-2: If human remains are unearthed unexpectedly during ground disturbing activities, 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 Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner will have 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent of the deceased Native American, who will then help determine what course of action should be taken in dealing with the remains.

Mitigation Measure C-3: In the event that deeper excavations into older Quaternary deposits may be required for the project, a qualified paleontologist shall be retained by the Applicant to perform inspections of excavation or grading activity within any Older Quaternary deposits below the original ground surface. The frequency of inspections shall be based on consultation with the paleontologist and will depend on the rate of excavation and grading activities, the materials being excavated, and, if found, the abundance and type of fossils encountered. If fossils are found during inspections, all work shall cease in that area. Any discovery of paleontological resources would be treated in accordance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology guidelines for identification, evaluation, disclosure, avoidance or recovery, and curation, as appropriate. The paleontologist shall then prepare a report summarizing the results of the monitoring program including methods of fossil recovery and curation, and a description of the fossils collected and their significance. A

copy of the report shall be provided to the Applicant and to the City of Los Angeles. The fossils and a copy of the report will be deposited in an accredited curation facility.

c. Finding

Incorporation of the mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR will ensure that potential impacts associated with archeological resources would be less than significant.

d. Rationale for Finding

The Draft EIR determined that overall, the potential for the proposed Project to encounter previously undiscovered archaeological resources within the Project boundaries appears to be low. Nevertheless, the Draft EIR recommended implementation of mitigation measures to monitor earth-moving activities at the Project site and otherwise address information regarding the potential location of a Native American village in the vicinity of the Project. Impacts relating to archaeological resources would therefore be less than significant upon implementation of the mitigation measures.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts to cultural resources, see Section IV.C. of the DEIR (Volume I).

2. Paleontological Resources

a. Description of Significant Effects

A paleontological records search conducted for the Project site by the Natural History Museum revealed that there are no known vertebrate fossil localities within the Project site or nearby from the same or similar sedimentary deposits. However, the record search does note that fossil vertebrates have been recovered from the Older Quaternary deposits south and west of Griffith Park. As surface grading or very shallow excavations required for the Project are unlikely to require excavation of older Quaternary deposits, the Project is unlikely to encounter significant vertebrate fossil remains. However, in the event that deeper excavations into older Quaternary deposits may be required for the Project, potential impacts associated with undiscovered paleontological resources could occur.

b. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures listed above are recommended to assure that should any archaeological, Native American, and paleontological resources be discovered during construction, they would not be significantly affected by the implementation of the proposed Project. Mitigation Measure C-3 is recommended specifically to assure that potential impacts associated with undiscovered paleontological resources would be less than significant.

c. Finding

Incorporation of the mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR will ensure that potential impacts associated with paleontological resources would be less than significant.

d. Rationale for Finding

The Draft EIR determined that the Project is unlikely to encounter significant vertebrate fossil remains as a result of surface grading or very shallow excavations. Nevertheless, the Draft EIR recommended implementation of mitigation measures to address potential impacts to paleontological resources that could occur in the event that deeper excavations into older Quaternary deposits are necessary. Impacts relating to archaeological resources would therefore be less than significant upon implementation of the mitigation measures.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts to cultural resources, see Section IV.C. of the of the DEIR (Volume I).

B. Noise

1. Construction Impacts

a. Description of Significant Effects

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to noise than others due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities typically involved at the receptor location. The City's CEQA Thresholds Guide considers residences, schools, motels and hotels, libraries, religious institutions, hospitals, nursing homes, and parks as noise sensitive uses. Currently, there are no existing residential uses in the Project vicinity; however, Griffith Park (including the golf courses) and the LAUSD Zoo Magnet Center located south and southwest of the site, respectively, as well as the Los Angeles Zoo located west of the Project site, are considered sensitive noise receptors.

Construction-related noise at the sensitive receptors is estimated to exceed the Project significance thresholds during Phase 1 and at the golf courses during Phase 2. Construction related noise levels at the animal exhibits within the Zoo would be reduced from the estimated noise levels at the Zoo entrance due to further distance and intervening structures. As such, construction noise at the animal exhibits would be consistent with the noise level from typical Zoo operation (i.e., visitors, keepers, and maintenance). Therefore, potential noise impacts in the Zoo's animal areas would not be expected.

The teeing area at the northern portion of the golf courses, where most golfers would congregate, is approximately 200 feet south of the Project site. The construction noise at the northern teeing area would be attenuated to 73 dBA, which is approximately 12 dBA above the lowest measured daytime ambient noise levels. At approximately 700 feet south from the golf courses boundary, the construction-related noise level is expected to be below the significance threshold level and consistent with the existing ambient noise levels. Golfers normally move

around to the different areas of the golf courses throughout the game, and it is expected that they would not be exposed to high noise levels for an extended duration. Therefore, a significant noise impact is not anticipated at the golf courses.

Components of the Campus may be open during construction and expose visitors to construction noise. However, impacts would be limited for it is expected that visitors would be outside for a short period during arrival and departure, and that noise barriers would separate construction equipment/activities from the Campus experience. Overall, the construction-related noise at the sensitive receptors is estimated to exceed the Project significance thresholds. Thus, Project construction activities would result in significant noise impacts.

b. Mitigation Measures

Since Project construction is expected to result in short-term temporary significant noise impacts to sensitive receptors, the following mitigation measures are recommended to minimize the impacts:

- **Mitigation Measure E-1:** Effective temporary noise barriers shall be used to block the line-of-site between the construction equipment and the noise-sensitive receptors, as follows:
  - During Project Phase 1 site demolition and site grading activities, provide a temporary sound barrier along the western boundary of the construction site, to reduce the construction noise to the Zoo and the Zoo Magnet Center.
  - During Project Phase 1 site demolition and site grading activities and Phase 2 construction periods, provide a temporary sound barrier along the southern boundary of the Project site to reduce the construction noise to the golf courses.
- **Mitigation Measure E-2:** Noise-generating construction equipment operated at the Project site shall be equipped with effective noise control devices, i.e., mufflers, lagging, and/or motor enclosures. All equipment shall be properly maintained to assure that no additional noise, due to worn or improperly maintained parts, would be generated

c. Finding

Incorporation of the mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR will reduce the Project's construction noise impacts by a minimum 10 dBA, which would reduce the construction noise impacts at the Zoo, the Zoo Magnet Center, and the golf courses to a less than significant level.

d. Rationale for Finding

The Draft EIR determined that the Project's construction-related noise levels would temporarily increase the ambient noise in the vicinity of the Project above the significance

threshold levels. As such, the Draft EIR recommended implementation of mitigation measures to ensure that the construction noise impacts are reduced. Impacts relating to Project noise would be less than significant upon implementation of the mitigation measures.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts to noise, see Section IV.E. of the of the DEIR (Volume I) and page I-4 of the Errata to the Final EIR.

C. Transportation and Circulation

1. Construction Impacts

a. Description of Significant Effects

Construction of Phase 1 of the Project is expected to commence in 2010, with the opening of the Campus in 2013. Site grading would last approximately one month and an estimated 38 haul truck round trips per day would result during this phase. This would result in approximately four to six entering and exiting trucks over the course of an excavation period hour. The demolition phase is expected to take approximately six months and approximately nine haul truck trips per day are expected during this phase. The main construction phase is expected to last approximately 14 months. Most, if not all, of these trips would take place during the first eight hours of the permitted construction work period (7:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M.). Thus, the generation of trips during the P.M. peak period (4:00 P.M. to P.M.) would be avoided.

The number of construction workers would vary throughout Phase 1 construction, with up to approximately 60 construction workers during the main construction phase. Construction activities at the proposed Project site would generate a maximum of 120 work-related trips on a daily basis, including 60 arrivals and 60 departures. In addition, a construction traffic and parking management plan would be implemented that would ensure potential Project-related construction traffic impacts associated with the combination of haul truck traffic and employee would be less than significant.

Phase 2 construction is expected to begin in 2015 and last approximately 22 months, with the re-opening of the Campus in approximately 2016. The demolition phase is expected to take approximately two weeks, and less than one haul truck round trip per day is expected during this phase. Site grading would last approximately six weeks and an estimated 81 haul truck round trips per day would take place during this phase. This would result in approximately eight to nine entering and exiting trucks over the course of an excavation period hour. Most, if not all, of these trips would take place during the first eight hours of the permitted construction work period (7:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M.). Thus, the generation of trips during the P.M. peak period would be avoided.

The number of construction workers would vary throughout the construction periods of Phase 2 with up to approximately 50 construction workers during the main construction phase. Construction activity at the proposed Project site would generate a maximum of 100 work-related trips on a daily basis, including 50 arrivals and 50 departures. Given the level of traffic at some of the study intersections near the Project site, the combination of haul truck and employee

traffic could cause temporary adverse impacts at some intersections. However, with the implementation of a construction traffic and parking management plan, such impacts would be less than significant.

The Campus contains 368 on-site visitor-serving spaces comprised of the north lot (178 spaces, including the 30-space overflow lot) and the south lot (190 spaces). In addition, the Autry has a key-card controlled employee lot with 41 spaces behind the museum (east lot). During Phase 1, the east lot (41 spaces) and a portion of the north and south lots (59 spaces) would be used for construction activities. This would leave approximately 309 spaces open during construction. Assigning one space per member of the estimated 50-person staff, there would be at least 259 spaces available for construction employees and visitors. A new 128-space parking lot would be constructed on the southeastern portion of the site during Phase 1, and the east and overflow lots would expand to 129 and 54 spaces, respectively. Upon the completion of Phase 1, at least 311 spaces would be available. Thus, temporary parking impacts associated with construction activities during Phase 1 would be less than significant.

In order to construct the Phase 2 semi-subterranean parking facility, approximately 128 spaces in the southeastern lot would be lost. To compensate for this loss, as part of the construction traffic and parking management plan, a temporary off-site parking location would be secured. Including the off-site supply, approximately 380 total spaces would be available during construction. Once the parking structure is complete, there would be 380 permanent parking spaces upon completion of Phase 2. Thus, parking impacts associated with construction activities during Phase 2 would be less than significant.

Two Class II dedicated bike lanes run adjacent to the Project site, northbound and southbound, along Western Heritage Way. During construction, the northbound bike lane along Western Heritage Way may be closed during various construction activities, causing a temporary significant impact. Specific information regarding closures would be noted in the construction traffic and parking management plan. While the lane may be closed during construction, bicyclists would be required to ride with traffic for less than approximately 1,000 feet. Because the Project is in a park setting with road speeds of 25 mph adjacent to the Project site, the conditions would still be safe for bicyclists.

b. Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure is intended to reduce the proposed Project's traffic impacts during construction.

Mitigation Measure H-1: A construction traffic and parking management plan shall be prepared and submitted to LADOT for review and approval prior to the start of any construction work. This plan will include such elements as the designation of haul routes for construction-related trucks, the location of access to the construction site, any driveway turning movement restrictions, temporary traffic control devices or flagmen, travel time restrictions for construction-related traffic to avoid peak travel periods on selected roadways, and designated staging and parking areas for workers and equipment.

c. Finding

Incorporation of the mitigation measure identified in the Draft EIR will reduce the Project's temporary construction traffic impacts to a less than significant level.

d. Rationale for Finding

The Draft EIR concluded that Project-related transportation and circulation impacts during temporary construction activities could cause temporary adverse impacts at some intersections. However, with the implementation of a construction traffic and parking management plan, such impacts would be less than significant.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts to transportation and circulation, see Section IV.H. of the of the DEIR (Volume I).

VIII. REQUIRED CEQA FINDINGS: IMPACTS FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE

Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, including those effects that can be mitigated but not to a less than significant level. Following is a summary of the impacts associated with the Project that were concluded to be significant and unavoidable. Specifically, as identified in the Draft EIR, the following impacts are not mitigated to a less than significant level for the proposed Project: Short-Term Regional Construction-Related Air Quality impacts; Short-Term Cumulative Local and Regional Construction-Related Air Quality impacts; Cumulative Operation-Related Traffic impacts; Short-Term Cumulative Construction-Related Traffic impacts, and Short-Term Cumulative Construction-Related Noise impacts. These impacts are discussed in Sections IV.B, Air Quality, IV.E, Noise and IV.H., Transportation and Circulation, of the DEIR (Volume I).

A. Air Quality

1. Regional Construction Impacts

a. Significant Environmental Effects

Daily regional emissions during construction were forecasted by assuming a conservative estimate of construction (i.e., assuming all construction occurs at the earliest feasible date) and applying the mobile-source and fugitive dust emissions factors derived from URBEMIS 2007.[22] Details are presented in Appendix C of the Draft EIR.

[22] URBEMIS 2007 is an emissions estimation/evaluation model developed by the CARB that is based, in part, on SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook guidelines and methodologies.

The SCAQMD has developed a set of mass emissions rate look-up tables that can be used to evaluate localized impacts that may result from construction-period emissions. The look-up tables were used to initially screen and determine if further dispersion modeling is warranted. The thresholds are based on several factors including the size of the Project construction site, distance from construction site to sensitive receptor locations, and local meteorological conditions. The thresholds for Source Receptor Area (SRA) Number 7 (East San Fernando Valley), which represents conditions for the general Project vicinity, are shown in the analysis below.

Emissions for the localized construction air quality analysis were compiled using the regional construction emissions less off-site emissions (e.g., construction worker, delivery, haul truck trips). Localized emissions were then compared to the localized screening tables promulgated by the SCAQMD.[23] Thresholds for CO and NO_2 were derived by adding the incremental emissions from the Project to the peak background NO_2 and CO concentrations and by comparing the total concentration to the most stringent air quality standards. Construction PM_{10} thresholds were derived using a dispersion model to back-calculate the level of emissions necessary to exceed SCAQMD's Rule 403 concentration level (50 $\mu g/m^3$ over five hours) for requiring implementation of best management practices for control of fugitive dust.[24]

Where construction emissions exceeded the screening-level look-up table values, the localized effects from the on-site construction emissions were evaluated to determine potential pollutant concentrations at sensitive receptors. The analysis was conducted using the Industrial Source Complex (ISCST3) dispersion model, a methodology that is consistent with the procedures outlined in the USEPA *1998 Guideline on Air Quality Models* and the SCAQMD *Localized Significance Threshold Methodology for CEQA Evaluations* guidance documents. A complete listing of the construction equipment by phase, duration, emissions estimation model and dispersion model input assumptions used in this analysis are included in the emissions calculation worksheets found in Appendix C of the Draft EIR.

The conservative estimate of maximum on-site daily emissions for CO, NO_X, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$, was compiled for each of the individual construction activities within the site and compared to the applicable screening threshold based on construction site acreage and distance to closest sensitive receptor. Individual construction activities within the site that are expected to occur simultaneously and are adjacent to one another were considered collectively as well as individually. Construction NOx emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD daily significance threshold during Phase 1 construction activities. However, NOx emissions would exceed the SCAQMD daily significance threshold during Phase 2 construction activities to the extent that individual construction stages (e.g., demolition and site grading) may overlap.

---

23 SCAQMD developed thresholds based upon the size or total area of the emissions source, the ambient air quality in each source receptor area, and the distance to the sensitive receptor.

24 The equivalent concentration for developing PM_{10} or $PM_{2.5}$ LSTs is 10.4 $\mu g/m^3$, which is a 24-hour average.

With respect to the Project, it should be noted that the Autry has proposed a variance to reduce the amount of Code-required on-site parking, while still providing adequate parking to meet actual demand. If granted, the variance would have the benefit of providing additional landscaped open space (approximately one-half acre) in the place of paved surface parking when compared with the Project's parking layout as included in the Draft EIR. As such, air quality impacts associated with construction of the southern surface parking lot would be incrementally less if the parking reduction variance is granted.

b. Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures are (1) intended to implement requirements of SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) and (2) set forth a program of air pollution control strategies designed to reduce the proposed Project's air quality impacts during construction.

Mitigation Measure B-1: General contractors shall implement a fugitive dust control program pursuant to the provisions of SCAQMD Rule 403.

Mitigation Measure B-2: All construction equipment shall be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with manufacturer's specifications.

Mitigation Measure B-3: General contractors shall maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions.

Mitigation Measure B-4: Construction emissions should be phased and scheduled to avoid emissions peaks and discontinued during second-stage smog alerts.

Mitigation Measure B-5: Electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel- or gasoline-powered generators shall be used.

Mitigation Measure B-6: All construction vehicles shall be prohibited from idling in excess of ten minutes, both on- and off-site.

Mitigation Measure B-7: The Applicant shall utilize coatings and solvents that are consistent with applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations**.**

Mitigation Measure B-8: General contractors shall require on-site heavy-duty construction equipment during Phase 2 site preparation/excavation activities to meet Tier II (2001) emission standards or be equipped with diesel oxidation catalysts. The requirements of this mitigation measure shall specifically be limited to excavators, graders, dozers, loaders, and scrapers.

c. Finding

Implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR will substantially lessen any potential significant environmental effects of the Project to the fullest extent feasible.

Every feasible mitigation measure has been adopted into the Project. Nonetheless, the impacts cannot be reduced further through feasible mitigation and significant impacts remain. However, the City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), outweigh and override the significant unavoidable impacts.

d. Rationale for Finding

The Draft EIR determined that while construction NOx emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD daily significance threshold during Phase 1 construction activities, NOx emissions would exceed the SCAQMD daily significance threshold during Phase 2 construction activities. However, the significant unavoidable regional air quality impact that is anticipated to result from the proposed Project would occur only on a short-term basis during the final phase of the Project. As such, impacts would be temporary. Moreover, all feasible mitigation measures to reduce NOx emissions have been incorporated into the Project. With the implementation of mitigation measures, maximum daily NOx emissions during Phase 2 site grading would be reduced. However, construction NOx emissions would be significant and unavoidable during the Phase 2 construction period to the extent that individual construction stages (e.g., demolition and site grading) may overlap, even with incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with the impacts and mitigation related to air quality, see Section IV.B. of the of the DEIR (Volume I).

2. Cumulative Impacts

a. Construction Impacts

(1) Significant Environmental Effects

Of the 30 related projects that have been identified in the Draft EIR, there are a number of related projects that have not yet been built or are currently under construction. Since the Applicant has no control over the timing or sequencing of the related projects, any quantitative analysis to ascertain daily construction emissions that assumes multiple, concurrent construction projects would be entirely speculative for the majority of the related projects. For this reason, the SCAQMD's methodology to assess a project's cumulative impact differs from the cumulative impacts methodology employed elsewhere in the Draft EIR.

With respect to the Project's construction-period air quality emissions and cumulative Basin-wide conditions, the SCAQMD has developed strategies to reduce criteria pollutant emissions outlined in the AQMP pursuant to Federal Clean Air Act mandates. As such, the proposed Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 requirements, and with adopted AQMP emissions control measures. Per SCAQMD rules and mandates as well as the CEQA requirement that the Project adopt all feasible mitigation measures, these same requirements (i.e., Rule 403 compliance, the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, and compliance with adopted AQMP emissions control measures) would also be imposed on construction

projects Basin-wide, which would include each of the related projects mentioned above. Every feasible mitigation measure has therefore been required in or incorporated into the Project in order to reduce air quality impacts.

Notwithstanding, three related projects would be located within proximity of the Project site that have the potential to result in a cumulative localized impact to sensitive receptors. The Los Angeles Zoo Parking Lot Project is scheduled to be constructed in 2009, which could be concurrent with the Project's Phase 1 construction period. The Unit 2 portion of the LADWP's Lower Reach RSC Project is tentatively scheduled to be constructed between 2012 and 2014, which would overlap with the proposed Project's Phase 2 construction (scheduled between 2013 and 2014). Construction of the IRP Facilities Plan Project would extend to 2020. Construction-related impacts for the IRP Facilities Plan would primarily be localized, confined to the areas of the shaft sites (the Los Angeles Zoo Shaft Site and the Griffith Park Observatory shuttle reservations center building Shaft Site), as the pipeline would be constructed using an underground tunneling method.

Currently, there are no thresholds or methodology available for determining cumulative impacts on a localized level. However, since the proposed Project and the three related projects are in proximity to one another, Project-level thresholds were used as a reference level. As presented in Table 5 of the DEIR, Project-level construction emissions are approximately 50 percent below the localized PM_{10} threshold. Given the proximity of the related projects and that they would disturb a large area or involve substantial earth moving activities, it can be ascertained that the combined impacts would likely exceed the localized significance threshold for PM_{10}. As such, cumulative impacts to air quality during the proposed Project construction would also be significant and unavoidable for regional and localized air quality impacts.

(2) Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures listed above are (1) intended to implement requirements of SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) and (2) set forth a program of air pollution control strategies designed to reduce the proposed Project's air quality impacts during construction.

(3) Finding

Implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR will substantially lessen any potential significant environmental effects of the Project to the fullest extent feasible. Every feasible mitigation measure has been adopted into the Project. Nonetheless, the impacts cannot be reduced further through feasible mitigation and significant impacts remain. However, the City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), outweigh and override the significant unavoidable impacts.

(4) Rationale for Finding

The Draft EIR determined that should the following related projects be constructed concurrent with the proposed Project, cumulative local and regional air quality impacts could result: Los Angeles Zoo Parking Lot, Integrated Resources Program, and Lower Reach River

Supply Conduit Project (identified in the Draft EIR as related projects 3a, 3b, and 3c, respectively). However, the significant unavoidable impact that would result would occur only on a short-term basis. As such, impacts would be temporary. Moreover, all feasible mitigation measures to reduce regional and localized emissions have been incorporated into the Project. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce construction emissions for all pollutants. Even with the implementation of mitigation measures, however, cumulative construction emissions would be significant and unavoidable to the extent that the three related projects are constructed at the same time as the proposed Project.

(5) Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with the impacts and mitigation related to air quality, see Section IV.B. of the of the DEIR (Volume I).

B. Noise

1. Cumulative Impacts

a. Construction Impacts

(1) Significant Environmental Effects

There are three related projects, related project 3a, Los Angeles Zoo Parking Lot's Demonstration on Environmental Sustainability Project, related project 3b, IRP Facilities Plan, and related project 3c, LADWP's Lower Reach River Supply Conduit (RSC) Project, that are located within 500 feet of the Project site, which have the potential to contribute to cumulative noise impacts.

Noise from construction activities would only have the potential of impacting areas immediately adjacent to the proposed Project. As described above, the three nearest related projects are located within 500 feet from the Project site. All of the other projects are located at a sufficient distance (over 2,200 feet from the Project site), which would preclude a cumulative impact associated with those related projects. The Los Angeles Zoo Parking Lot Project is scheduled to be constructed in 2009, and thus may be constructed within the Project Phase 1 construction period. The Unit 2 portion of the LADWP's Lower Reach RSC Project is tentatively scheduled to be constructed between 2012 and 2014, and thus may overlap with the Project's Phase 2 construction activities (scheduled between 2013 and 2014). Construction of the IRP Facilities Plan Project would be conducted in phases and would extend to 2020. Construction-related noise for the IRP Facilities Plan would primarily be centered in the areas of the shaft sites (the Los Angeles Zoo Shaft Site and the Griffith Park Observatory shuttle reservations center building Shaft Site), as the pipeline would be constructed using an underground tunneling method.

The potential for cumulative construction noise impacts occurs when there are concurrent construction activities associated with the use of heavy construction equipment from one or more of the related projects. Due to the potential for the Project to overlap with the construction of the related projects in the vicinity, and the relative distance between these projects, cumulative noise impacts on sensitive receptors, such as the Los Angeles Zoo and the Zoo Magnet Center, could

occur. However, the noise impacts would be temporary and implementation of mitigation measures would minimize the overall noise impacts.

(2) Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures will reduce noise impacts:

Mitigation Measure E-1: Effective temporary noise barriers shall be used to block the line-of-site between the construction equipment and the noise-sensitive receptors as follows:

- During project Phase 1 site demolition and site grading activities, provide a temporary sound barrier along the western boundary of the construction site, to reduce the construction noise to the Zoo and the Zoo Magnet Center.

- During project Phase 1 site demolition and site grading activities and Phase 2 construction periods, provide a temporary sound barrier along the southern boundary of the project site, to reduce the construction noise to the golf courses.

Mitigation Measure E-2: Noise-generating construction equipment operated at the project site shall be equipped with effective noise control devices, i.e., mufflers, lagging, and/or motor enclosures. All equipment shall be properly maintained to assure that no additional noise, due to worn or improperly maintained parts, would be generated

(3) Finding

Implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR will substantially lessen any potential significant environmental effects of the Project to the fullest extent feasible. Every feasible mitigation measure has been adopted into the Project. Nonetheless, the impacts cannot be reduced further through feasible mitigation and significant impacts remain. However, the City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), outweigh and override the significant unavoidable impacts.

(4) Rationale for Finding

The Draft EIR determined that cumulative construction-related noise levels resulting from the Project and three other nearby projects could be significant if such projects were to be constructed at the same time as the proposed Project and if they were to use heavy construction equipment at the same time as the proposed Project. Due to the potential for the Project to overlap with the construction of the related projects in the vicinity, and the relative distance between these projects, cumulative noise impacts on sensitive receptors such as the Los Angeles Zoo and the Zoo Magnet Center could occur. However, such impacts would be temporary.

Moreover, implementation of the Project's proposed mitigation measures would reduce the construction noise impacts. Nonetheless, even with these mitigation measures, should the related projects be constructed concurrent with the proposed Project, significant unavoidable cumulative construction noise impacts could occur.

(5) Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with the impacts and mitigation related to noise, see Section IV.E. of the of the DEIR (Volume I).

C. Transportation and Circulation

1. Cumulative Impacts

a. Operational Impacts

(1) Significant Environmental Effects

All of the identified related projects have been considered for the purpose of assessing cumulative traffic impacts. Cumulative effects on intersection operations attributable to traffic from ambient growth and related projects have been incorporated into the Draft EIR's analysis of the future cumulative base condition. Year 2014 with cumulative base conditions demonstrates that cumulative development would result in three intersections operating at LOS E or F. Additional analysis performed for a postponed buildout year of 2016, which factored in additional ambient growth arising from the delayed buildout, did not affect this conclusion. Cumulative growth in the Project area would result in increases in traffic on street and freeway segments in the Project vicinity. Cumulative traffic impacts on intersection operations could therefore occur as a result of this cumulative development.

(2) Mitigation Measures

There are no feasible mitigation measures to substantially reduce the anticipated cumulative traffic impacts associated with the operation of the proposed Project.

(3) Finding

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which substantially lessen the significant environmental effect of the Project upon cumulative operational traffic impacts identified in the Draft EIR. However, although such measures may reduce and possibly eliminate certain impacts, cumulative traffic impacts during Project operation would be significant and unavoidable. However, the City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), outweigh and override the significant unavoidable impacts.

(4) Rationale for Finding

No significant and unavoidable transportation and parking impacts would occur as a result of the operation of the Project, however, as discussed above, cumulative growth in the Project area, inclusive of the proposed Project, would result in increases in traffic on street and freeway segments in the Project vicinity. Since no guarantee exists that mitigation measures would be implemented with the identified related projects, it is conservatively concluded that cumulative development would yield a significant cumulative traffic impact on intersection operations. The Project includes a mitigation measure to address traffic and access impacts during construction. In addition, the Transportation Management Plan, Appendix 4 of the Final EIR, would encourage carpoolers, provide a transit information kiosk, and enhanced website to keep the public informed about access and parking to the Griffith Park Campus. Implementation of these measures would reduce traffic and access impacts, should the nearby related projects be constructed at the same time as the proposed Project. Nevertheless, the Draft EIR conservatively concludes that cumulative development would yield a significant and unavoidable traffic impact on intersection operations to the extent that the three related projects are constructed at the same time as the proposed Project.

(5) Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with the impacts and mitigation related to transportation and circulation, see Section IV.H. of the DEIR (Volume I).

b. Construction Impacts

(1) Significant Environmental Effects

Three neighboring related projects require further qualitative discussion because of their proximity to the Project site and their construction schedules. The Los Angeles Zoo Parking Lot Project, or related project 3a as identified in the Draft EIR, is scheduled for construction in 2009 and may occur during construction of Phase 1 of the proposed Project. This related project is not expected to impact the street network because the construction area would be kept on-site. Additional trips associated with the construction of the parking lot project would be temporary. A second related project (related project number 3c), Unit 2 of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power's Lower Reach River Supply Conduit (RSC) Project, is tentatively scheduled between 2012 and 2014, during construction of Phase 2 of the proposed Project. The third project (related project number 3b), the Integrated Resources Program Facilities Plan, would extend construction until 2020. Construction for this project would be primarily at the shaft sites at the Los Angeles Zoo and Griffith Park Observatory shuttle reservations center, which are connected by an underground pipeline. These three projects could impact traffic and both vehicular and bicycle access during Project construction activities. The RSC Project is expected to include lane closures and reduced intersection capacity during construction, as the pipeline will be laid beneath the street. Thus, should nearby related projects occur at the same time as the proposed Project, cumulative construction-related traffic and access impacts, although temporary, could be significant.

(2) Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure would reduce the proposed Project's traffic impacts.

Mitigation Measure H-1: A construction traffic and parking management plan shall be prepared and submitted to LADOT for review and approval prior to the start of any construction work. This plan will include such elements as the designation of haul routes for construction-related trucks, the location of access to the construction site, any driveway turning movement restrictions, temporary traffic control devices or flagmen, travel time restrictions for construction-related traffic to avoid peak travel periods on selected roadways, and designated staging and parking areas for workers and equipment.

(3) Finding

Implementation of Mitigaiton Measure H-1 will substantially lessen any potential significant environmental effects of the Project to the fullest extent feasible. Every feasible mitigation measure has been adopted into the Project. Nonetheless, the impacts cannot be reduced further through feasible mitigation and significant impacts remain. However, the City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations identified in these Findings (Statement of Overriding Considerations), outweigh and override the significant unavoidable impacts.

(4) Rationale for Finding

The Draft EIR determined that cumulative construction traffic and access impacts could occur should three nearby related projects be constructed at the same time as the proposed Project. However, such impacts would be temporary. In addition, the Project includes a proposed mitigation measure to address cumulative construction traffic and access impacts, should the nearby infrastructure-related projects be constructed at the same time as the proposed Project. It is also likely that related projects contributing to cumulative impacts would be required on an individual basis to mitigate potentially significant traffic impacts to the extent feasible. However, no guarantee exists that mitigation measures would be implemented with the identified related projects. Thus, should nearby projects occur at the same time as the proposed Project, cumulative construction-related traffic and access impacts could be significant.

(5) Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts and mitigation related to transportation and circulation, see Section IV.H. of the DEIR (Volume I).

IX. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

A. Project Objectives

An important consideration in the analysis of alternatives to the proposed Project is the degree to which such alternatives would achieve the objectives of the proposed Project. To facilitate this comparison, the objectives of the proposed Project are listed in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR. As stated therein, the underlying purpose of the Project is as follows:

> Engaging all peoples in the inclusive stories of the American West; expanding and modernizing the Griffith Park Campus; and creating an accessible, enlightening, inspiring, innovative and scholarly Campus to provide a deeper understanding of the art, history and cultures of the American West.

This underlying purpose would be met through achievement of numerous objectives. As listed in the Draft EIR, the objectives are grouped into three categories: (1) Mission Objectives; (2) Program Objectives; and (3) Design Objectives.

B. Alternatives Considered but Rejected

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), an EIR should identify any alternatives that were considered for analysis but rejected as infeasible and briefly explain the reasons for their rejection. According to the CEQA Guidelines, among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration is the alternative's failure to meet most of the basic Project objectives, the alternative's infeasibility, or the alternative's inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. Alternatives that have been considered and rejected are discussed below.

The first alternative that was identified, but subsequently rejected from further analysis, included an alternative use mix. Under this alternative, the mix of uses developed within the Project site would be varied. For example, the Project might include an expanded amount of retail space and an increased educational component, while reducing the amount of exhibit space. Altering the use mix would not necessarily change the resulting impacts of the Project, and would be less supportive of the Project objectives which are best met through the particular use mix selected for the Project.

A second rejected alternative included an alternative Project design that would keep the Campus Building intact by expanding the Campus with new structures on the Project site. For example, new exhibit space would be provided in a new stand-alone structure on the South Lawn, or the existing theatre would be used for exhibit space, with construction of a new theater on the South Lawn. Such a redesign of the Project would likely create new obstacles to providing the Project's facilities and parking in a manner that results in the most attractive and cohesive site design/usage.

Additional alternatives that were considered and rejected included those that involve storage of a substantial part of the Autry's collections at an off-site location as well as decentralization of the various uses proposed within the Griffith Park Campus. The underlying purpose of the Project is to expand and modernize the Griffith Park Campus to create an accessible, enlightening, inspiring, innovative and scholarly Campus and to provide a deeper understanding of the art, history and cultures of the American West. Key to this purpose are the objectives designed to create synergies between the Autry National Center's display, interpretation, conservation and education roles, as well as the objectives designed to create a research environment that is supportive of artifact history and archival history, to stimulate the "convergence" dialogue among researchers, curators and the public, and to develop interpretive programs that demonstrate the interconnected stories of Native Americans and new arrivals from

around the world. Other primary objectives of the Project that are intended to implement the underlying purpose of the Project include the objective to provide public access to larger segments of the collection and the objective to create a "museum-inside-out" design with visible collections and staff areas to reveal the dynamic inner workings of the museum functions and place the greatest amount of the collection on display. Alternatives that include storage of a substantial part of the Autry's collections at an off-site location and/or decentralization of the various uses proposed within the Griffith Park Campus would be directly counter to the underlying purpose and key objectives of the Project.

Placement of an above grade parking structure to the east of the Campus Building within the area used for employee parking and deliveries was also considered but rejected for a host of reasons. The area to the east of the Campus Building is a secure area that is also used for unloading and loading of collections and related materials. Thus, placement of a parking facility for visitors in this area would compromise the security of the area and would be inconsistent with the objective to ensure that a secure area is provided for the collections. In addition, use of this area for visitor parking would also not meet the Project objective to provide an enhanced entryway that is visible to visitors since the public entrance to the building would not be visible from much of the parking area to the east.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2), consideration was given to locating the Project at alternative locations. Specifically, as the Autry National Center also operates the Arroyo Campus in the Mount Washington area of Los Angeles, the Arroyo Campus has been given consideration as an alternative site for expansion of some of the Project uses. Consideration was also given to relocating the entire Griffith Park Campus building area, including the Project's additional 129,000 gross square feet of development, to the Arroyo Campus. However, due to physical constraints, the Arroyo Campus does not lend itself to development of the building area that would result upon completion of the proposed Project within Griffith Park. Further, the physical constraints of the Arroyo Campus would also not readily accommodate the 129,000 gross square foot expansion proposed for the Project. Thus, based on the substantially greater environmental impacts that would result, both of these scenarios were rejected from further analysis.

Relocation of the Project to other sites not operated by the Autry National Center would not be feasible. Specifically, the Project's goal is to remodel and enhance the existing Campus building, which is architecturally designed to be suitable for museum purposes. Due to the unique design and architectural requirements involved in housing the collection, relocating the Project to another site would be infeasible. Relatedly, the cost of acquiring a new site and constructing an entirely new building and associated infrastructure would be so severe as to render it impractical to proceed with the Project. Further, the current site is ideally suited for the Project's visitor-serving objectives, as it is located on a relatively flat, developed site in a regional visitor facility with immediate freeway access. The possibility of finding an equally suitable site would be remote, and an alternative outside of Griffith Park would also be inconsistent with the 1978 Griffith Park Master Plan and would not benefit the City's citizens to the same extent as the current location. In addition, construction of the Project at an alternative site would most likely result in greater impacts than Project development at the existing location. Specifically, the only significant Project-related impact occurring at the Project site is a short-term air quality impact associated with grading and use of construction equipment. An entirely

new development at an alternative site would require a far greater construction program than required at the existing site, thus resulting in greater construction impacts associated with air quality, traffic, and noise. Further, operational impacts would be greater with regard to traffic as an entirely new use would be interjected into an area that previously would not have that use. In addition, depending on existing conditions, including surrounding/sensitive uses, impacts associated with aesthetics and noise could possibly be substantially increased when compared with the proposed expansion of the Griffith Park Campus.

C. Project Alternatives

In addition to the proposed Project, the Draft EIR evaluated a reasonable range of five alternatives to the proposed Project. These alternatives are:

Alternative A: No Project

Alternative B: Reduced Program

Alternative C: Above Ground Parking

Alternative D: Off-site Parking

Alternative E: Alternative Site – Expansion at the Arroyo Campus

In accordance with CEQA requirements, the alternatives to the Project include a "No Project" alternative and alternatives capable of eliminating the significant adverse impacts of the proposed Project. These alternatives and their impacts, which are summarized below, are more fully described in Section V. of the Draft EIR.

1. Alternative A — No Project Alternative

a. Description of Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, a new Project would not be approved and no new development would occur within the Project site. The physical conditions of the Griffith Park Campus would remain as they are today. No new buildings would be constructed, none of the existing facilities would be expanded or improved, no change would occur to the existing parking areas, and the existing buildings would continue to function as they currently do, with no increase in size or function.

b. Impact Summary of Alternative A

Implementation of the No Project Alternative would not result in new environmental impacts, and overall would result in a reduced level of impact (i.e., no impact) when compared to the proposed Project in all areas except historic resources. Impacts on historic resources would be similar to the proposed Project (i.e., no impacts under Alternative A or the Project). The significant and unavoidable impact (i.e., regional air quality emissions during construction) associated with the proposed Project would also be avoided under this alternative.

c. Finding

The No Project Alternative would eliminate the proposed Project's significant air quality impact, and would further reduce the overall impact profile across the environmental topics evaluated. Therefore, the No Project Alternative is considered environmentally superior to the proposed Project. However, this alternative does not meet the objectives of the Project. The City finds that this alternative is infeasible for the reasons stated, and therefore, is rejected.

d. Rationale for Finding

The No Project Alternative would not meet any of the Project's objectives, nor would it meet the underlying intent of creating an expanded and modernized Griffith Park Campus that provides visitors with a deeper understanding of the art, history, and cultures of the American West. The alternative would not provide expanded exhibition, storage, collection management, and educational research facilities. The alternative also would not assist in enhancing the visitor experience and the Griffith Park Campus as a visitor destination.

Under the No Project Alternative, the Project's goals of providing greater public access to larger segments of the collection, and enhancing the operational program with improved entertainment, retail, and café facilities, would not be met. Broader programmatic objectives such as creating an enhanced research environment would also not be met. The alternative would not provide specific improvements such as new exhibition spaces with the appropriate light, temperature and humidity controls for the protection of artifacts. Further, Project objectives related to the needed upgrades to the building, infrastructure, and parking would not be met.

The No Project Alternative would also not provide a modernized design that celebrates the convergence of the cultures that shape the American West in Griffith Park. A new design that better supports and enhances the Griffith Park setting would also not be provided. This alternative also would not allow the Autry National Center to create a "museum-inside-out" that reveals a greater amount of the collection, to support sustainability, and to create an enhanced visitor entryway would also not be met under this alternative.

Further, unlike the Project, the No Project Alternative would not achieve numerous General Plan Framework and Hollywood Community Plan objectives and policies. The alternative would not further the Open Space and Conservation goal of the General Plan Framework, including Framework Objective 3.1 to support the needs of the City's existing and future residents and visitors. Nor would the alternative support the Hollywood Community Plan Policy 3, which indicates that existing sites and facilities should be upgraded through site improvements, rehabilitation, and reuse of structures. Therefore, the City finds that this alternative is infeasible and rejects this alternative for the reasons stated above.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of Alternative A, see Section V.A. of the DEIR (Volume I).

2. Alternative B — Reduced Program

a. Description of Alternative

The Reduced Program Alternative would reduce the Project's density of development within the site by reducing the programmatic functions within the Project site. Specifically, under this Alternative, the Project would not include construction of the Phase 2 Institute Building with semi-subterranean parking below. Thus, without the Phase 2 Institute Building, the Project's increase in the educational/research functions of the Autry National Center would not occur at the Griffith Park Campus. Further, the additional space sought for storage and collections management would be severely restricted as such space would be reduced by approximately 29,019 square feet from the amount included in the proposed Project. Overall, the Reduced Program would include a total of 237,928 square feet of space upon completion, 50,000 square feet less than the proposed Project.

b. Impact Summary of Alternative B

Implementation of the Reduced Program Alternative would result in similar (i.e., less than significant) or less (i.e., no impact) impacts for all environmental factors analyzed as compared to the proposed Project, with the exception of consistency with applicable land use plans. Impacts on light and glare, shade and shadow, toxic air contaminants, odors, consistency with regulatory air quality policies, hydrology/water quality, land use compatibility, operational noise, parking, and pedestrian/bicycle safety would be similar to the proposed Project (i.e., less than significant under Alternative B and the Project). Impacts on historic resources would also be similar to the Project (i.e., no impact under either scenario). Impacts on visual character, views, air quality during construction, local and regional operational emissions, archeological resources, public services – fire, intersection operations, regional facilities, transit, and site access would be less than the Project (i.e., impacts would be less than significant under either Alternative B or the Project, but of lesser magnitude under Alternative B). Impacts on paleontological resources, construction noise, and traffic during construction would also be less (i.e., impacts would be less than significant with mitigation under either Alternative B or the Project, but of lesser magnitude under Alternative B). In addition, the significant and unavoidable air quality impact during construction would be reduced to a less than significant level.

c. Finding

The Reduced Program Alternative would produce an overall impact profile that would be less than that of the proposed Project. However, this alternative would not meet many of the Project's objectives. The City finds that this alternative is infeasible for the reasons stated, and therefore, is rejected.

d. Rationale for Finding

The Reduced Program Alternative would not allow the Autry National Center to meet many of the Project's objectives to the same extent as the proposed Project. Specifically, the Reduced Program Alternative would not provide the educational research facilities, storage, and collection management facilities necessary to meet future needs. Further, it would not contribute

to fully realizing the Project's intended synergy between the Autry National Center's display, interpretation, conservation and education roles, whereby these functions converge into a greater experience beyond that which occurs when provided separately. Without the full development program, contributions to the Project's mission to enhance the visitor experience, to enhance the Griffith Park Campus as a visitor destination, and to enhance the economic sustainability of the Autry National Center would not be fully attained.

The achievement of Program objectives would also be limited in comparison to the Project. The Autry National Center would be limited in its ability to fully provide needed space for the storage and management of its collections. It would not have sufficient space to provide the same level of research and education functions. In addition, the Reduced Program Alternative would not fulfill the Project's objective to bring the museum collections, library holdings and Institute for the Study of the American West to the same facility. The Reduced Program Alternative would also not fulfill the objective to stimulate a convergence dialogue among researchers, curators, and the public.

Moreover, the Reduced Program Alternative does not achieve the policies of several land use plans including the Los Angeles General Plan Framework Element, the Hollywood Community Plan, and 1978 Griffith Park Master Plan. Specifically, the Reduced Program Alternative does not further the policy of the Hollywood Community Plan to develop and expand existing sites and facilities within Griffith Park to the same extent that the proposed Project would. Nor would the Reduced Program Alternative achieve consistency with the Open Space and Conservation goals of the General Plan Framework, including the objective to "accommodate a diversity of uses that support the needs of the City's existing and future residents, businesses, and visitors." Because the Reduced Program Alternative does not include the Phase 2 Institute Building, its ability to provide greater educational services for visitors and scholars is limited as compared to the proposed Project. Nor does the Reduced Program Alternative further the goals of the 1978 Griffith Park Master Plan to improve the cultural and entertainment aspects of Griffith Park. Unlike the Reduced Program Alternative, the proposed Project's design includes the Phase 2 Institute Building, which supports new and expanded educational and cultural purposes. Therefore, the City finds that this alternative is infeasible and rejects this alternative for the reasons stated above.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative B, see Section V.B. of the DEIR (Volume I).

3. Alternative C — Above Ground Parking

a. Description of the Alternative

Under this alternative, an above ground parking structure would be developed in lieu of the Phase 2 two-level semi-subterranean parking structure that would be located below the Phase 2 Institute Building. The above ground structure would include two parking levels containing approximately 113 parking spaces that would be located above the surface parking area developed within the southern portion of the site as part of Phase 1. The new above ground

parking structure would be approximately 20 feet in height and would be comprised of an approximately 20,000 square foot footprint. Other than the varied parking arrangement, this alternative would provide a project that would be identical to the proposed Project with regard to the facilities provided, adding up to 79,000 gross square feet of new area in Phase 1 and 50,000 square feet of new area in Phase 2, for a total Project area of approximately 287,928 square feet. The expanded building areas would be developed in the same locations proposed by the Project. However, the Phase 2 Institute Building would be located above a single level of parking that would generally be at-grade in lieu of the two levels of parking proposed by the Project. In addition, access under this alternative would also be similar to that of the proposed Project.

b. Impact Summary of Alternative C

The Above Ground Parking Alternative would result in similar (less than significant) environmental impacts for most areas as compared to the proposed Project. Impacts on shade and shadow, operational air quality, hydrology/water quality, consistency with land use plans, operational noise, public services – fire, intersection operations, regional facilities, transit, site access, parking, and pedestrian/bicycle safety would be similar and less than significant, like the proposed Project. There would be no impacts on historical resources, like the proposed Project.

Impacts on local emissions during construction, paleontological resources, archeological resources, construction noise, and construction traffic would be less than the proposed Project (i.e., impacts would be less than significant in these areas under either Alternative C or the Project, but of lesser magnitude under Alternative C).

The impacts of the Above Ground Parking Alternative would be greater when compared to the Project with respect to visual character, views, light and glare, and land use compatibility (i.e., impacts would be less than significant in these areas under Alternative C or the Project, but of greater magnitude under Alternative C).

In addition, the significant and unavoidable air quality impact during construction would be reduced to a less than significant level under the Above Ground Parking Alternative.

c. Finding

The Above Ground Parking Alternative results in generally similar impacts as compared to the Project with the exception of the Project's significant construction impact on air quality, which would be reduced to a less than significant level. However, long-term impacts regarding aesthetics and land use compatibility would be incrementally increased. The Above Ground Parking Alternative would therefore not be an environmentally superior alternative to the Project. The City finds that this alternative is infeasible for the reasons stated, and therefore, is rejected.

d. Rationale for Finding

Overall, under the Above Ground Parking Alternative, most of the objectives established for the Project would be attained, though some would not be attained to the same extent as under the Project. Specifically, the alternative would not meet objectives that allow the Autry National

Center to enhance the character of the site to the same extent as the Project. Construction of an above ground parking structure would create more visible building mass and would therefore not meet the objective of enhancing the Project's relationship with Griffith Park to the extent the Project would. This Alternative also would not achieve the 1978 Griffith Park Master Plan and Hollywood Community Plan objectives related to site design compatibility with the park setting of Griffith Park. The incremental increase in long-term operational impacts on aesthetics would also be avoided under the Project, as the proposed Project includes a semi-subterranean parking facility that would generally not be visible from areas of the Park to the west. Therefore, the City finds that this alternative is infeasible and rejects this alternative for the reasons stated above.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative C, please see Section V.C. of the DEIR (Volume I).

4. Alternative D — Off-Site Parking

a. Description of Alternative

Under this Alternative, the configuration of surface parking areas would be the same as that proposed for Phase 1 of the Project. However, the Phase 2 Institute Building would be located above a single level of parking that would generally be at-grade in lieu of the two levels of semi-subterranean parking proposed by the Project. In addition, the approximately 113 spaces that were otherwise proposed by the Project to be located within the second level under the Phase 2 Institute Building would be provided off-site.

The location and nature of the off-site parking facility might vary depending on the availability of sites to accommodate the parking. There are currently surface parking areas within the Zoo parking lot to the west of the Project site and within the Griffith Park Observatory shuttle reservations center building and shuttle station lot to the southwest of the Project site. However, these surface parking areas are currently used and are often fully utilized by visitors to the Zoo and the Griffith Park Observatory. Therefore, if the additional parking were to be provided in proximity to the Griffith Park Campus, it would likely be accomplished through a parking structure. Such a structure would likely be similar in size to the one described for the Above Ground Parking Structure with a footprint of approximately 20,000 square feet. However, the structure would be somewhat lower in height as it would be comprised of only two levels of parking (The parking levels under Alternative C, Above Ground Parking Structure, would be located above a surface parking area developed under Phase 1).

If space were not available in the immediate proximity to the Project site, a more remote location would be required. Such a location could include a more distant area within Griffith Park or within a more developed area of the City of Glendale or the City of Burbank. In addition, if the remote parking were located within Griffith Park, it could be at the expense of open space within the less developed portions of the Park. Based on the specific characteristics of the site, such an off-site parking facility could be located within an at-grade surface parking area or within a parking structure comprised of up to two parking levels. However, as the distance to the

off-site parking area increases, the difficulties of managing an off-site parking location also increase, and visitors are more greatly inconvenienced. For example, directing visitors from more distant locations becomes more difficult, and the use of a shuttle transit system that would be necessary to transport visitors to the Campus becomes less practical and less efficient. Furthermore, as discussed below, the use of a shuttle system at more distant locations together with the necessity of providing regularly scheduled trips between the parking facility and the Campus would result in an increase in traffic and associated air quality emissions and noise from vehicle trips.

b. Impact Summary of Alternative D

The Off-Site Parking Alternative would result in similar or greater impacts for nearly all environmental factors as compared to the proposed Project. Impacts on views, shade and shadow, local construction emissions, toxic air contaminants, odors, consistency with regulatory air quality policies, operational noise, public services – fire, regional facilities, transit, site access, and pedestrian/bicycle safety would be similar, i.e. less than significant, like the proposed Project. Impacts on construction noise would be less than significant after mitigation, like the proposed Project. There would be no impacts on historical resources, like the proposed Project. Impacts on paleontological and archeological resources would be less than the Project (i.e., impacts would be less than significant with mitigation and less than significant, respectively, under Alternative D and the Project, but of lesser magnitude under Alternative D). The Project's significant and unavoidable regional construction air quality impact would be reduced to a less than significant level under Alternative D.

The Off-Site Parking Alternative would have greater environmental impacts than the Project with regard to visual character, light and glare, regional and local operational air emissions, hydrology/water quality, land use, intersection operations, and parking (i.e., impacts would be less than significant in these areas under Alternative D or the Project, but of greater magnitude under Alternative D). Traffic impacts during construction would also be greater under the Off-Site Parking Alternative (i.e., impacts would be less than significant after mitigation under both scenarios, but of greater magnitude under Alternative D).

c. Finding

With the Off-Site Parking Alternative, the Project's short-term regional air quality impact would be avoided; however, a range of environmental impacts would occur that would be greater than those associated with the proposed Project. Therefore, this Alternative would not be an environmentally superior alternative to the Project. Additionally, the alternative would not meet many of the Project's objectives. The City finds that this alternative is infeasible for the reasons stated, and therefore, is rejected.

d. Rationale for Finding

This alternative results in generally similar or greater environmental impacts as the Project. Additionally, the Off-Site Parking Alternative would not allow the Autry National Center to meet several Project objectives. If the off-site location would not be within walking distance to the Project site and would require the use of a shuttle system, this alternative would

not fully meet the Project's objective to establish the Griffith Park Campus as a visitor destination. Specifically, the use of a shuttle system from an off-site parking area may create a perceived inconvenience for visitors that would reduce the number of people visiting the site over time. The Off-Site Parking Alternative also would not allow the Autry National Center to enhance the existing parking facilities. Establishing parking at more remote locations would reduce rather than enhance the quality of the visitor experience.

Moreover, the Off-Site Parking Alternative would not achieve the policies of several land use plans including the Los Angeles General Plan Framework Element, the Hollywood Community Plan, and the 1978 Griffith Park Master Plan related to providing a welcoming and enjoyable experience. Relocating the Griffith Park Campus parking facilities to an off-site area would inconvenience the public and diminish the value of the museum as an important cultural and educational attraction. Accordingly, the City finds that this alternative is infeasible and rejects this alternative for the reasons stated above.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative D, please see Section V.D. of the DEIR (Volume I).

5. Alternative E — Alternative Site — Arroyo Campus Expansion

a. Description of Alternative

The Arroyo Campus is not a part of the Project. However, Alternative E is an alternative in which additional facilities would be provided at the site of the Autry National Center's Arroyo Campus located within the Mount Washington area of the City of Los Angeles. The Arroyo Campus includes the Southwest Museum Building, the Casa de Adobe, and the Braun Library. The site includes a steeply sloped hillside that extends upward in a northerly direction from the site entry on Museum Drive at the foot of the hill. In addition, the Arroyo Campus includes roughly 33,000 square feet of building area. The lower portion of the Arroyo Campus contains the Casa de Adobe as well as gardens and walk-ways spreading up the hillside to the Southwest Museum Building. The Southwest Museum Building houses galleries, a museum store, collection storage area, and staff areas and is a recognized historic resource.

Further up the site are additional facilities that were built in more recent years and that do not share the Southwest Museum Building's historic standing, including the approximately 7,000 square foot Braun Library. Still further up the hill is a large parking area, with approximately 60 to 65 parking spaces and steeper hillsides that extend to the edge of the property.

The present setting of the Arroyo Campus provides views and visibility that support the value of the Campus as a community resource. At the same, the site's setting provides challenges to development. The site's hillside limits vehicular access to one street, Museum Drive. The width of this street does not adequately provide for buses or freight deliveries. Furthermore, the steep slopes make staging of construction difficult. The site's location, unlike that of the proposed Project site, is not immediately freeway accessible, but requires traveling to it via a series of narrow neighborhood streets. However, the overall site is adjacent to the Gold Line Metro Station, which provides an opportunity for a high level of public transit accessibility. In

addition, the site setting is located in an area that is ringed by residential development on the west and north and therefore is subject to greater impacts on sensitive receptors than the proposed Project.

New development within the Arroyo Campus has been a focus of discussion in recent years, including the preparation of site plans presented by certain members of the community to provide their thoughts regarding the potential future use of the site. For purposes of analyzing an Arroyo Campus Expansion Alternative, it has been assumed that the development program would incorporate most of the recommendations in the community's proposals. Accordingly, the Alternative includes an increase in the size of the facilities from roughly 33,000 square feet to approximately 64,500 square feet. The expansion under this Alternative would roughly double the amount of space for exhibit/galleries (to 22,500 square feet), and retail uses (to 2,000 square feet); and triple the amount of space for research/education/community uses (to 21,000 square feet). This Alternative would also add approximately 5,000 square feet of new space for food services, and include an amount of space for collections management that would be roughly similar to that existing today (7,000 square feet). Approximately, 7,500 square feet of building area would be used for other miscellaneous uses, including a new theater, an amphitheater, and a hill-top restaurant.

For purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that under this Alternative the lower portion of the site would be maintained to protect the historic context of the main building. The main building would be rehabilitated in a manner protective of its historic value, and new development would be added to the north of the historic building. To the extent feasible under the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Structures, new development would be located within areas already developed with buildings and/or surface parking areas. In order to accommodate the development, the existing parking area would be excavated to a lower elevation, and widened to the west. Fill materials would be placed along the eastern side of the site, further extending its buildable area. These site modifications would create an area for expanded parking, and pads for new buildings. Further excavation into the northern hillside would be required to create pads for additional buildings. With such modifications, the site could accommodate approximately 110 parking spaces. Development would be placed in a major new facility that would extend northward from the Braun Library and over the parking area on the western side of the site; smaller buildings would be placed around the perimeter of the parking area. Structures would be one- and two stories in height.

b. Impact Summary of Alternative E

The Arroyo Campus Alternative would result in an overall increase in impacts, including potential additional significant impacts, when compared with the Project and other alternatives. Impacts related to regional operational air quality emissions, and regional facilities, would be less than the Project (i.e., impacts would be less than significant under both scenarios, but of lesser magnitude under Alternative E). Impacts on shade and shadow, toxic air contaminants, odors, consistency with regulatory air quality policies, archeological resources, consistency with land use plans, transit, and pedestrian/bicycle safety would be less than significant, similar to the proposed Project. Impacts on paleontological resources would be less than significant after mitigation, similar to the Project.

The Arroyo Campus Alternative would have greater impacts, as compared to the Project, on visual character, views, light and glare, local operational air quality emissions, hydrology/water quality, land use compatibility, operational noise, public services – fire, intersection operations, parking, and site access (i.e., impacts would be less than significant in these areas under either Alternative E or the Project, but of greater magnitude under Alternative E). Impacts on historic resources would also be greater than the Project (i.e., there would be no impacts under the Project, and impacts would be less than significant under Alternative E). Traffic impacts during construction would be less than significant with mitigation, but of greater magnitude under the Arroyo Campus Alternative. The Arroyo Campus Alternative would have the same significant and unavoidable impact during construction on regional air quality emissions as the Project, however, it would be of greater magnitude under the Arroyo Campus Alternative.

c. Finding

The Arroyo Campus Alternative would result in an overall increase in impacts, including potential additional significant impacts, when compared with the Project and other alternatives. Thus, Alternative E would not be the environmentally superior alternative under CEQA. The City finds that this alternative is infeasible for the reasons stated, and therefore, is rejected.

d. Rationale for Finding

The Arroyo Campus Expansion Alternative would result in an overall increase in impacts, including potential additional significant impacts, and would not meet several Project objectives. Specifically, under the Arroyo Campus Expansion Alternative, the Autry National Center would not be able to create a research environment that is supportive of artifact history, as well as archival history, by bringing the museum collections, library holdings, and Institute for the Study of the American West to the same facility. Therefore, the Arroyo Campus Expansion Alternative would also limit the ability to attain the objective to stimulate a convergence dialogue among researchers, curators, and the public. Other objectives intended to improve the operational program of the Autry National Center would also not be met. The Arroyo Campus Expansion Alternative would not provide sufficient space in proximity to the Autry National Center's collection to support the necessary upgrade of the standard of care. The alternative would allow greater public access to larger segments of the collection, with some improved entertainment, retail and café facilities; however, this would occur in a manner that is piecemeal to the overall Project objective, and would place a burden on potential visitors to travel to facilities in two different parts of the City to fully appreciate the Autry National Center's offerings. Furthermore, objectives regarding the needed upgrade to the facilities and infrastructure at the Griffith Park Campus would not be met.

Moreover, the Arroyo Campus Expansion Alternative would not allow the Autry National Center to enhance its relationship with the Griffith Park setting, to better integrate the indoor and outdoor spaces with outdoor educational space, or to implement the Autry National Center's "museum-inside-out" concept to reveal a greater amount of the collection as well as the dynamic inner workings of the museum functions. Development at the Arroyo Campus would also not contribute to objectives regarding synergy between the Autry National Center's display, interpretation, conservation and education roles, whereby these functions converge into a greater

experience beyond that which occurs when provided separately. In addition, the Project's objectives to enhance the visitor experience and the Griffith Park Campus as a visitor destination would not be met to the extent that they would be met under the Project.

Finally, the Arroyo Campus Expansion Alternative would result in new impacts that would hinder the alternative's ability to respect the residential character of the surrounding neighborhood. Accordingly, the City finds that this alternative is infeasible and rejects this alternative for the reasons stated above.

e. Reference

For a complete discussion of impacts associated with Alternative E, see Section V.E. of the DEIR (Volume I).

D. Environmentally Superior Alternative

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that an analysis of alternatives to a proposed project shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR. In addition, Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines states that: "If the environmentally superior alternative is the 'No Project' Alternative, then the EIR shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives."

As indicated in the above analysis, the No Project Alternative would eliminate the proposed Project's significant air quality impact, and would further reduce the overall impact profile across the environmental factors evaluated. The remaining alternatives would not achieve this level of reduction in impacts and, therefore, the No Project Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative. As the No Project Alternative has been identified as the environmentally superior alternative, in accordance with CEQA requirements, the remaining alternatives were compared to determine which of these alternatives would be environmentally superior.

Alternative B, Reduced Program, would reduce the Project's significant construction impact on air quality, and further would produce an overall impact profile that would be less than that of the proposed Project. However, this reduction would be at the expense of meeting many of the Project's objectives. Nonetheless, of the remaining alternatives, the Reduced Program Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative.

Alternative C, Above Ground Parking, would also reduce the Project's significant construction impact on air quality, and its overall impact profile would be very similar to that of the proposed Project. This Alternative would substantially meet the Project's basic objectives. However, providing a substantial portion of on-site parking in a semi-subterranean structure has allowed the Project's design to reduce the extent of the Project's impacts on aesthetics, and to provide a more attractive overall site design. This incremental reduction of the aesthetic impacts would not be achieved under the Above Ground Parking Alternative, and the alternative represents a trade-off between construction-related air-quality impacts and long-term operational impacts regarding aesthetics.

Alternative D, Off- Site Parking, would eliminate the Project's significant short-term regional air quality impact associated with regional construction emissions, but would present environmental impacts at alternative sites that would be greater than those associated with the proposed Project.

Finally, Alternative E, the Arroyo Campus Alternative, would result in an overall increase in impacts, including potential additional significant impacts, when compared with the Project and other alternatives. Thus, such an alternative would not be the environmentally superior alternative under CEQA.

X. FINDINGS REGARDING OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

A. Potential Secondary Effects

Section 15126.4(a)(1)(D) of the state CEQA Guidelines requires mitigation measures to be discussed in less detail than the significant effects of the proposed Project if the mitigation measure(s) cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the proposed Project. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, proposed Project mitigation measures that could cause potential impacts were evaluated. The following provides a discussion of the potential secondary environmental effects that could occur as a result of implementing Project mitigation measures.

1. Aesthetics

No mitigation measures related to Aesthetics would be required for the construction and operation of the Project. With implementation of the Project design features and adherence to the applicable regulations, impacts of the Project would be reduced to less than significant levels. No mitigation measures are required and, therefore, no potential significant secondary effects would occur.

For a complete discussion of Aesthetics, see Section IV.A. of the DEIR (Volume I).

2. Air Quality

In accordance with SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) and to set forth a program of air pollution control strategies, mitigation measures have been included to reduce the proposed Project's air quality impacts. Specifically, implementation of Mitigation Measure B-1 would ensure that general contractors would implement a fugitive dust control program pursuant to the provisions of SCAQMD Rule 403. Mitigation Measure B-2 requires that all construction equipment be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. Mitigation Measure B-3 requires that the general contractors maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions. Mitigation Measure B-4 requires that construction emissions should be phased and scheduled to avoid emissions peaks and discontinued during second-stage smog alerts. Mitigation Measure B-5 requires that electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel- or gasoline-powered generators be used. Mitigation Measure B-6 prohibits all construction vehicles from idling in excess of ten minutes, both on- and off-site. Mitigation Measure B-7 would ensure that the Applicant would utilize coatings and solvents that are consistent with applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations.

Mitigation Measure B-8 would ensure that general contractors require on-site heavy-duty construction equipment during Phase 2 site preparation/excavation activities to meet Tier II (2001) emissions standards or be equipped with diesel oxidation catalysts. The requirements of this mitigation measure shall specifically be limited to excavators, graders, dozers, loaders, and scrapers. Implementation of the mitigation measures described above would reduce construction emissions for all pollutants. Because these measures represent procedural actions, these measures would not result in changes to the physical environment. Therefore, no significant secondary effects would occur.

For a complete discussion of Air Quality, see Section IV.B. of the DEIR (Volume I).

3. Biological Resources

As identified in the Initial Study, attached as Appendix A in Volume II of the Draft EIR, any trees on the Project site that are affected by the City's Protected Tree Ordinance – specifically, naturally existing and not planted trees – must be protected or properly compensated for if the Project requires their removal. Specifically, this Ordinance requires any protected tree that is removed shall be replaced within the Project site by at least two trees of a protected species (2:1 basis). No trees on the Project site are considered protected specimens became they were planted. However, the Autry intends to replace all trees that are impacted during construction as a result of the Project. Construction work that would potentially impact any protected trees would be subject to supervision of and inspection by a tree expert defined by the City of Los Angeles Protected Tree Ordinance. Furthermore, during construction, the construction supervisor would be required to ensure that all construction workers are fully informed of the tree protection practices and that construction fencing would be erected to delineate the tree protection area. Implementation of these mitigation measures would ensure that any potential impacts to protected trees would be reduced to less than significant levels. Furthermore, these mitigation measures would not result in additional physical changes to the environment. Therefore, no significant secondary effects would occur.

4. Cultural Resources

As discussed in Section IV.C., Cultural Resources, of the Draft EIR, mitigation measures have been included to ensure that potential impacts associated with cultural resources would be less than significant. For example, Mitigation Measure C-1 requires that a qualified archaeologist be retained to review grading plans and geotechnical information and prepare a monitoring plan for all ground-disturbing activities in previously undisturbed sediments. Mitigation Measure C-2 contains instructions in the event that human remains are unearthed unexpectedly during ground-disturbing activities. Mitigation Measure C-3 requires that a qualified paleontologist be retained to perform inspections of excavation and grading activities that would occur within the Older Quaternary deposits below the original ground surface, and provides requirements in the event that fossils are unearthed during inspections. These mitigation measures would not result in physical changes to the environment that would create significant secondary effects.

5. Geology/ Soils

As discussed in the Initial Study, attached as Appendix A in Volume II of the Draft EIR, the potential for soil erosion to occur within the areas of the Project site is very limited. However, as a precautionary measure, mitigation measures were included to ensure that impacts associated with erosion would be less than significant. The mitigation measures require that the Applicant comply with the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) and the associated BMPs to ensure that soil erosion is reduced to the maximum extent feasible. In addition, the Applicant is also required to comply with Chapter IX, Division 70 of the LAMC, which addresses grading, excavations, and fills. With implementation of these mitigation measures, soil erosion impacts during construction and the operational life of the Project would be less than significant. These mitigation measures would not result in physical changes that would create significant secondary environmental effects.

6. Hydrology

As discussed in Section IV.D., Hydrology, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would be subject to the NPDES requirements as set forth in the Clean Water Act, including preparation of a SWPPP and compliance with SUSMP requirements. Compliance with these requirements would ensure that impacts to hydrology and surface water quality are reduced to less than significant levels. As the proposed Project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts to hydrology and surface water quality, no mitigation measures would be required and no significant secondary effects would occur.

7. Land Use

As analyzed in Section IV.E., Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the Project would generally be consistent with the existing regulatory requirements and relevant land use polices. In addition, the Project would not disrupt or divide an established community. Thus, no mitigation measures are required and no significant secondary effects would occur.

8. Noise

Since Project construction has the potential to result in significant short-term noise impacts at the nearby Zoo and Zoo Magnet Center during Phase 1 construction activities, Mitigation Measure E-1 requires that effective temporary noise barriers be erected between the construction equipment and the noise-sensitive receptors. Specifically, during site demolition and grading, a temporary sound barrier is required to be provided along the western boundary of the construction site. Mitigation Measure E-2 requires that noise-generating construction equipment which operate at the Project site be equipped with effective noise control devices such as: mufflers, lagging, and/or motor enclosures. All equipment shall be properly maintained to assure that no excessive noise levels, due to worn or improperly maintained parts, would be generated. Implementation of these measures would reduce the construction noise levels at the Zoo, the Zoo Magnet Center, and the golf courses by a minimum of 10 dBA, resulting in a less than significant impact. For example, the estimated construction noise level at the golf course (northern teeing area) is 73 dBA, which would be 12 dBA above the lowest measured daytime ambient noise level of 61 dBA and would result in a significant noise impact (i.e., 5 dBA above ambient). The

proposed mitigation measures would provide a minimum 10 dBA noise reduction, which would reduce the construction noise level to 63 dBA (or 2 dBA above the ambient). Therefore, the construction noise impact at the golf course would be less than significant. No significant secondary effects would occur.

For a complete discussion of Noise, see Section IV.F. of the DEIR (Volume I).

9. Public Services- Fire Protection

As indicated in Section IV.G., Public Services- Fire Protection of the DEIR, impacts to fire services would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation measures would be required and no significant secondary effects would occur.

10. Transportation and Circulation

As indicated in Section IV.H., Transportation and Circulation, of the DEIR, to address Project-related traffic and access impacts during construction activities, a mitigation measure requiring implementation of a construction traffic and parking management plan has been proposed. This plan would not result in physical changes that would create significant secondary environmental effects.

B. Growth Inducing Impacts of the Proposed Project

Section 15126.2(d) of the state CEQA Guidelines requires that growth-inducing impacts of a proposed Project be considered. Growth-inducing impacts are characteristics of a project that could directly or indirectly foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing in the area or region. According to the CEQA Guidelines, growth-inducing impacts can include impacts associated with the removal of obstacles to growth as well as the development of facilities that encourage and facilitate growth.

Examples of growth-inducement are the removal of obstacles to population growth, such as the expansion of a major wastewater treatment plant that would allow more development in a service area, or construction of new roads and highways that would provide access to areas that were previously inaccessible. In addition, some projects may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, such as creating the demand for goods and services not previously available in an area. Growth must not be assumed as beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

The proposed Project would involve the improvement of certain portions of the Griffith Park Campus to establish the Campus as the premier interpretive site of the exhibition of the American West; to store its collections with museum standard-of-care controls and appropriate physical storage conditions; to showcase the internal workings of the Campus (*e.g.*, visible storage of collections and staff areas); to provide additional gallery and presentation areas for the public; and to enhance its research and education programs.

The expansion of the Campus would not be considered growth-inducing because it would not cause a progression of substantial population growth. Specifically, as the proposed Project would be developed in an area of Griffith Park already used for Campus purposes, new

infrastructure or an extension of the current infrastructure (*i.e.*, roads and utilities), and community service facilities (*i.e.*, police, fire, schools, and libraries) would not be expanded beyond the needs of the proposed Project. Therefore, the proposed Project would not induce off-site population growth.

C. Significant Irreversible Impacts

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c) indicates that:

"[u]ses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified."

The Project would necessarily consume limited, slowly renewable and non-renewable resources. This consumption would occur during the construction phases of the Project and would continue throughout its operational lifetime. The new development would require a commitment of resources that would include: (1) building materials; (2) fuel and operational materials/resources; and (3) the transportation of goods and people to and from the Project site. Construction of the Project would require the consumption of resources that are not replenishable or which may renew so slowly as to be considered non-renewable. These resources would include the following construction supplies: certain types of lumber and other forest products; aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt such as sand, gravel and stone; metals such as steel, copper, and lead; petrochemical construction materials such as plastics; and water. Fossil fuels such as gasoline and oil would also be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment.

The resources that would be committed during operation of the Project would be similar to those currently consumed within the City of Los Angeles and on the Project site. These would include energy resources such as electricity and natural gas, petroleum-based fuels required for vehicle-trips, fossil fuels, and water. Fossil fuels would represent the primary energy source associated with both construction and ongoing operation of the Project, and the existing, finite supplies of these natural resources would be incrementally reduced. Operation of the Project would occur in accordance with Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations, which sets forth conservation practices that would limit the amount of energy consumed by the Project. In addition, the Project would be subject to energy efficient planning and construction guidelines as set forth by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, LEEDs aspects that address energy conservation have been incorporated into the Project. However, the energy requirements associated within the Project would, nonetheless, represent a long-term commitment of essentially non-renewable resources.

The limited use of potentially hazardous materials typical of educational facilities, including cleaning solvents, pesticides for landscaping, and chemicals used for photography, science, and pottery classes, would continue to be used and stored on the Project site. These

materials would be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and applicable standards and regulations. Compliance with such regulations would serve to protect against a significant and irreversible environmental change resulting from the accidental release of hazardous materials.

The Project site has been used for museum-related facilities since 1988. Development of the Project represents the continuation of Campus uses on land that is already committed to such uses. Thus, such a commitment would be justified.

In sum, construction and operation of the Project would result in the irretrievable commitment of limited, slowly renewable, and nonrenewable resources, which would limit the availability of these particular resource quantities for future generations or for other uses during the life of the Project. However, continued use of such resources would be of a relatively small scale and would be consistent with regional and local growth forecasts in the area. Furthermore, the loss of such resources would not be highly accelerated as compared to existing conditions. As such, although irreversible environmental changes would result from the Project, such changes would not be considered significant.

XI. OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

1. The City of Los Angeles (the "City"), acting through the Department of Recreation and Parks, is the "Lead Agency" for the Project evaluated in the EIR. The City finds that the EIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The City finds that it has independently reviewed and analyzed the EIR for the Project, that the Draft EIR which was circulated for public review reflected its independent judgment and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City.

2. The City finds that the EIR provides objective information to assist the decision-makers and the public at large in their consideration of the environmental consequences of the Project. The public review period provided all interested jurisdictions, agencies, private organizations, and individuals the opportunity to submit comments regarding the Draft EIR. The Final EIR was prepared after the review period and responds to comments made during the public review period.

3. The City evaluated comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the Draft EIR. In accordance with CEQA, the City prepared written responses describing the disposition of significant environmental issues raised. The Final EIR provides adequate, good faith and reasoned responses to the comments. The City reviewed the comments received and responses thereto and has determined that neither the comments received nor the responses to such comments add significant new information regarding environmental impacts to the Draft EIR. The Lead Agency has based its actions on full appraisal of all viewpoints, including all comments received up to the date of adoption of these findings, concerning the environmental impacts identified and analyzed in the EIR.

4. The EIR evaluated the following potential Project and cumulative environmental impacts: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Hydrology/Surface Water Quality, Land

Use, Noise, Public Services – Fire, and Transportation and Circulation. Additionally, the EIR considered, in separate sections, Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes, Growth Inducing Impacts and Potential Secondary Effects of the Project. The significant environmental impacts of the Project and the alternatives were also identified in the Draft and Final EIR.

5. The mitigation measures for the Project were identified in the Draft and Final EIR. The final mitigation measures are described in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP"). Each of the mitigation measures identified in the MMRP, and contained in the Final EIR, is incorporated into the Project. The City finds that the impacts of the Project have been mitigated to the extent feasible by the mitigation measures identified in the MMRP, and contained in the Final EIR.

6. Textual refinements and errata were compiled and presented to the decision-makers for review and consideration. The Lead Agency has made every effort to notify the decision-makers and the interested public/agencies of each textual change in the various documents associated with the Project review. These textual refinements arose for a variety of reasons. First, it is inevitable that draft documents would contain errors and would require clarifications and corrections. Second, textual clarifications were necessitated in order to describe refinements suggested as part of the public participation process.

7. The responses to the comments on the Draft EIR, which are contained in the Final EIR, clarify and amplify the analysis in the Draft EIR.

8. Having reviewed the information contained in the Draft and Final EIR and in the administrative record as well as the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines regarding recirculation of Draft EIRs, the City finds that there is no new significant information in the Final EIR and finds that recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required.

9. CEQA requires the Lead Agency approving a project to adopt an MMRP for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of Project approval in order to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during Project implementation. The mitigation measures included in the EIR as certified by the City and included in the MMRP as adopted by the City serves that function. The MMRP includes all of the mitigation measures identified in the EIR and adopted by the City in connection with the approval of the Project and has been designed to ensure compliance with such measures during implementation of the Project. In accordance with CEQA, the MMRP provides the means to ensure that the mitigation measures are fully enforceable. In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code § 21081.6, the City hereby adopts the MMRP.

10. In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code § 21081.6, the City hereby adopts each of the mitigation measures expressly set forth herein as conditions of approval for the Project.

11. The custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City's decision is based is the Los Angeles City Department of Recreation and Parks, 1200 W. 7th Street, Suite 700, Los Angeles CA 90017.

12. The City finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the EIR, which is incorporated herein by this reference, or is in the record of proceedings in the matter.

13. The City is certifying an EIR for, and is approving and adopting findings for, the entirety of the actions described in these Findings and in the EIR as comprising the Project. It is contemplated that there may be a variety of actions undertaken by other State and local agencies (who might be referred to as "responsible agencies" under CEQA). Because the City is the Lead Agency for the Project, the EIR is intended to be the basis for compliance with CEQA for each of the possible discretionary actions by other State and local agencies to carry out the Project.

14. The EIR is a Project EIR for purposes of environmental analysis of the Project. A Project EIR examines the environmental effects of a specific project. The EIR serves as the primary environmental compliance document for entitlement decisions regarding the Project by the City of Los Angeles and the other regulatory jurisdictions.