CHAPTER 3. REVISIONS, CLARIFICATIONS, AND CORRECTIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

3.1 PREFACE

This chapter presents revisions, clarifications, and corrections that have been made since publication of the Draft EIR. No significant changes have been made that would result in a new or substantially increased environmental impact, and no significant new information has been added that would require recirculation of the document under State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. According to State CEQA Guidelines 15088.5:

> Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.

The changes highlighted in this section merely clarify, amplify, or make minor modifications to the information provided in the Draft EIR. According to State CEQA Guidelines 15088.5, the four conditions which require an EIR to be recirculated are as follows:

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

The information and revisions included in the Final EIR do not constitute "significant" new information because no additional substantial environmental effect of the project has been identified, nor has the severity of an environmental impact been increased. There has been no disclosure of any feasible alternatives or mitigation measures that would clearly lessen the impacts of the project that the County has declined to adopt. Lastly, there has been no evidence provided which demonstrates that the Draft EIR was inadequate or conclusory in nature. Therefore, none of the conditions for recirculation of the EIR, as specified above in State CEQA Guidelines 15088.5, have been met.

The information provided in this chapter is intended only to provide a summary of the modifications to the Draft EIR, and are demonstrated below under the respective chapter, section, and page number. The actual location of each revision within Volume II of the Final EIR should be referred for a complete representation of the revisions to the Draft EIR. Paragraph reference is to the first full paragraph on the page and references to table rows do not include headers. Deletions are shown with ~~strikethrough~~ and additions are shown with <u>underline</u>.

3.2 SUMMARY OF REVISIONS CONTAINED WITHIN FINAL EIR VOLUME II

3.2.1 Chapter 1. Introduction

1. Page 1-1. The first paragraph has been revised as follows:

   This chapter provides an overview of the purpose and intended uses of Volume II of this Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the La Brea Tar Pits Master Plan (project). It explains the organization of this volume of the Final EIR and includes a description of the environmental and public review process for the project. The Final EIR includes two volumes: Volume I, which contains responses to comments received on the Draft EIR as well as information regarding the Final EIR process, and Volume II (this volume), which contains the full text and analysis of the EIR, including the incorporation of changes to the Draft EIR since its publication on September 11, 2023.

2. Page 1-3: Header 1.3 has been revised as "Final EIR Volume II Contents."

3. Page 1-3: The third paragraph has been revised as follows:

   This volume of the Final EIR is organized into the following chapters, sections, and appendices:

4. Page 1-4: The first reference to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife was removed as it was erroneously duplicated.

5. Page 1-4: The second paragraph has been revised as follows:

   The CDFW is a potential responsible agency and trustee agency, as defined by Sections 15381 and 15386, respectively, of the State CEQA Guidelines. While CDFW does not have regulatory authority over approval of the broader La Brea Tar Pits Master Plan, CDFW could have regulatory authority over project activities within the riparian habitat and/or aquatic resources in and along Oil Creek and at the Lake Pit. Similarly, USACE could also have discretionary authority over activities in these features. These considerations are further discussed under thresholds "b)" and "c)" ~~b and c~~ in Section 5.3.5 of this volume of the EIR.

6. Page 1-6: Leslie Negritto's title has been updated as "Chief Financial and Operating Officer."

7. Page 1-5: The discussion regarding review of the Draft EIR has been revised as follows:

   The Notice of Availability of ~~this~~ the Draft EIR was distributed to responsible and trustee agencies, other affected agencies, interested parties, and all parties requesting a copy of the Draft EIR in accordance with PRC Section 21092(b)(3). The Notice of Completion and Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR are distributed and posted as required by CEQA.

   ~~The public review period is 45 days. During this 45-day period, the EIR and its appendices will be available for review on the Natural History Museum's website: https://tarpits.org/reimagine. Printed copies of the documents with attached electronic appendices are also available for review during the 45-day public review period at the following locations and hours, as listed in Table 1-1.~~

   The public review period was from September 11, 2023 through October 26, 2023. During the review period, the Draft EIR and its appendices were available for review on the Natural History Museum's website: https://tarpits.org/reimagine.

   A newspaper advertisement of the NOA and Draft EIR comment period and information regarding the public meeting was also placed in the Los Angeles Times. Printed copies of the documents with attached

electronic appendices were also available for review during the public review period at the following locations and hours, as listed in Table 1-1.

8. Page 1-6: The first paragraph has been revised as follows:

On behalf of the County of Los Angeles as the Lead Agency, comments on the ~~Draft~~ EIR should be addressed to:

Leslie Negritto, Chief Financial and Operating Officer
Natural History Museums of Los Angeles County
900 Exposition Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90007
Email: lnegritto@nhm.org

Written responses to all significant environmental issues raised during the Draft EIR review period were ~~will be~~ prepared and included as part of the Final EIR and the administrative record for consideration by decision makers for the project. The County may approve the project if the EIR has been certified per State CEQA Guidelines 15090.

3.2.2 Chapter 2. Summary

1. Page 2-2: The second paragraph has been revised as follows:

The 13-acre La Brea Tar Pits site is located within the eastern and northwestern portions of the 23-acre Hancock Park (Assessor's Parcel Number [APN] 5508-016-902) at 5801 Wilshire Boulevard. The project site includes 13 acres of the eastern and northwestern portions of Hancock Park and is directly adjacent to the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA). Both LACMA and the Museum of Natural History ~~Museum~~ are responsible for managing separate and distinct portions of the 23 acres in Hancock Park, with the Museum of Natural History ~~Museum~~ responsible for the 13-acre project site and LACMA responsible for the remainder of Hancock Park to the south and west of the project boundaries. LACMA's facilities are not included in the project.

2. Page 2-3: The eight row of Table 2-1 has been revised as follows:

Landscaping Concept Plan	Establish three distinct landscaping zones encircled by a looping pedestrian path. More than 330 trees are currently on the project site. The project would require removal and replacement and/or relocation of between 150 and 200 trees. The planting strategy includes the introduction or relocation of a similar number of trees as would be removed. It is ~~preliminarily~~ estimated that up to 10 percent of the 150 to 200 trees to be removed would be relocated rather than replaced. Create three biofiltration areas for stormwater management.

3. Page 2-6: A new citation has been added to Objective 1:

1. Renovate and expand the existing museum structure to address deferred maintenance of the building envelope and systems, to meet modern seismic, electrical, building code standards, and universal design standards, and to meet sustainability goals consistent with the County's sustainability plan (County of Los Angeles 2019; County of Los Angeles 2024).

4. Page 2-16: Mitigation Measure BIO/mm-5.3 has been added to Table 2-2. Further information regarding this new mitigation measure is provided in the summary of revisions to Final EIR Volume II, Section 5.3, Biological Resources.

BIO/mm-5.3: To prevent birds from striking or colliding with the new museum building, new construction shall include deterrent features on glass barriers, windows, and building elements likely to present imperceptible barriers for avian species. These features would include ceramic frit patterns and/or other features that meet the criteria from the American Bird Conservancy for bird friendly glazing.

5. Page 2-16: Mitigation Measure BIO/mm-6.1 has been revised within Table 2-2. Further information regarding the changes to this mitigation measure is provided in the summary of revisions to Final EIR Volume II, Section 5.3, Biological Resources.

BIO/mm-6.1: For oak trees within the project site that are to be retained in their current location, prior to construction, chain-link fencing shall be installed around the protected zone of the trees (5 feet beyond the dripline, the outermost extent of the tree's branches, or 15 feet from the trunk, whichever is greater). The fencing shall remain in place throughout the entire period of construction. Any excavation or grading allowed within the protected zone shall be limited to hand tools or small hand-powered equipment. This measure shall only apply to existing trees where the limits of construction work are within 20 feet of the protected zone.

In addition, one of the following measures (BIO/mm-6.1a or BIO/mm-6.1b) shall be implemented:

a. If possible, removal, relocation, trimming, or replacement of the oak trees at the Tar Pits site shall be avoided.

b. If modification (removal, relocation, trimming, or replacement) of protected oaks is required, coordination with the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning shall occur prior to commencement of any work on-site. Any encroachment or removal requests must be reviewed by the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning for consistency with County policies and ordinances relating to oak tree protection prior to commencement of any work on-site. Although an oak tree permit is not required, measures to mitigate for impacts to oak trees shall include the following:

- Removed oak trees shall be mitigated by planting coast live oaks at a 2:1 ratio on the project site. Each replacement tree shall be at least a 15-gallon specimen.
- The replacement oaks shall be monitored for a period of 5 years, with any failures resulting in a new oak being planted and initiation of a new 5-year monitoring period for the replanted tree.

6. Page 2-21: Mitigation Measure CR-ARCH/mm-1.2 has been revised within Table 2-2. Further information regarding the changes to this mitigation measure is provided in the summary of revisions to Final EIR Volume II, Section 5.4, Cultural Resources – Archeological Resources.

CR-ARCH/mm-1.2: Prepare an Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources Management Plan (AR-TCR Management Plan).

a. Prior to commencing ground-disturbing activities, an AR-TCR Management Plan shall be prepared by the Qualified Archaeologist and submitted to the Page Museum curators and the NHMLAC Curator of Anthropology, who shall review and approve the AR-TCR Management Plan on behalf of the County. The AR-TCR Management Plan shall be prepared in conformance with Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, and PRC Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1.

b. The AR-TCR Management Plan shall include but not be limited to the following elements:

i. Historical context statement, research design, the specific types of archaeological sites likely to be encountered.

ii. Construction worker training program (described in CR-ARCH/mm-1.3).

iii. Monitoring protocol for ground-disturbing activities that includes a framework for assessing the geoarchaeological setting to determine whether sediments capable of preserving archaeological remains are present in substantial conformance with the Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources Assessment and include a protocol for identifying the conditions under which additional or reduced levels of monitoring (e.g., spot-checking) may be appropriate. The duration and timing of the monitoring shall be determined based on the rate of excavation, geoarchaeological assessment, and, if present, the quantity, type, and spatial distribution of archaeological resources identified.

iv. Limited program of archaeological presence/absence testing within naturally deposited asphaltic or non-asphaltic alluvial sediments before they are mechanically excavated. In particular, the area of the new museum, promenade, and parking lot expansion shall be further investigated. These investigations shall be conducted via a combination of archaeological units, hand tools, and mechanical trenching. The methods used to conduct the limited archaeological testing shall be coordinated with contractors to ensure that sufficient time is afforded to evaluate the significance of any identified resources, and if they are found to be significant, time to develop and implement a

treatment plan appropriate to the type of resource. The timing of any such efforts shall be conducted in localized areas so that delays to project earthwork activities are minimized while allowing archaeological materials to be identified in a manner that retains the scientific integrity of the discovery.

v. An approach to evaluate newly identified site components, if applicable, as contributors to the significance of LAN-159/H as a "historical resource" pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) or a "unique archaeological resource" pursuant to PRC 21083.2(g). If any archaeological resources are identified and are found not to be significant or do not retain integrity, then they shall be recorded to a level sufficient to document the contents and condition.

vi. Potential treatment plans to be implemented in the event a newly discovered archaeological resource is determined by the Qualified Archaeologist to contribute to the significance of the site as a historical resource based on California Register of Historical Resources criteria or a unique archaeological resource in substantial conformance with the Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources Assessment. The AR-TCR Management Plan shall require that if the treatment plans outlined therein are found to be infeasible or other alternatives are proposed, the Qualified Archaeologist shall coordinate with the project proponent and the County to amend the AR-TCR Management Plan with a formal treatment plan that would reduce impacts to the resource(s). The treatment plans stated in the AR-TCR Management Plan or prepared after the discovery of a historical resource, shall be in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f) for historical resources and Public Resources Code Sections 21083.2(b) for unique archaeological resources. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment and if it is determined avoidance is not feasible, treatment may include but not be limited to any of the following depending on the type of resource and the significance evaluation:

- Native American archaeological site components. Data recovery shall be conducted (i.e., excavation, laboratory processing and analysis) to remove the resource(s) and reduce potential impacts to less than significant where significance is determined under CRHR Criterion 4 or as a unique archaeological resources and integrity is retained. Additional treatment measures to mitigate potentially significant impacts to the component as a tribal cultural resource, which is to be carried out in consultation with the Tribal Consultants and after considering the status of the discovery as a tribal cultural resource.
- Historical archaeological site components. If a historical archaeological component of the site is present and found to retain integrity, data recovery shall be conducted (i.e., excavation, laboratory processing and analysis) to remove the resource(s) and reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

vii. Discovery and processing protocol for inadvertent discoveries of archaeological resources that are encountered when an Archaeological Monitor is not present.

viii. A process by which recovered materials will be prepared for curation at the Page Museum or the Research and Collections Department at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County ~~at the Los Angeles Exposition Park~~, as directed by Page Museum curators and collections managers, and in consultation with Tribal Consultants. The curation shall ensure their long-term preservation and allow access to interested scholars and shall be done at the expense of the County and/or the Foundation. If the materials are Native American in origin or any item of cultural patrimony, the manner of their handling and long-term curation may require additional consultation with the appropriate Native American community that shall be determined as part of a tribal consultation process to be conducted by the County who shall be responsible for the disposition of these materials.

ix. The AR-TCR Management Plan shall summarize the requirements for tribal coordination ~~during~~ in the event of an inadvertent discovery of Native American archaeological resources, including the applicable regulatory compliance measures or conditions of approval for the inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources to be carried out in concert.

7. Page 2-26 through 2-28: Mitigation Measures CR-HIST/mm-1.3 and CR-HIST/mm-1.4 have been revised within Table 2-2. Further information regarding the changes to these mitigation measures is provided in the summary of revisions to Final EIR Volume II, Section 5.5, Cultural Resources – Historical Resources.

CR-HIST/mm-1.3: ~~A Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)-like Documentation Package~~ A historic documentation package shall be prepared to document the contributing features of the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and Page Museum prior to the authorization of demolition or construction activities. The documentation package shall emulate and include elements of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) and/or the Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS). The HABS/HALS-like Documentation Package shall adhere to best professional practices promulgated by the National Park Service and shall be provided to interested parties such as the Los Angeles Conservancy and County of Los Angeles Historic Preservation Commission for review and comment. Documentation shall be in accordance with the applicable standards described in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation.

Prior to the commencement of construction activities, a historian or architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in History and/or Architectural History shall be retained to prepare HABS/HALS -like documentation for the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and Page Museum.

Required contents for the HABS/HALS-like package include the following:

- Photographs: Photographic documentation will focus on the Page Museum and, within the historic district, those contributing elements (built, landscape, hardscape, paleontological, and natural features) slated for demolition, alterations, or adjacent new construction. Photographs shall include detail shots of contributing features and components slated for demolition, with overview and context photographs for the adjacent setting. Photographs shall be taken using a professional-quality single lens reflex (SLR) digital camera with a minimum resolution of 10 megapixels. Digital photographs will be provided in electronic format.
- Descriptive and Historic Narrative: The historian or architectural historian will prepare descriptive and historic narrative of the historical resources/features slated for demolition. Physical descriptions will detail each contributing component, with accompanying photographs, and information on how the resource fits within the broader historic district during its period of significance. The historic narrative shall draw upon previously prepared studies, including the Historical Resources Technical Report prepared for the La Brea Tar Pits Master Plan, as well as the La Brea Tar Pits Inventory and Treatment Plan prepared under Mitigation Measure CR-HIST/mm-1.2. The narrative shall also include a methodology section specifying the name of researcher, date of research, and sources/archives visited, as well as a bibliography. Within the written history, statements shall be footnoted as to their sources, where appropriate.

Upon finalization of the HABS/HALS-like Documentation Package, a hard copy and digital copy shall be prepared and offered to the Seaver Center for Western History Research at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County ~~Seaver Center for Western History Research~~, University of Southern California Special Collections, and the Los Angeles Public Library.

CR-HIST/mm-1.4: A Retrospective Exhibit and Interpretive Program shall be prepared and implemented. The Retrospective Exhibit and Interpretive Project shall be prepared by a qualified historic preservation professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in History and/or Architectural History. The exhibit materials shall be drawn from previous studies including but not limited to the Inventory and Treatment Plan described in Mitigation Measure CR-HIST/mm-1.2 and the HABS/HALS-like documentation package described in Mitigation Measure CR-HIST/mm-1.3, as well as other supplemental research materials as needed.

The retrospective exhibit and interpretive program shall focus on the history of the site, the people involved in the early ownership, development, and scientific discoveries and excavations, and the events leading to its donation to the County of Los Angeles, as well as on the site's development through the end of the period of significance for the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District, 1977.

The retrospective exhibit and interpretive program may include but not be limited to exhibit materials and interpretive panels, both exterior (e.g., as a series of panels in the park), interior (e.g., as a permanent exhibit in the Page Museum or new museum building), and online (on the museum website). The exhibit and interpretive program shall be designed for maximum public accessibility.

The plan for the interpretive and commemorative program shall be detailed in an Interpretive Program Plan Memorandum to be prepared with the guidance of a qualified historic preservation professional. The retrospective exhibit and interpretive program shall be completed within three (3) years of commencement of initial construction activities. The Draft Interpretive Program Plan Memorandum shall be reviewed by interested parties such as the Los Angeles Conservancy and County of Los Angeles Historic Preservation Commission for comment.

8. Page 2-34: Mitigation Measure GEO/mm-6.2 has been revised within Table 2-2. Further information regarding the changes to this mitigation measure is provided in the summary of revisions to Final EIR Volume II, Section 5.6, Geology & Soils.

GEO/mm-6.2: Prepare a Paleontological Resources Management Plan: After finalization of the engineering, design, and grading plans for the project and prior to the start of preconstruction ground-disturbing activities, a Paleontological Resources Management Plan (PRMP) shall be prepared by the Project Paleontologist and submitted to the Page Museum curators, who shall review and approve the final PRMP on behalf of the County ~~and Natural History Museum~~. The PRMP shall define the processes and procedures for paleontological monitoring and fossil excavation based on the nature of ground-disturbing activities required for project. The PRMP shall: […]

9. Page 2-36: Mitigation Measure GEO/mm-6.4 has been revised within Table 2-2. Further information regarding the changes to this mitigation measure is provided in the summary of revisions to Final EIR Volume II, Section 5.6, Geology & Soils.

GEO/mm-6.4: Monitor for Paleontological Resources: Full-time monitoring shall be required during all ground-disturbing activities (including artificial fill or previously disturbed sediments), regardless of depth. Additionally, special considerations shall be given to the project design elements and geotechnical and soils remediation or hazard reduction recommendations, including but not limited to the paleontological screening of tar sands prior to disposal or

treatment. Procedures and protocols for paleontological monitoring and fossil salvage shall be outlined in the PRMP. Monitoring shall:

a. Be conducted by a qualified paleontological monitor who meets the standards of the SVP (2010) and shall be supervised by the Project Paleontologist, who shall coordinate with the Page Museum curators and collections managers and County officials. The Project Paleontologist may periodically inspect construction activities to recommend adjusting the level of monitoring in response to subsurface conditions; however, modifications, such as increasing, reducing, or ceasing of paleontological monitoring, or any changes of the implementation of the PRMP, should be approved by Page Museum curators and the County ~~Natural History Museum~~.

b. […]

10. Page 2-37: Mitigation Measure GEO/mm-6.5 has been revised within Table 2-2. Further information regarding the changes to this mitigation measure is provided in the summary of revisions to Final EIR Volume II, Section 5.6, Geology & Soils.

GEO/mm-6.5: Prepare a Paleontological Resources Monitoring Report: Upon conclusion of ground-disturbing activities, the Project Paleontologist overseeing the implementation of the PRMP, including paleontological monitoring and fossil salvaging, shall prepare a final monitoring report that documents the paleontological monitoring efforts for the project and describes any paleontological resources discoveries observed and/or recorded during the life of the project. The final monitoring report and any associated data pertinent to the salvaged fossil specimen(s) shall be submitted to the Page Museum and the Research and Collections Department at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County within 90 days after construction is completed. If the project is developed in phases, the final report is only necessary at the completion of the last phase to be constructed. At the discretion of the County, if there are unanticipated gaps in the phases of construction or other reasons why the County would prefer phased final reports, multiple final reports could be prepared.

11. Page 2-46: Mitigation Measure NOI/mm-1.1 has been revised within Table 2-2. Further information regarding the changes to this mitigation measure is provided in the summary of revisions to Final EIR Volume II, Section 5.11, Noise and Vibration.

NOI/mm-1.1: The following measures shall be implemented to reduce construction-related noise impacts:

a. Operation of equipment used in construction, alteration, drilling, or demolition work shall be prohibited between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., Monday through Friday; before 8:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on Saturday; and any time on Sundays or legal holidays.

b. A temporary barrier shall be erected around active construction areas. The placement and height of the barrier shall be adjusted based on the specific location of construction activities within the site, ensuring that the barriers are positioned as close as feasible to the work area and are sufficiently tall to maximize effectiveness in minimizing direct noise transmission to surrounding areas, such that a sound reduction of 10 dBA is achieved at the property lines on the east side of Curson Avenue and north side of 6th Street. Prior to the commencement of each construction phase, a phase-specific acoustic analysis shall be conducted to determine the optimal placement and configuration of noise barriers. In consultation with an acoustical engineer, the barrier configuration may be modified to address the specific conditions of phased construction, provided that the adjustments achieve an equivalent noise reduction outcome. ~~and impermeable 12-foot-high temporary barrier designed to provide a 10 dBA noise reduction, shall be erected along the eastern and northern sides of the project site boundary. This barrier shall be constructed in one of the following ways:~~

   - ~~from acoustical blankets hung over or from a supporting frame, or~~
   - ~~from commercially available acoustical panels lined with sound-absorbing material, or~~
   - ~~from common construction materials such as plywood, provided that the barrier is designed with overlapping material at the seams to ensure that no gaps exist between the panels.~~

c. […]

12. Page 2-51: Mitigation Measure TRA/mm-4.1 has been revised within Table 2-2. Further information regarding the changes to this mitigation measure is provided in the summary of revisions to Final EIR Volume II, Section 5.13, Transportation.

TRA/mm-4.1: A construction traffic management plan (CTMP) shall be developed by the contractor, approved by the County, ~~and~~ the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), Caltrans, and LA Metro, and implemented to alleviate construction period impacts. The CTMP will include, but may not be limited to, the following restrictions:

- Prohibition of construction worker parking on nearby residential streets.
- Prohibition of construction-related vehicles parking or staging on surrounding public streets.
- Prohibition of construction-related parking or staging on streets with bus service.
- Temporary pedestrian and vehicular traffic controls (i.e., flag persons) during all construction activities adjacent to public rights-of-way to improve traffic flow on public roadways.
- Safety precautions for pedestrians and bicyclists through such measures as alternate routing and protection barriers shall be implemented as appropriate.
- Scheduling of construction-related deliveries, haul trips, etc., shall occur outside the commuter peak hours to the extent feasible.
- Avoidance of construction-related deliveries, haul trips, etc. from routing along congested local and state facilities, to the extent feasible.
- Relocation and accommodation (as needed) of adjacent bus stops and access, to the extent feasible.

13. Page 2-61: Table 2-3 has been updated to indicate that the Hydrology and Water Quality impacts of the "No Project/No Build" alternative would in fact be similar to the impacts of the proposed project, rather than decreased as originally described.

14. Page 2-61 through 2-63: "Alternative 3" is now referred to as "Refined Alternative 3." Refer to Final EIR Volume II, Chapter 6, Alternatives for further information regarding this revision. This revision is also summarized in Final EIR Volume I, Section 1.3, Revised Alternative 3.

15. Page 2-62: The first paragraph has been revised as follows:

> As detailed in Chapter 6 and based strictly on an analysis of the relative environmental impacts, Alternative 1, Renovate the Page Museum Only, would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative because it would be the built alternative that minimizes the project's adverse impacts on the environment. The Foundation and the Museum of Natural History, as a departmental unit of the County, will consider the whole of the record when considering the project including, but not limited to, public comment and testimony ~~related to the size and design of the residence~~. The Foundation and the Museum of Natural History may select the project as proposed, an alternative, or a specified combination of particular elements identified in the alternatives, as the approved project.

16. Page 2-63: The second paragraph has been revised as follows:

> Refined Alternative 3, Adjust Footprint to Reduce Contact with Page Museum and Expand Central Green, would result in similar environmental impacts as the project for each issue area analyzed in this EIR, as shown in Table 2-3, except for historical resources and land use and planning. While Refined Alternative 3 would lessen certain impacts to character-defining features to both the Page Museum and the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District thereby reducing the overall severity of the impacts to historical resources, it would not avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impacts. One of the primary character-defining features of the Page Museum is its visual primacy on the grounds of the Tar Pits; the design refinements presented in the refined version of Alternative 3 would result in less of an impact to the Page Museum's visual primacy. Refined Alternative 3 would reduce impacts to the Page Museum to the extent that the building would continue to convey its historic significance and retain its eligibility as a historical resource. However, the site plan changes would continue to result in a significant and unavoidable impact to the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District. The overall severity of the significant and unavoidable impacts to the historic district would be reduced because of the separation of the new museum building from the Page Museum, the narrowing of the transition area connection between the two buildings, and the design refinements that retain more of the Page Museum's character-defining features such as the existing structural space frame, frieze, and courtyard. Similarly, the design refinements in this alternative would help to further support the land uses plans and policies applicable to the project as they relate to the protection and alternation of historical resources, but not in such a way to avoid the project's related significant and unavoidable impacts. This alternative would also result in the project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to increased regional VMT. However, Refined Alternative 3 is the alternative

that meets all project objectives by providing an adjusted museum footprint and incorporating a series of design refinements that would support the basic objectives of the project.

3.2.3 Chapter 3. Project Description

1. Page 3-4: Paragraph seven, which continues onto page 3-5, has been revised as follows:

> The County acquired Hancock Park in 1924, through a donation by George Hancock (Natural History Museums of Los Angeles County 2022). Recognizing the site as scientifically valuable, Hancock donated the site under the condition that the County would develop the park as a scientific monument known as La Brea Tar Pits. After Hancock Park was established in 1924, little in the way of formal excavation was accomplished for the next 45 years (Natural History Museums of Los Angeles County 2022). In 1969, the Rancho La Brea Project began by resuming excavation of a major deposit of fossils in Pit 91 that had been discovered in 1915. In 1960, a portion of the land within Hancock Park was dedicated to the creation, development and maintenance of the LACMA campus.[2] Over several decades, the LACMA portion of the site has been altered and undergone expansion. In 1975, philanthropist George C. Page donated funds to construct an on-site museum within the La Brea Tar Pits portion of Hancock Park. The Page Museum opened to the public in 1977.

2. Page 3-5: A new footnote has been added corresponding to the revision above:

> [2] Originally part of the Los Angeles Museum of History, Science, and Art, which opened in 1910 in Exposition Park, LACMA was established in 1961 as a separate, art-focused institution.

3. Page 3-7: A new citation has been added to Objective 1:

> 2. Renovate and expand the existing museum structure to address deferred maintenance of the building envelope and systems, to meet modern seismic, electrical, building code standards, and universal design standards, and to meet sustainability goals consistent with the County's sustainability plan (County of Los Angeles 2019; County of Los Angeles 2024).

4. Page 3-8: The eighth row of Table 3-1 has been revised, as displayed above in Chapter 2, Revision 1.

Landscaping Concept Plan	Establish three distinct landscaping zones encircled by a looping pedestrian path. More than 330 trees are currently on the project site. The project would require removal and replacement and/or relocation of between 150 and 200 trees. The planting strategy includes the introduction or relocation of a similar number of trees as would be removed. It is ~~preliminarily~~ estimated that up to 10 percent of the 150 to 200 trees to be removed would be relocated rather than replaced. Create three biofiltration areas for stormwater management.

5. Page 3-12: The following paragraph has been added after the third paragraph:

> To reduce the risk of birds striking or colliding with the building, new construction would include deterrent features on glass barriers, windows, and building elements likely to present imperceptible barriers for avian species. These features would include ceramic frit patterns and/or other features that meet the criteria from the American Bird Conservancy for bird friendly glazing.

6. Page 3-12: Paragraph six has been revised as follows:

> There would be pedestrian entrances leading into the central lobby from the Central Green and from the parking lot. The façade of the new museum building would be constructed using nonreflective materials, consistent with the exterior materials of nearby buildings, and would rely on protective coatings such as anti-graffiti coatings or scratch-resistant films to reduce the potential for vandalism. The new museum building would also include safety measures including surveillance cameras and security lighting.

7. Page 3-19: The second paragraph has been revised as follows:

> More than 330 trees are currently on the project site. The project would require removal and replacement and/or relocation of between 150 and 200 trees. The planting strategy includes the introduction or relocation of a similar number of trees as would be removed. It is ~~preliminarily~~ estimated that up to 10 percent of the 150 to 200 trees to be removed would be relocated rather than replaced. The relocated trees would be from existing locations within the project site. New plantings would be consistent with the planting and landscape concept and plant palette included in the La Brea Tar Pits Master Plan. New plantings would be selected for resilience to disease and with consideration for their ability to create shaded areas at the park. Trees that would be removed include non-native trees and/or trees that are diseased or are not in good health. Species such as the western sycamore and California buckeye would be preserved, unless they are diseased or in locations where new built features are planned (e.g., the pathway, museum expansion, and shifted parking lot on the northern side of the project site). Trees could be relocated to other locations of the 13-acre site if the trees are healthy and if it is determined through the more detailed design process that relocation is feasible. ~~It is estimated that 10 percent of the 150 to 200 trees to be removed would be relocated rather than replaced.~~

8. Page 3-24: The first and second paragraph have been removed as they were an erroneous duplication of the seventh and eighth paragraphs on page 3-23:

> ~~The proposed project includes a new school drop-off area from South Curson Avenue, adjacent to the Wilshire Gateway picnic area. This inset loading area would be 215 to 230 feet long to accommodate school buses. School buses would also be able to access the parking lot from South Curson Avenue and drop-off in the loading area in the parking lot.~~
>
> ~~Emergency vehicle access into the project site would be provided from the two site entrances off South Curson Avenue and off West 6th Street.~~

3.2.4 Chapter 4. Environmental Setting

1. Page 4-2: The third paragraph has been revised as follows:

> The project site includes 13 acres of the eastern and northwestern portions of Hancock Park and broadly encompasses what is known as La Brea Tar Pits, which includes the George C. Page Museum (Page Museum). The entirety of the 23-acre Hancock Park is enclosed with an 8- to 10-foot-high metal fence that serves to secure the site by providing full closure of Hancock Park when La Brea Tar Pits, the Page Museum, and LACMA are closed in the evenings. In 1960, a portion of the land within Hancock Park was dedicated to the creation, development and maintenance of the LACMA campus.[1] Over several decades, the LACMA portion of the site has been altered and undergone expansion. In 1975, philanthropist George C. Page donated funds to construct an on-site museum within the La Brea Tar Pits portion of Hancock Park. The Page Museum opened to the public in 1977.

2. Page 4-2: A new footnote has been added corresponding to the revision above:

> [1] Originally part of the Los Angeles Museum of History, Science, and Art, which opened in 1910 in Exposition Park, LACMA was established in 1961 as a separate, art-focused institution.

3.2.5 Chapter 5. Environmental Impact Analysis

As detailed below, revisions have been made to the following Sections of Volume II of the Final EIR: Section 5.3 Biological Resources, Section 5.13 Transportation, and Section 5.16, Mandatory Findings of Significance.

No changes have been made to the following Sections of Volume II of the Final EIR: Section 5.1, Aesthetics, Section 5.2, Air Quality, Section 5.4, Cultural Resources – Archaeological Resources, Section

5.5, Cultural Resources – Historical Resources, Section 5.6, Geology and Soils, Section 5.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 5.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section 5.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, Section 5.10, Land Use and Planning, Section 5.12, Recreation, Section 5.14, Tribal Cultural Resources, or Section 5.15, Utilities and Service Systems.

Section 5.3 Biological Resources

1. Page 5.3-5: The second and third paragraphs have been revised as follows:

> Birds were the only wildlife encountered (seen, heard, and/or flying over the site) during the field survey conducted on March 18, 2022, and all were species typical of urban areas: Anna's hummingbird (*Calypte anna*); American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*); house finch (*Haemorhous mexicanus*); dark-eyed junco (*Junco hyemalis*); bushtit (*Psaltriparus minimus*); black phoebe (*Sayornis nigricans*); and yellow-rumped warbler (*Setophaga coronata*). No records of birds in or immediately adjacent to the park are recorded in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). Over the last 10 years, citizen scientists and professional scientists on staff at the Natural History Museum have reported over 90 native bird species (and several non-native species) flying over, foraging, or otherwise detected in and around Hancock Park.
>
> No amphibians, reptiles, mammals, or indication of site use by wildlife (burrows, tracks, scat, etc.) were found during the March 18 field survey. Common urban wildlife expected to occur includes eastern fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger*), desert cottontail rabbit (*Sylvilagus audobonii*), mice, rats, and lizards. It is assumed that the hydrocarbon content in Oil Creek is too high for wildlife use; no wildlife was seen in or near this drainage. Table 5.3-2 lists the bird species observed by SWCA at the project site (2022).

2. Page 5.3-6: The first paragraph has been revised as follows:

> A query of the ~~California Natural Diversity Database (~~CNDDB~~)~~ for a 1-mile radius of the project site yielded three recent records (within 20 years) of special-status species: Southern California rufous-crowned sparrow (*Aimophila ruficeps canescens*); coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica ssp. californica*); and Nevin's barberry (*Berberis nevinii*) (CDFW 2022a). The online community science database iNaturalist (2022) reports observations of adult monarch butterflies. No birds listed as sensitive by the Los Angeles Audubon Society (2009) or other sensitive wildlife or plants were observed during the field survey conducted for the project. Table 5.3-3 and Table 5.3-4 summarize these results. The sections following the table provide an assessment of the potential for the six ~~three~~ species that were identified in the records search within the 1-mile radius of the site.

3. Page 5.3-7: A fourth and fifth row has been added to Table 5.3-4:

Yuma myotis *Eumops perotis*	G5 S4 ICUN:LC BLM:S	Common and widespread across California, generally below 8,000 feet. Preferred habitats include open forests and woodlands with sources of water providing foraging habitat. Known to roost in warm and dark sites in buildings, mines, caves, or natural crevices. Generalist invertebrate forager including moths, midges, flies, termites, ants, homopterans and caddisflies.	**Absent (roosting) – Low (foraging)** No roosting habitat is present on-site and site presents limited opportunities for foraging. The only known occurrence is documented from Natural History Museum of Los Angeles article published October 9, 2014 (Foundation 2014).

Hoary bat *Lasiurus cinereus*	G3G4 S4 ICUN:LC	Common and widespread across North America, generally below 13,200 feet. Preferred habitats for bearing young include forests and woodlands with medium to large-sized trees. Primarily feeds on moths, although various flying insects are taken.	**Absent (roosting) – Low (foraging)** No roosting habitat is present on-site and site presents limited opportunities for foraging. The only known occurrence is documented from Miguel Ordeñana, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles staff biologist, dated February 3, 2024 (Foundation 2024).

Note: Records within 1-mile radius of project site (all within U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-minute Hollywood quadrangle) and within previous 20 years (CNDDB [CDFW 2022a]; iNaturalist 2022).

Status Definitions: FC = Federal candidate; FT = Federally listed as Threatened; SSC = Species of Special Concern (CDFW); WL = Watch List (North American Bird Conservation Initiative); IUCN:LC = International Union for Conservation of Nature: Least Concern; BLM:S = Bureau of Land Management: Sensitive; S4 = State Ranking - Vulnerable (CDFW); G3 = Global Ranking – Vulnerable (CDFW); G4 = Global Ranking - Apparently Secure (CDFW); G5 = Global Ranking - Secure (CDFW) (CDFW 2022c)

4. Page 5.3-8: The first paragraph has been revised as follows:

Nevin's barberry (*Berberis nevinii*) is a plant that is both state- and federally listed as endangered. Wild plants occur on steep north-facing slopes and low-grade sandy washes in chaparral, cismontane woodland, and coastal and riparian scrub communities. ~~Because this plant is available at plant nurseries and widely planted, it can be difficult to distinguish natural from introduced plants. This species would have been observable and was not found on the project site during the site visit of March 18, 2022.~~ This plant is available at plant nurseries and widely planted. Planted specimens are included in the landscape, but no natural occurrences of Nevin's barberry were found at the project site during the site visit of March 18, 2022, and are not expected to occur.

5. Page 5.3-9: A new subsection has been added:

BAT SPECIES

Initial background database reviews did not indicate known bat presence at, or within the vicinity of the project site and no CNDDB records less than 30 years old were found within 5-miles of the site. Additionally, during the initial reconnaissance survey on March 18, 2022, no species of bats nor obvious signs indicating potential bat roosts, were detected within the project area. The project site includes open water features which may present suitable foraging habitat and nearby trees which may provide suitable roosting habitat for some bat species.

Between 2014 and 2024, Natural History Museum staff biologists have documented the presence of five bat species in the park, but their abundance and persistence are unknown. The following five species of bats have been identified: big brown bat (*Eptesicus fuscus*), canyon bat (*Parastrellus hesperus*), Mexican free-tailed bat (*Tadarida brasiliensis*), Yuma myotis (*Myotis yumanensis*), and hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus*) (Foundation 2014; Foundation 2024). Based on the habitat requirements and habits of these species, it is likely that these bats are transient foragers of the project area.

None of these species are listed under the CESA or the ESA and of the five species discussed, only the Yuma myotis and the hoary bat occur on the CDFW Special Animals List. Yuma myotis has a NatureServe Global rank of G5 (Secure; at very low risk of extinction due extensive range, abundant populations or occurrences, and little to no concern from declines or threats) and State Rank of S4 (Apparently secure; uncommon but not rare; no immediate conservation concern). The hoary bat has a NatureServe Global rank of between G3 (Vulnerable; At moderate risk of extinction due to a fairly restricted range, relatively few populations or occurrences, recent and widespread declines, threats, or other factors) and G4 (Apparently secure; at fairly low risk of extinction due to an extensive range and/or many populations or occurrences, but with possible cause for some concern as a result of local recent declines, threats, or other factors) and State Rank of S4 (Apparently secure; uncommon but not rare; no immediate conservation concern).

6. Page 5.3-13: The second header under section 5.3.2.2 has been revised as "California Fish and ~~F~~ Game Code"

7. Page 5.3-17: The third paragraph has been revised as follows:

> One candidate species for listing under the ESA ~~federal Endangered Species Act~~ ~~—~~monarch butterfly~~—~~has been recorded on the project site in iNaturalist between 2014 and 2023 ~~2019~~, including results as part of the 2017 La Brea Wildlife Survey (iNaturalist 2017). ~~No~~ The potential for other candidate, sensitive, or special-status species of flora or fauna ~~are expected~~ to occur at the project site is low or unlikely. As such, direct and indirect impacts to other sensitive wildlife species during construction (from temporary noise, dust, construction personnel, and equipment) and project operation are not anticipated because no other special-status species are present or expected to occur at the project site.

8. Page 5.3-18: The following paragraph has been added after the first paragraph:

> Bats potentially use the project area for foraging but are not known to roost in the project area and current proposed construction activities would have little to no direct impact on bat species. Potential indirect impacts to existing bat populations may be sustained from changes to the exiting habitat including those related to the removal of vegetation and changes to lighting. However, no significant change in the amount of lighting from within buildings is proposed. The new museum building would close at 5 pm, as the Page Museum closes now. Thus, no change in the timing of building illuminations would occur. In addition, only warm-white toned LEDs would be incorporated into lighting regimes during the nighttime (between dawn and dusk). Light shields that limit the light flux only to required areas and thereby avoiding as much light trespass into potential transitory pathways of the bats may be used. Lighting in areas of highest sensitivity where bats are most likely to occur (i.e., any ponding or surface water and areas of dense canopy) would be limited. For these reasons, impacts created by the proposed project would not result in a demonstrable change from existing conditions and would not be significant.

9. Page 5.3-18: The fourth paragraph has been revised as follows:

> Given the project site does not support overwintering aggregations of monarch butterflies and ~~no~~ the potential for other candidate, sensitive, or special-status species of flora or fauna is low or unlikely ~~are expected~~ to occur at the project site, operation of the project would not result in impacts, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS. Impacts during project operation would be *less than significant*.

10. Page 5.3-24 through 5.3-26: The analysis under impact question (d) "*Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?*" has been revised to include a more in-depth discussion regarding impacts to non-special status wildlife. The updated analysis also discusses potential impacts related to potential bird collisions with the new museum building.

11. Page 5.3-26 through 5.3-27: Mitigation Measure BIO/mm-5.3 has been added, as displayed above in Chapter 2, Revision 2. It should be noted that while the impact related to bird collisions would be less than significant prior to mitigation, the County recommends a mitigation measure to provide assurances that appropriate features would be integrated into new construction to reduce bird collision incidents.

BIO Impact 5	
The project could directly impact nesting birds during project construction and temporally impact nesting bird habitat during project operation. Impacts during construction and operation of the project could be significant. The project would not create a significant impact related to bird collisions. While this impact would be less than significant prior to mitigation, the County recommends a mitigation measure to provide assurances that appropriate features would be integrated into new construction to reduce bird collision incidents. (CEQA Checklist Appendix G Threshold IV. d)	
Mitigation Measures	
BIO/mm-5.1	*To avoid impacts to nesting birds, one of the following measures (BIO/mm-5.1a or BIO/mm-5.1b) shall be implemented:* a. *If possible, no vegetation trimming, pruning, removal, construction, or grading shall occur during the nesting and breeding season (January 1 through September 15).* *OR* b. *If activities associated with vegetation trimming, pruning, removal, construction, or grading are necessary during the bird nesting and breeding season (January 1 through September 15), the following measures shall be implemented:* • *A qualified biologist shall conduct surveys for active nests weekly, beginning 14 days prior to initiation of any new construction activities, with the last survey conducted no more than 3 days prior to the start of clearance/construction work. If ground-disturbing activities are delayed, additional pre-construction surveys should be conducted so that no more than 3 days have elapsed between the survey and ground-disturbing activities.* • *Active nests found within 100 feet of the construction zone shall be delineated with highly visible construction fencing or other exclusionary material that would inhibit entry by personnel or equipment into the buffer zone. The size of the buffer zone shall be at the discretion of the qualified biologist and shall be no less than 25 feet. Raptors may require a larger buffer zone, up to 300 feet. Installation of the exclusionary material shall be completed by construction personnel under the supervision of a qualified biologist prior to initiation of construction activities. The buffer zone shall remain intact and maintained while the nest is active (i.e., occupied or being constructed by at least one adult bird) and until young birds have fledged and no continued use of the nest is observed, as determined by a qualified biologist. The barrier shall be removed by construction personnel only at the direction of the biologist.*
BIO/mm-5.2	*New and replacement trees shall be 24-inch box specimen trees or larger to reduce temporary impacts to nesting birds.*
BIO/mm-5.3	*To reduce the risk of birds striking or colliding with the building, new construction would include deterrent features on glass barriers, windows, and building elements likely to present imperceptible barriers for avian species. These features would include ceramic frit patterns and/or other features that meet the criteria from the American Bird Conservancy for bird friendly glazing.*
Impacts Following Mitigation	
Implementation of BIO/mm-5.1 and BIO/mm-5.2 would reduce construction and operation impacts to nesting birds to less than significant. Beneficial impacts would result from the addition of ground cover, shrubs, and trees native to California. While the project would not create a significant impact related to bird collisions, BIO/mm-5.3 would provide for assurances that appropriate features would be integrated into new construction to reduce bird collision incidents.	

These revisions do not affect any conclusions or significance determinations provided in the Draft EIR and do not necessitate the recirculation of the EIR. According to CEQA Guidelines 15088.5, recirculation is only required if the new mitigation results in a new significant impact:

> *"Significant new information" requiring recirculation include, for example, a disclosure showing that: (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.*

Mitigation Measure BIO/mm-5.3 would not result in a new significant environmental impact; therefore, the incorporation of Mitigation Measure BIO/mm-5.3 does not necessitate the recirculation of the EIR.

12. Page 5.3-27: Mitigation Measure BIO/mm-6.1 has been revised, as shown above in the summary of revisions to Final EIR Volume II Chapter 2, Summary.

> ***BIO/mm-6.1:*** *For oak trees within the project site that are to be retained in their current location, prior to construction, chain-link fencing shall be installed around the protected zone of the trees (5 feet beyond the dripline, the outermost extent of the tree's branches, or 15 feet from the trunk, whichever is greater). The fencing shall remain in place throughout the entire period of construction. Any excavation or grading allowed within the protected zone shall be limited to hand tools or small hand-powered equipment. This measure shall only apply to existing trees where the limits of construction work are within 20 feet of the protected zone.*
>
> *In addition, one of the following measures (BIO/mm-6.1a or BIO/mm-6.1b) shall be implemented:*
>
> *a. If possible, removal, relocation, trimming, or replacement of the oak trees at the Tar Pits site shall be avoided.*
>
> *b. If modification (removal, relocation, trimming, or replacement) of protected oaks is required, coordination with the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning shall occur prior to commencement of any work on-site. Any encroachment or removal requests must be reviewed by the County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning for consistency with County policies and ordinances relating to oak tree protection prior to commencement of any work on-site. Although an oak tree permit is not required, measures to mitigate for impacts to oak trees shall include the following:*
>
> - *Removed oak trees shall be mitigated by planting coast live oaks at a 2:1 ratio on the project site. Each replacement tree shall be at least a 15-gallon specimen.*
> - *The replacement oaks shall be monitored for a period of 5 years, with any failures resulting in a new oak being planted and initiation of a new 5-year monitoring period for the replanted tree.*

These revisions do not affect any conclusions or significance determinations provided in the Draft EIR. According to State CEQA Guidelines 15088.5:

> *Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.*

As demonstrated above, the revised text in Mitigation Measure BIO/mm-6.1 does not differ considerably from the original measure that was described in the Draft EIR. Instead, the revision merely include further detail and refinements to better achieve the goal of the measure, which is to protect existing trees located near construction work. As no significant modifications have been made, recirculation of the EIR is not required.

Section 5.5 Cultural Resources – Archaeological Resources

1. Page 5.4-16: Mitigation Measure CR-ARCH/mm-1.2 has been revised, as shown above in the summary of revisions to Final EIR Volume II Chapter 2, Summary.

CR-ARCH/mm-1.2: *Prepare an Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources Management Plan (AR-TCR Management Plan).*

a. Prior to commencing ground-disturbing activities, an AR-TCR Management Plan shall be prepared by the Qualified Archaeologist and submitted to the Page Museum curators and the NHMLAC Curator of Anthropology, who shall review and approve the AR-TCR Management Plan on behalf of the County. The AR-TCR Management Plan shall be prepared in conformance with Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, and PRC Sections 21083.2 and 21084.1.

b. The AR-TCR Management Plan shall include but not be limited to the following elements:

i. Historical context statement, research design, the specific types of archaeological sites likely to be encountered.

ii. Construction worker training program (described in CR-ARCH/mm-1.3).

iii. Monitoring protocol for ground-disturbing activities that includes a framework for assessing the geoarchaeological setting to determine whether sediments capable of preserving archaeological remains are present in substantial conformance with the Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources Assessment and include a protocol for identifying the conditions under which additional or reduced levels of monitoring (e.g., spot-checking) may be appropriate. The duration and timing of the monitoring shall be determined based on the rate of excavation, geoarchaeological assessment, and, if present, the quantity, type, and spatial distribution of archaeological resources identified.

iv. Limited program of archaeological presence/absence testing within naturally deposited asphaltic or non-asphaltic alluvial sediments before they are mechanically excavated. In particular, the area of the new museum, promenade, and parking lot expansion shall be further investigated. These investigations shall be conducted via a combination of archaeological units, hand tools, and mechanical trenching. The methods used to conduct the limited archaeological testing shall be coordinated with contractors to ensure that sufficient time is afforded to evaluate the significance of any identified resources, and if they are found to be significant, time to develop and implement a treatment plan appropriate to the type of resource. The timing of any such efforts shall be conducted in localized areas so that delays to project earthwork activities are minimized while allowing archaeological materials to be identified in a manner that retains the scientific integrity of the discovery.

v. An approach to evaluate newly identified site components, if applicable, as contributors to the significance of LAN-159/H as a "historical resource" pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a) or a "unique archaeological resource" pursuant to PRC 21083.2(g). If any archaeological resources are identified and are found not to be significant or do not retain integrity, then they shall be recorded to a level sufficient to document the contents and condition.

vi. Potential treatment plans to be implemented in the event a newly discovered archaeological resource is determined by the Qualified Archaeologist to contribute to the significance of the site as a historical resource based on California Register of Historical Resources criteria or a unique archaeological resource in substantial conformance with the Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources Assessment. The AR-TCR Management Plan shall require that if the treatment plans outlined therein are found to be infeasible or other alternatives are proposed, the Qualified Archaeologist shall coordinate with the project proponent and the County to amend the AR-TCR Management Plan with a formal treatment plan that would reduce impacts to the resource(s). The treatment plans stated in the AR-TCR Management Plan or prepared after the discovery of a historical resource, shall be in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f) for historical resources and Public Resources Code Sections 21083.2(b) for unique archaeological resources. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment and if it is determined avoidance is not feasible, treatment may include but not be limited to any of the following depending on the type of resource and the significance evaluation:

- *Native American archaeological site components. Data recovery shall be conducted (i.e., excavation, laboratory processing and analysis) to remove the resource(s) and reduce potential impacts to less than significant where significance is determined under CRHR Criterion 4 or as a unique archaeological resources and integrity is retained. Additional treatment measures to mitigate potentially significant impacts to the component as a tribal cultural resource, which is to be carried out in consultation with the Tribal Consultants and after considering the status of the discovery as a tribal cultural resource.*
- *Historical archaeological site components. If a historical archaeological component of the site is present and found to retain integrity, data recovery shall*

be conducted (i.e., excavation, laboratory processing and analysis) to remove the resource(s) and reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

vii. Discovery and processing protocol for inadvertent discoveries of archaeological resources that are encountered when an Archaeological Monitor is not present.

viii. A process by which recovered materials will be prepared for curation at the Page Museum or the Research and Collections Department at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County ~~at the Los Angeles Exposition Park~~, as directed by Page Museum curators and collections managers, and in consultation with Tribal Consultants. The curation shall ensure their long-term preservation and allow access to interested scholars and shall be done at the expense of the County and/or the Foundation. If the materials are Native American in origin or any item of cultural patrimony, the manner of their handling and long-term curation may require additional consultation with the appropriate Native American community that shall be determined as part of a tribal consultation process to be conducted by the County who shall be responsible for the disposition of these materials.

- *The AR-TCR Management Plan shall summarize the requirements for tribal coordination ~~during~~ in the event of an inadvertent discovery of Native American archaeological resources, including the applicable regulatory compliance measures or conditions of approval for the inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources to be carried out in concert.*

These revisions do not affect any conclusions or significance determinations provided in the Draft EIR. According to State CEQA Guidelines 15088.5:

> *Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.*

As demonstrated above, the revised text in Mitigation Measure CR-ARCH/mm-1.2 does not differ considerably from the original measure that was described in the Draft EIR. As no significant modifications have been made, recirculation of the EIR is not required.

Section 5.5 Cultural Resources – Historical Resources

1. Page 5.5-1: The third paragraph has been revised as follows:

> The project site includes 13 acres of the eastern and northwestern portions of Hancock Park and broadly encompasses what is known as La Brea Tar Pits, which includes the George C. Page Museum (Page Museum). In 1960, a portion of the land within Hancock Park was dedicated to the creation, development and maintenance of the LACMA campus.[1] Over several decades, the LACMA portion of the site has been altered and undergone expansion. LACMA's portion of the 23-acre Hancock Park has been almost entirely developed. In contrast, the property known as La Brea Tar Pits is generally a park-like setting.

2. Page 5.5-1: A new footnote has been added corresponding to the above revision:

> [1] Originally part of the Los Angeles Museum of History, Science, and Art, which opened in 1910 in Exposition Park, LACMA was established in 1961 as a separate, art-focused institution.

3. Page 5.5-36: Mitigation Measures CR-HIST/mm-1.3 and CR-HIST/mm-1.4 have been revised, as shown above in the summary of revisions to Final EIR Volume II Chapter 2, Summary.

CR-HIST/mm-1.3: *~~A Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)-like Documentation Package~~ A historic documentation package shall be prepared to document the contributing features of the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and Page Museum prior to the authorization of demolition or construction activities. The documentation package shall emulate and include elements of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) and/or the Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS). The HABS/HALS-like Documentation Package shall adhere to best professional practices promulgated by the National Park Service and shall be provided to interested parties such*

[1] Originally part of the Los Angeles Museum of History, Science, and Art, which opened in 1910 in Exposition Park, LACMA was established in 1961 as a separate, art-focused institution.

as the Los Angeles Conservancy and County of Los Angeles Historic Preservation Commission for review and comment. Documentation shall be in accordance with the applicable standards described in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation.

Prior to the commencement of construction activities, a historian or architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in History and/or Architectural History shall be retained to prepare HABS/HALS-like documentation for the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District and Page Museum.

Required contents for the HABS/HALS-like package include the following:

- *Photographs: Photographic documentation will focus on the Page Museum and, within the historic district, those contributing elements (built, landscape, hardscape, paleontological, and natural features) slated for demolition, alterations, or adjacent new construction. Photographs shall include detail shots of contributing features and components slated for demolition, with overview and context photographs for the adjacent setting. Photographs shall be taken using a professional-quality single lens reflex (SLR) digital camera with a minimum resolution of 10 megapixels. Digital photographs will be provided in electronic format.*
- *Descriptive and Historic Narrative: The historian or architectural historian will prepare descriptive and historic narrative of the historical resources/features slated for demolition. Physical descriptions will detail each contributing component, with accompanying photographs, and information on how the resource fits within the broader historic district during its period of significance. The historic narrative shall draw upon previously prepared studies, including the Historical Resources Technical Report prepared for the La Brea Tar Pits Master Plan, as well as the La Brea Tar Pits Inventory and Treatment Plan prepared under Mitigation Measure CR-HIST/mm-1.2. The narrative shall also include a methodology section specifying the name of researcher, date of research, and sources/archives visited, as well as a bibliography. Within the written history, statements shall be footnoted as to their sources, where appropriate.*
- *Upon finalization of the HABS/HALS-like Documentation Package, a hard copy and digital copy shall be prepared and offered to the Seaver Center for Western History Research at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County ~~Seaver Center for Western History Research~~, University of Southern California Special Collections, and the Los Angeles Public Library.*

CR-HIST/mm-1.4: *A Retrospective Exhibit and Interpretive Program shall be prepared and implemented. The Retrospective Exhibit and Interpretive Project shall be prepared by a qualified historic preservation professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in History and/or Architectural History. The exhibit materials shall be drawn from previous studies including but not limited to the Inventory and Treatment Plan described in Mitigation Measure CR-HIST/mm-1.2 and the HABS/HALS-like documentation package described in Mitigation Measure CR- HIST/mm-1.3, as well as other supplemental research materials as needed.*

The retrospective exhibit and interpretive program shall focus on the history of the site, the people involved in the early ownership, development, and scientific discoveries and excavations, and the events leading to its donation to the County of Los Angeles, as well as on the site's development through the end of the period of significance for the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District, 1977.

The retrospective exhibit and interpretive program may include but not be limited to exhibit materials and interpretive panels, both exterior (e.g., as a series of panels in the park), interior (e.g., as a permanent exhibit in the Page Museum or new museum building), and online (on the museum website). The exhibit and interpretive program shall be designed for maximum public accessibility.

The plan for the interpretive and commemorative program shall be detailed in an Interpretive Program Plan Memorandum to be prepared with the guidance of a qualified historic preservation professional. The retrospective exhibit and interpretive program shall be completed within three (3) years of commencement of initial construction activities. The Draft Interpretive Program Plan Memorandum shall be reviewed by interested parties such as the Los Angeles Conservancy and County of Los Angeles Historic Preservation Commission for comment.

These revisions do not affect any conclusions or significance determinations provided in the Draft EIR. According to State CEQA Guidelines 15088.5:

> *Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.*

As demonstrated above, the revised text in Mitigation Measures CR-HIST/mm-1.3 and CR-HIST/mm-1.4 does not differ considerably from the original measures that were described in the Draft EIR. As no significant modifications have been made, recirculation of the EIR is not required.

Section 5.6 Geology and Soils

4. Page 5.6-8: The first paragraph has been revised as follows:

> Table 5.6-3 summarizes the results from a museum records search that was requested and conducted in early 2022. The search was led by the Research and Collections Department at Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (Natural History Museum) and was completed on February 5, 2022. The records search highlights several known fossil localities within the project site and its vicinity. See the Paleontological Resources Technical Report (Appendix F) for additional information regarding the records search.

5. Page 5.6-25 and Page 5.6-27: Mitigation Measures GEO/mm-6.1, GEO/mm-6.4, and GEO/mm-6.5 have been revised, as displayed above in Chapter 2, Revisions 7, 8, and 9.

GEO/mm-6.2: Prepare a Paleontological Resources Management Plan: *After finalization of the engineering, design, and grading plans for the project and prior to the start of preconstruction ground-disturbing activities, a Paleontological Resources Management Plan (PRMP) shall be prepared by the Project Paleontologist and submitted to the Page Museum curators, who shall review and approve the final PRMP on behalf of the County ~~and Natural History Museum~~. The PRMP shall define the processes and procedures for paleontological monitoring and fossil excavation based on the nature of ground-disturbing activities required for project. The PRMP shall:*

a. *Incorporate the results of the Paleontological Resources Technical Report (SWCA 2023), the final geotechnical investigation, and the final engineering/grading plans for the project.*

b. *Require all construction personnel to attend a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training to be presented by the Project Paleontologist, or their designee.*

c. *Define the processes and procedures for coordinating and communicating with responsible parties and stakeholders (including but not limited to the contractors, consultants, County officials, and the Page Museum curators and collections managers), when construction activities would be halted due to discovery and subsequent salvage efforts during ground-disturbing activities, and when regularly scheduled meetings between the Project Paleontologist and the Page Museum curators and collections managers would be required.*

d. *Outline a procedure whereby mechanical excavation is conducted to remove any non-fossil-bearing sediments or soils subject to environmental soil remediation, such that adequate time is afforded to identify fossil localities and to conduct scientific salvage operations to a feasible extent (see Millington and Dietler 2023); the timing of scientific fossil salvage operations during initial grading should be given special considerations in the PRMP such that delays to earthwork activities are minimized while allowing paleontological material to be salvaged at an acceptable level that retains the scientific integrity of the discoveries.*

e. *Require full-time paleontological monitoring by qualified paleontological monitors who meet the standards of the SVP (2010) and shall be supervised by the Project Paleontologist; qualified paleontological monitors shall have the authority to temporarily halt construction activities to record and salvage fossil discoveries as they are unearthed to allow for potentially significant fossils to be collected with their scientific integrity intact to the extent feasible and practical.*

f. *Discuss unanticipated fossil discovery and communication protocols if paleontological resources are discovered by non-paleontology staff working on the project in instances where paleontological monitors are documenting or recording paleontological resources discovered elsewhere within the project site.*

g. *Discuss feasible monitoring procedures for each of the different ground-disturbing activities, including but not limited to active observation or inspection of sediments during active ground disturbances, whether they be trenching, grading, excavating, drilling, or some other activity that disturbs sediments; inspection of sedimentary spoils spiles or cuttings, as well as backfill originating from Hancock Park that may contain asphaltum or fossil material; and/or matrix screening of spoils for small or microfossils as needed.*

h. *Define fossil salvaging procedures, including but not limited to outlining the treebox method for asphaltum bearing large accumulations of fossils, salvaging of isolated fossils, matrix screening in the field for microfossils, and chain-of-custody procedures for transferring the fossil discoveries to the Page Museum curators or collection managers as they are exhumed from the project site. Because of the unique conditions of La Brea Tar Pits and the chemical considerations of working with asphaltum fossil deposits, any paleontological resource discoveries shall remain on-site with the Page Museum. The paleontological monitor shall record pertinent geologic data and collect appropriate sediment samples from any fossil localities.*

Require the Project Paleontologist to prepare a report of the findings of the monitoring efforts within 90 days after construction is completed.

GEO/mm-6.4: Monitor for Paleontological Resources: *Full-time monitoring shall be required during all ground-disturbing activities (including artificial fill or previously disturbed sediments), regardless of depth. Additionally, special considerations shall be given to the project design elements and geotechnical and soils remediation or hazard reduction recommendations, including but not limited to the paleontological screening of tar sands prior to disposal or treatment. Procedures and protocols for paleontological monitoring and fossil salvage shall be outlined in the PRMP. Monitoring shall:*

a. Be conducted by a qualified paleontological monitor who meets the standards of the SVP (2010) and shall be supervised by the Project Paleontologist, who shall coordinate with the Page Museum curators and collections managers and County officials. The Project Paleontologist may periodically inspect construction activities to recommend adjusting the level of monitoring in response to subsurface conditions; however, modifications, such as increasing, reducing, or ceasing of paleontological monitoring, or any changes of the implementation of the PRMP, should be approved by Page Museum curators and the County ~~Natural History Museum~~.

b. Include inspection of exposed sedimentary units during active excavations, grading, tar sand removal, and any other ground-disturbing activity that has the potential to impact sediments capable of preserving significant fossils. The Page Museum curators (or their representatives) and the paleontological monitor shall have authority to temporarily divert activity away from exposed fossils to evaluate the significance of the find and, shall the fossils be determined significant or likely significant, professionally and efficiently recover the fossil specimens and collect associated data while minimizing delays. Data collection procedures may require the support of construction contractors to carefully and efficiently collect field data and extract the fossils to allow construction to continue.

c. Require grading and earthwork contractors to follow the guidance of Page Museum staff or the Project Paleontologist regarding the collection and/or extraction of paleontological resources. The paleontological monitor shall record pertinent geologic data and collect appropriate sediment samples from any fossil localities. Recovered fossils shall be directly retained by the Page Museum for later analysis, laboratory preparation, and eventual curation if deemed significant or important by the Page Museum curators or collection managers.

GEO/mm-6.5: Prepare a Paleontological Resources Monitoring Report: *Upon conclusion of ground-disturbing activities, the Project Paleontologist overseeing the implementation of the PRMP, including paleontological monitoring and fossil salvaging, shall prepare a final monitoring report that documents the paleontological monitoring efforts for the project and describes any paleontological resources discoveries observed and/or recorded during the life of the project. The final monitoring report and any associated data pertinent to the salvaged fossil specimen(s) shall be submitted to the <u>Page Museum and the Research and Collections Department at the</u> Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County within 90 days after construction is completed. If the project is developed in phases, the final report is only necessary at the completion of the last phase to be constructed. At the discretion of the County, if there are unanticipated gaps in the phases of construction or other reasons why the County would prefer phased final reports, multiple final reports could be prepared.*

These revisions do not affect any conclusions or significance determinations provided in the Draft EIR. According to State CEQA Guidelines 15088.5:

> *Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.*

As demonstrated above, the revised text in Mitigation Measures GEO/mm-6.1, GEO/mm-6.4, and GEO/mm-6.5 does not differ considerably from the original measures that were described in the Draft EIR. As no significant modifications have been made, recirculation of the EIR is not required.

Section 5.11 Noise and Vibration

1. Page 5.11-21 and 5.11-22: Mitigation Measure BIO/mm-6.1 has been revised, as shown above in the summary of revisions to Final EIR Volume II Chapter 2, Summary.

NOI/mm-1.1: *The following measures shall be implemented to reduce construction-related noise impacts:*

a. Operation of equipment used in construction, alteration, drilling, or demolition work shall be prohibited between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., Monday through Friday; before 8:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on Saturday; and any time on Sundays or legal holidays.

b. A temporary barrier shall be erected around active construction areas. The placement and height of the barrier shall be adjusted based on the specific location of construction activities within the site, ensuring that the barriers are positioned as close as feasible to the work area and are sufficiently tall to maximize effectiveness in minimizing direct noise transmission to surrounding areas, such that a sound reduction of 10 dBA is achieved at the property lines on the east side of Curson Avenue and north side of 6th Street. Prior to the commencement of each construction phase, a phase-specific acoustic analysis shall be conducted to determine the optimal placement and configuration of noise barriers. In consultation with an acoustical engineer, the barrier configuration may be modified to address the specific conditions of phased construction, provided that the adjustments achieve an equivalent noise reduction outcome. ~~and impermeable 12-foot-high temporary barrier designed to provide a 10-dBA noise reduction, shall be erected along the eastern and northern sides of the project site boundary. This barrier shall be constructed in one of the following ways:~~

- ~~*from acoustical blankets hung over or from a supporting frame, or*~~
- ~~*from commercially available acoustical panels lined with sound-absorbing material, or*~~
- ~~*from common construction materials such as plywood, provided that the barrier is designed with overlapping material at the seams to ensure that no gaps exist between the panels.*~~

c. Noise levels from powered equipment or powered hand tools at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source or within 500 feet of a residential zone will be limited to 75 dBA, such limits shall not apply where compliance is technically infeasible. Technical infeasibility means that the noise limit cannot be achieved despite the use of mufflers, shields, sound barriers, and/or other noise reduction devices or techniques during operation of the equipment.

d. All construction equipment shall be properly maintained per manufacturers' specifications and fitted with the best available noise-suppression devices.

e. Pneumatic tools used at the site shall be equipped with an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust to minimize noise levels.

f. Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from adjacent sensitive receptors as possible and shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds or insulated barriers when possible.

g. Prior to commencement of construction, a designated project contact person will directly notify the management of any surrounding residential properties located within 100 feet of the project site about the construction schedule and activities and provide a contact number to address any noise-related complaints during construction.

h. A designated point of contact shall be identified to address noise-related complaints during construction. The noise disturbance coordinator will be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise.

These revisions do not affect any conclusions or significance determinations provided in the Draft EIR. According to State CEQA Guidelines 15088.5:

> *Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.*

As demonstrated above, the revised text in Mitigation Measure BIO/mm-6.1 does not differ considerably from the original measure that was described in the Draft EIR. Instead, the revisions merely include further detail and refinements to better achieve the goal of the measure, which is to erect a temporary noise barrier around active construction areas. As no significant modifications have been made, recirculation of the EIR is not required.

2. Page 5.11-23: The footnotes for Table 5.11.14 have been revised as follows:

Source: SWCA (2022)

* Threshold is equivalent to the measured daytime ambient noise levels plus 5 dBA.

† Assumes an estimated noise reduction of 10 dBA due to noise barrier~~wall~~.

Section 5.13 Transportation

6. Pages 5.13-8 and 5.18-9: The following text has been added as follows:

- **Line 20 (Downtown Los Angeles – Westwood/Santa Monica via Wilshire Boulevard)** runs between Downtown Los Angeles and Santa Monica on Wilshire Boulevard along the entire route between these two destinations. Service runs 7 days a week; the bus runs 24 hours, with 15-minute headways during daylight hours and 30-minute headways during overnight every day of the week. Stops near the project site are located at Wilshire/Spaulding and Wilshire/Curson for both directions of travel. <u>As part of its NextGen Bus Plan, LA Metro proposes to merge Line 20 and 720 between Downtown Santa Monica and Downtown Los Angeles. The new Line 20 would have 5-minute headways during weekday peak periods. Bus stop consolidation includes the removal of the Wilshire/Masselin bus stops approximately 750 feet east of the project site.</u>
- **Line 217 (Hollywood/Vine Station – La Cienega Station via Hollywood Boulevard-Fairfax Avenue)** runs between Los Angeles' Los Feliz and Baldwin Hills neighborhoods, on Vermont Avenue, Hollywood Boulevard, and Fairfax Avenue along the west side of the project site. Service runs 7days a week; the bus runs on 12- to 15-minute headways for the majority of the day every day of the week, with longer headways at the beginning and end of service. Stops near the project site are located at Fairfax/West 6th and Fairfax/Wilshire for both directions of travel. <u>As part of its NextGen Bus Plan, LA Metro proposes to merge Lines 180, 181, 217, and 780; Line 217 would be discontinued south of La Cienega/Jefferson Station to Howard Hughes Center. The new Line 180 would have 7.5-minute headways during weekday peak periods. Bus stop consolidation is not proposed for this route.</u>
- **Line 720 (Santa Monica – Downtown Los Angeles via Wilshire Boulevard)** runs between Downtown Los Angeles and Santa Monica on Wilshire Boulevard along the entire route between these two destinations. Service runs 7days a week; the bus runs on 5- to 10-minute headways for the majority of the day, with 15-minute headways during overnight hours of service. This is an express bus with limited stops, so the closest bus stops to the project site are at Wilshire/Cloverdale and at Wilshire/Crescent Heights. <u>As part of its NextGen Bus Plan, LA Metro proposes to merge Line 20 and 720 between Downtown Santa Monica and Downtown Los Angeles. The new Line 720 would continue to operate weekday peak periods with 10-minute headways, serving only between Downtown Los Angeles and Westwood.</u>

7. Page 5.13-24: Mitigation Measure TR/mm-5.1 has been revised, as shown above in the summary of revisions to Final EIR Volume II Chapter 2, Summary.

> ***TRA/mm-4.1:*** *A construction traffic management plan (CTMP) shall be developed by the contractor, approved by the County, ~~and~~ the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT)<u>, Caltrans, and LA Metro</u>, and implemented to alleviate construction period impacts. The CTMP will include, but may not be limited to, the following restrictions:*
>
> - *Prohibition of construction worker parking on nearby residential streets.*
> - *Prohibition of construction-related vehicles parking or staging on surrounding public streets.*
> - *<u>Prohibition of construction-related parking or staging on streets with bus service.</u>*
> - *Temporary pedestrian and vehicular traffic controls (i.e., flag persons) during all construction activities adjacent to public rights-of-way to improve traffic flow on public roadways.*
> - *Safety precautions for pedestrians and bicyclists through such measures as alternate routing and protection barriers shall be implemented as appropriate.*
> - *Scheduling of construction-related deliveries, haul trips, etc., shall occur outside the commuter peak hours to the extent feasible.*
> - *<u>Avoidance of construction-related deliveries, haul trips, etc. from routing along congested local and state facilities, to the extent feasible.</u>*
> - *<u>Relocation and accommodation (as needed) of adjacent bus stops and access, to the extent feasible.</u>*

These revisions do not affect any conclusions or significance determinations provided in the Draft EIR. According to State CEQA Guidelines 15088.5:

> *Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.*

As demonstrated above, the revised text in Mitigation Measure TRA/mm-4.1 does not differ considerably from the original measure that was described in the Draft EIR. Instead, these revisions merely include further detail and refinements to better achieve the goal of the measure, which is to require the County to prepare a thorough construction traffic management plan. As no significant modifications have been made, recirculation of the EIR is not required.

Section 5.15 Utilities and Service Systems

1. Page 5.15-20: The mitigation measures listed for Utilities Impact 6 (Cumulative) have been updated to reflect the addition of BIO/mm-5.3, as addressed above in Section 5.3 Biological Resources.

Implement Mitigation Measures AES/mm-4.1; AQ/mm-3.1; BIO/mm-1.1, BIO/mm-2.1, BIO/mm-3.1, BIO/mm-5.1 through ~~and~~ 5.3 ~~5.2~~, and BIO/mm-6.1; CR-ARCH/mm-1.1 through 1.4; CR-HIST/mm-1.1 through 1.5; GEO/mm-3.1 and 3.2, GEO/mm-4.1, and GEO/mm-6.1 through 6.5; GHG/mm-1.1; HAZ/mm-1.1 through 1.2, and HAZ/mm-2.1 and 2.2; NOI/mm-1.1; TRA/mm-1.1 and TRA/mm-4.1 through 4.3; TCR/mm-1.1 through 1.4; and UTL/mm-1.1.

Section 5.16 Mandatory Findings of Significance

2. Page 5.16-1: A reference to Mitigation Measure BIO/mm-5.3 has been added to the second paragraph.

3. Page 5.16-1: A reference to Mitigation Measure BIO/mm-5.3 has been added to Table 5.16-1.

3.2.6 Chapter 6. Alternatives Analysis

1. Page 6-3: Th eighth row of Table 6-1 has been revised, as shown above in the summary of revisions to Final EIR Volume II Chapter 2, Summary.

Landscaping Concept Plan	Establish three distinct landscaping zones encircled by a looping pedestrian path. More than 330 trees are currently on the project site. The project would require removal and replacement and/or relocation of between 150 and 200 trees. The planting strategy includes the introduction or relocation of a similar number of trees as would be removed. It is ~~preliminarily~~ estimated that up to 10 percent of the 150 to 200 trees to be removed would be relocated rather than replaced. Create three biofiltration areas for stormwater management.

2. Page 6-3: A new citation has been added to Objective 1:

> Renovate and expand the existing museum structure to address deferred maintenance of the building envelope and systems, to meet modern seismic, electrical, building code standards, and universal design standards, and to meet sustainability goals consistent with the County's sustainability plan (County of Los Angeles 2019; County of Los Angeles 2024).

3. Page 6-4: The first paragraph has been revised as follows:

> Alternatives to be considered under CEQA are those that would avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant environmental effects identified during evaluation of the project. The environmental impact issue areas described in Chapter 5, Environmental Impact Analysis, were determined to be potentially significant but could be reduced to less than significant through the implementation of mitigation measures. ~~Three~~ For the proposed project, three impacts were found to be significant and unavoidable after implementation of the feasible mitigation measures. A summary of impacts identified for the project by issue area is provided in Table 6-2.

4. Page 6-4: The footnote of Table 6-2 of has been revised as follows:

> * Based on the evaluation in Section 7.5, Environmental Effects Found Not to be Significant, the County determined that the project would not result in significant impacts related to agricultural and forestry resources, energy, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, and wildfire. ~~Issues evaluated in Section 7.5, Environmental Effects Found Not to be Significant. Based on preliminary analysis and discussions with the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History Foundation, it was determined that the project would not result in significant impacts related to agricultural and forestry resources, energy, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, and wildfire.~~

5. Page 6-9 through 6-61: "Alternative 3" is now referred to as "Refined Alternative 3."

6. Page 6-15: The second and third paragraphs have been revised as follows:

> Under the No Project/No Build Alternative, existing buildings and features on-site would remain as they are under current conditions, there would be no changes to the amount of impervious or pervious surfaces on the project site, and no modifications to the existing drainage patterns would be made. This alternative would not implement the project's proposed Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMPs), including the project's three proposed biofiltration areas, or the project's related mitigation measure to further reduce the volume of runoff or improve the quality of runoff from the project site.~~; however, even without the benefit of the project's LID BMPs and mitigation measure for non-structural BMPs, impacts from this alternative would be decreased when compared to those of the project.~~
>
> Therefore, impacts of the No Project/No Build Alternative related to hydrology and water quality would be ~~*decreased*~~ *similar* in comparison to the project. This is because the No Project/No Build Alternative would not result in short-term, less-than-significant, construction-related water quality and hydrology impacts; however, this alternative would also not result in the permanent hydrology and water quality improvements that are contemplated for the site under the proposed project.

7. Page 6-24: The fourth paragraph has been revised as follows:

> Therefore, impacts of the Alternative 1, Renovate Page Museum Only related to hydrology and water quality would be *similar* in comparison to the project. This is because Alternative 1 would not result in short-term, less-than-significant, construction-related water quality and hydrology impacts; however, this alternative would also not result in the permanent hydrology and water quality improvements that are contemplated for the site under the proposed project.

8. Page 6-38 through 6-40: The following text has been added regarding "Refined Alternative 3: Adjusted Footprint to Reduce Contact with Page Museum and Expand Central Green." Further information regarding why the revisions to Alternative 3 do not require recirculation are presented in the revisions to Page 6-47, below.

> Refined Alternative 3, Adjusted Footprint to Reduce Contact with Page Museum and Expand Central Green, would include the renovation of the Page Museum within the existing building footprint, similar to the project, but would incorporate a series of design refinements to reduce impacts on certain primary character-defining features of the Page Museum, including retaining the courtyard (also referred to as the "atrium") as an exterior space and retaining the space frame that supports the frieze ~~refining the materiality~~

~~and size of the expansion atrium pop-up to better compliment the frieze, preserving a larger portion of the existing berm on the west side of the Page Museum, and detailing the second-floor glass enclosure underneath the Page Museum frieze to be as transparent as possible.~~ This alternative would also include constructing a new museum building of approximately 40,000 square feet, similar to the project, but would adjust the building footprint further to the north and west of the project's proposed footprint (Figure 6-3). This adjustment would allow for more separation of the new museum from the existing Page Museum ~~by narrowing the transition area connection between the two buildings~~. Adjusting the footprint of the new museum to the north would also allow for approximately 4,000 square feet of open space to be added to the Central Green. In this alternative, the on-site surface parking would be reconfigured to complement the adjusted building footprint, extending west of the new museum building as with the project, but this alternative would maintain the number of parking spaces that currently exist on-site and would not add additional parking spaces.

After completion of the Draft EIR, the County, acting through the Foundation, considered the EIR evaluation with respect to the Draft EIR comments made by the commenting entities and individuals. Many comments noted that the full build out of the Master Plan, as reflected in the Draft EIR, would result in historic resources losing their eligibility. Additionally, some comments opined that the footprint of the project was too large and expressed that alternatives should be considered which would result in fewer impacts to the Page Museum. As a result, the County conducted further feasibility studies of the original Alternative 3; the County determined that further exploration of Alternative 3 should occur to determine if additional improvements could be made to the alternative to address the comments received on the Draft EIR. As a result of this process, this section of the EIR expands the consideration of the original Alternative 3 with a refined version of the alternative. Additional figures showing Refined Alternative 3 are presented in Figures 6-4, 6-5, and 6-6. Refined Alternative 3 would not create additional or more intense environmental impacts than those previously disclosed when compared to the original Alternative 3 concept, as further detailed in each of the expanded environmental evaluations that follow. Below are some key variations in Refined Alternative 3 that are considered in this alternatives analysis:

- The central, open courtyard of the Page Museum, which contributes to the indoor-outdoor integration of the museum and is a primary character-defining feature, would no longer be covered and converted to indoor space; it would remain as an open courtyard. The landscaping and hardscaping features of the courtyard would be renovated to create a more usable public space and include climate-appropriate and native vegetation relevant to interpretive themes of the tar pits. This differs from the original Alternative 3, which replaced the open courtyard with research laboratory space.
- The structural space frame that supports the frieze (the open-air, steel-grid roof that enhances the indoor-outdoor integration of the Page Museum and is a primary character-defining feature) would not be altered or capped, as had been proposed in the original Alternative 3. Instead, the existing space frame and open-air grid roof would remain intact as it is currently but would be repainted and repaired.
- The Page Museum and the new museum building would be connected only with a covered, open-air breezeway; the original Alternative 3 proposed a physical connection/joining of the two buildings. An entrance would be incorporated into the northwestern corner of the Page Museum to provide access to the breezeway. The open-air breezeway that is proposed in the Refined Alternative 3 is a contrast to the previous concept of an enclosed entrance space joining the two buildings, which was proposed by the original Alterative 3. This change in the Refined Alternative 3 design means the connection between the two buildings would be scaled down, and demolition at the northwest corner of the Page Museum would be reduced, thereby retaining more of the original character-defining features and materials of the historical Page Museum resource.
- Removal of a portion of the berm would be focused at the northwest corner to accommodate a new entrance to the Page Museum, and modification of the west and north sides of the berm would still be necessary, albeit in a scaled down manner. The modifications would result in a new version of the berm that would allow for an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) ramp up to the terrace level on the west, and a change in elevation on the north allowing for access to the new entrance.

- As described above, the on-site surface parking would be reconfigured to complement the adjusted building footprint. The original Alternative 3 proposed two driveways along 6th Street and one driveway on South Curson Avenue for public vehicular access to the parking lot. However, it has been determined that it would be operationally preferred to eliminate the driveway at the far western end of the parking lot on 6th Street. The result is that Alternative 3 would have one driveway on 6th Street and one driveway on South Curson Avenue. This modification has been further addressed in the Transportation analysis contained in Section 6.4.4.2, below.
- The programming for interior spaces of the Page Museum and the new museum building would be revised, resulting in changes to the location of the theater, classrooms, the retail store, the café, and other interior elements. The Page Museum would also feature less staff office space than originally proposed.
- The canopy above the existing main entrance to the Page, which was envisioned in the proposed project and the original Alternative 3, would not be included in Refined Alternative 3, and would be replaced with trees to shade the proposed stepped seating.
- The reduced footprint of Refined Alternative 3 would require less ground disturbance during construction and would result in less soil import and export. The features retained by Refined Alternative 3 would be maintained and repaired as needed.
- Like the project, Refined Alternative 3 would include renovations to address deferred maintenance of the building and systems and to meet modern seismic, electrical, building code standards, and universal design standards.

9. Page 6-41: Figure 6-3 has been renamed as "Original Alternative 3: Museum plan and section diagrams" and text has been added to the figure itself to emphasize that it is the original plan diagram for Alternative 3.

10. Page 6-42: "Figure 6-4 Refined Alternative 3: Hancock Park site plan" has been added.

11. Page 6-43: "Figure 6-5. Refined Alternative 3: Aerial illustration" has been added.

12. Page 6-44: "Figure 6-6. Refined Alternative 3: Courtyard" has been added.

13. Page 6-45: The fourth row of Table 6-8 has been revised as follows:

Circulation and Parking	Reconfigure parking lot, extending it west of the new museum building footprint while maintaining the existing number of on-site parking spaces. This would require removing and, where possible, relocating existing trees on-site.

14. Page 6-45: The second row of Table 6-9 has been revised as follows:

Provide expanded collections storage facilities that enable access for scientific research, and preserve, protect, and allow future growth of the museum's world-class collections.	**Yes.** This alternative would include constructing an additional 2,000 square-foot satellite maintenance and support building dedicated to ~~fossil~~ storage, maintenance, and service facilities along the northern boundary of the project site.

15. Page 6-46: The eighth row of Table 6-9 has been revised as follows:

Preserve and protect the National Natural Landmark—La Brea Tar Pits—to allow access for future research and excavation, support cultural and educational interpretation, and enable the ongoing natural processes of the asphaltic seeps.	**Yes.** This alternative would allow for renovating and expanding the existing Page Museum and the remainder of the project site within Hancock Park in a way that would further the fundamental mission of La Brea Tar Pits as a site and facility dedicated to research, education, and exhibition. Under this alternative, the project site would continue to be recognized and protected as a National Natural Landmark. Furthermore, this alternative would result in the preservation of several character-defining features of the Page Museum and the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District. Specifically, the central atrium of the Page Museum would remain as an open atrium garden, the existing space frame of the frieze would not be altered or capped, the Page Museum and the new museum would only be connected by a covered open-air breezeway, and demolition of the northwest corner of the Page Museum would be avoided.

16. Page 6-47: The following text has been added after the first paragraph:

> Further, Refined Alternative 3 does not differ significantly from the original Alternative 3 that was described in the Draft EIR. None of the conditions for recirculation of the Draft EIR specified in State CEQA Guidelines 15088.5 have been met, and this new information merely amplifies and expands upon the broad intent of the original Alternative 3. The adjustments made in the Refined Alternative 3 do not constitute "significant" new information because no additional substantial environmental effect of the project has been identified, nor has the severity of an environmental impact changed.

17. Page 6-47 through 6-59: Additional detail has been provided regarding Refined Alternative 3. The within this section of Chapter 6 are too extensive for direct reproduction. In summary, each impact analysis under Section 6.4.4.2 *Comparison of Significant Effects of the Alternative to the Project,* has been revised to incorporate the adjustments made to Refined Alternative 3. As previously discussed, Refined Alternative 3 would include the renovation of the Page Museum within the existing building footprint, similar to the project, but would incorporate a series of design refinements to reduce impacts on certain primary character-defining features of the Page Museum. As discussed in Chapter 6, Refined Alternative 3 merely amplifies and expands upon the broad intent of the original Alternative 3. As reflected in edits made to Chapter 6 in this Final EIR, differences between the Refined Alternative 3 and the original concept are not substantial from an environmental perspective.

18. Page 6-60: Table 6-10 has been updated to indicate that the Hydrology and Water Quality impacts of the "No Project/No Build" alternative would in fact be "similar" to the impacts of the proposed project, rather than "decreased" as originally described.

19. Page 6-61: The first, second, and third paragraphs have been revised as follows:

> Refined Alternative 3, Adjust Footprint to Reduce Contact with Page Museum and Expand Central Green, would result in similar environmental impacts as the project for each issue area analyzed in this EIR, as shown in Table 6-10, with the exception of historical resources and land use and planning. ~~While~~ Refined Alternative 3 would lessen certain impacts to character-defining features to both the Page Museum and the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District thereby reducing the overall severity of the impacts to historical resources; however, it would not avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impacts. One of the primary character-defining features of the Page Museum is its visual primacy on the grounds of the Tar Pits; the design refinements presented in the refined version of Alternative 3 would result in less of an impact to the Page Museum's visual primacy. Refined Alternative 3 would reduce impacts to the Page Museum to the extent that the building would continue to convey its historic significance and retain its eligibility as a historical resource. However, the site plan changes would continue to result in a significant

and unavoidable impact to the La Brea Tar Pits Historic District. The overall severity of the significant and unavoidable impacts to the historic district would be reduced because of the separation of the new museum building from the Page Museum, the narrowing of the transition area connection between the two buildings, and the design refinements that retain more of the Page Museum's character-defining features such as the existing structural space frame, frieze, and courtyard.

Similarly, the design refinements in this alternative would help to further support the land uses plans and policies applicable to the project as they relate to the protection and alternation of historical resources, but not in such a way to avoid the project's related significant and unavoidable impacts. This alternative would also result in the project's significant and unavoidable impacts related to increased regional VMT. However, Refined Alternative 3 is the alternative that meets all project objectives by providing an adjusted museum footprint and incorporating a series of design refinements that would support the basic objectives of the project.

Based strictly on an analysis of the relative environmental impacts, Alternative 1, Renovate the Page Museum Only, is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative. The Foundation and the Museum of Natural History, as a departmental unit of the County, will consider the whole of the record when considering the project including, but not limited to, public comment and testimony ~~related to the size and design of the residence~~. The Foundation and the Museum of Natural History may select the project as proposed, an alternative, or a specified combination of particular elements identified in the alternatives, as the approved project. In all scenarios, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) would be applied to the approved project.

3.2.7 Chapter 7. Other CEQA Considerations

No changes have been made to Chapter 7 of Volume II of the Final EIR.

3.2.8 Chapter 8. References and Report Preparation

1. Pages 8-1, 8-6, and 8-7: The following references have been added:

County of Los Angeles. 2024. *2045 Climate Action Plan*. Available at: https://planning.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/gp_2045_Climate_Action_Plan_June-2024.pdf. Accessed August 2024.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) 2024. *Areas of Conservation Emphasis Factsheet: Terrestrial Connectivity.* Available at: https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=150835. Accessed April 2024.

City of Los Angeles. 2016. *Mobility Plan 2035: An Element of the General Plan.* Available at: https://ladot.lacity.org/sites/default/files/documents/mobility-plan-la-city-planning.pdf. Accessed October 2022.

Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History Foundation (Foundation). 2014. *We Found Bats Living at La Brea Tar Pits!* Available at: https://nhm.org/stories/we-found-bats-living-la-brea-tar-pits. Accessed January 2024.

Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History Foundation (Foundation). 2024. Email correspondence from Miguel Ordeñana, Community Science Senior Manager, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County and Julia Klein, Capital Improvement Project Manager, Natural History Museums of Los Angeles County Foundation and Bobbette Biddulph, Senior Environmental Planner, SWCA Environmental Consultants. On file, SWCA Environmental Consultants, Pasadena, California.

San Francisco Planning Department. 2011. *Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings.* Available at: https://sfplanning.org/standards-bird-safe-buildings. Accessed April 2024.

2. Pages 8-23 and 8-24: Table 8-1 has been updated to include additional staff who assisted with preparation of the Final EIR.

This page intentionally left blank.