

4311 SUNSET BOULEVARD

Preliminary Endangerment Assessment

Prepared for
City of Los Angeles
Department of City Planning

December 2020



[Draft phase here]

4311 SUNSET BOULEVARD

Preliminary Endangerment Assessment

Prepared for
City of Los Angeles
Department of City Planning

December 2020

626 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017
213.599.4300
www.esassoc.com



| | | |
|--------------|------------|---------------|
| Bend | Oakland | San Francisco |
| Camarillo | Orlando | Santa Monica |
| Delray Beach | Pasadena | Sarasota |
| Destin | Petaluma | Seattle |
| Irvine | Portland | Sunrise |
| Los Angeles | Sacramento | Tampa |
| Miami | San Diego | |

D170142

OUR COMMITMENT TO SUSTAINABILITY | ESA helps a variety of public and private sector clients plan and prepare for climate change and emerging regulations that limit GHG emissions. ESA is a registered assessor with the California Climate Action Registry, a Climate Leader, and founding reporter for the Climate Registry. ESA is also a corporate member of the U.S. Green Building Council and the Business Council on Climate Change (BC3). Internally, ESA has adopted a Sustainability Vision and Policy Statement and a plan to reduce waste and energy within our operations. This document was produced using recycled paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preliminary Endangerment Assessment

| | <u>Page</u> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Executive Summary..... | 1 |
| 1. Introduction..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Purpose and Objectives..... | 1 |
| 1.2 Scope of Work..... | 1 |
| 1.3 Assumptions and Exclusions | 2 |
| 1.4 Information Provided from User/Owner/Landowner | 2 |
| 2. Site Description | 3 |
| 2.1 Site Identification..... | 3 |
| 2.2 Site Geology and Hydrogeology | 4 |
| 3. Background | 4 |
| 3.1 Site Status/Historical Site Information | 4 |
| 3.2 Hazardous Material/Substance/Waste Management Information..... | 5 |
| 3.3 Current and Historical Use(s) of Surrounding Properties | 5 |
| 3.4 All Appropriate Inquiries Required Information..... | 5 |
| 4. Apparent Problem | 7 |
| 5. Conceptual Site Model..... | 8 |
| 5.1 Factors Related to Soil and Air Pathways | 8 |
| 5.2 Factors Related to Water Pathways | 8 |
| 6. Sampling Activities and Results | 9 |
| 6.1 Summary of Activities | 9 |
| 6.2 Sample Collection | 9 |
| 6.3 Discussion of Results..... | 9 |
| 7. Human Health Screening Evaluation | 10 |
| 7.1 Risk Characterization Summary | 10 |
| 8. Ecological Screening Evaluation | 11 |
| 8.1 Biological Characterization | 11 |
| 8.2 Ecological Pathway Assessment..... | 11 |
| 8.3 Ecological Screening Evaluation Summary..... | 11 |
| 9. Community Profile | 12 |
| 10. Environmental Professional Conclusions and Recommendations..... | 13 |
| 11.1 Summary and Conclusions | 13 |
| 11.2 Recommendations | 13 |
| 11.3 Data Gaps | 13 |
| 12. References | 14 |
| 13. Signatures and Qualifications of Environmental Professionals..... | 15 |

Page

Appendices

- A. Figures
- B. Phase I Report

Tables

| | | |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| 1 | Project Site Description | 3 |
| 2 | Site Location and Elevation..... | 4 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Preliminary Endangerment Assessment (PEA) has been prepared for the City of Los Angeles' Department of City Planning for the 4311 Sunset project (Project) described herein. The developer proposes to redevelop the property located at 4311 Sunset Boulevard (Site) in the City of Los Angeles. In order to facilitate the development of the property, a cumulative assessment for information regarding known hazardous materials and the potential for adverse effects on people or the environment is necessary.

The purpose of this PEA is to identify whether a release or threatened release of metals, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and/or total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH) exists at the Site and to evaluate the potential human health risks. Objectives of the PEA were to evaluate soil sampling data and identify chemicals of potential concern (COPCs), estimate potential future human health impacts as a result of exposure to identified COPCs, and if potential impacts exceed thresholds, provide recommendations to reduce human health impacts below thresholds. This PEA was performed in accordance with the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) PEA Guidance Manual (DTSC, 2015).

Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) were completed for the Site (Terracon 2007a, 2014). Soil or groundwater sampling investigations were not completed at the Site since the results of the 2007 Phase I ESA indicated there are no recognized environmental conditions (RECs) and no further evaluation of the Site was necessary (Terracon 2007b). The results of the 2007 Phase I ESA were incorporated into the 2014 ESA. Groundwater was not encountered in the maximum depth explored, approximately 56-½ feet below ground surface (bgs) below the Site. The proposed project would have two levels of underground parking. Given the reported depth to groundwater, the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to reach groundwater. In the event that the depth to groundwater is shallower at the time of construction and construction activities reach groundwater, dewatering would be implemented in accordance with all applicable regulations.. The City of Los Angeles provides a summary document that lists the relevant dewatering regulations and guidelines for compliance (City of Los Angeles undated).

- Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) 62.80 Drainage of Water into Streets - (a) It is unlawful for any person to drain water or other liquids or permit water or other liquids to be drained from lands or premises under such person's management or control onto any public street, or causes interference with or creates a hazard to public travel.
- LAMC 64.70.03 Elimination of Illicit Discharges and Illicit Connections - A. Prohibitions of Illicit Discharges. No person shall discharge non-storm water to the storm drain system, unless authorized by a separate or general NPDES Permit or if the discharges are exempted or conditionally exempted by the Municipal Storm Waters and

Urban Runoff NPDES Permit for Los Angeles County, as provided or as subsequently amended or if granted as a special waiver or exemption by the Regional Board.

- Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Order No. R4-2018-0095, General NPDES Permit No. CAG994004, Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Groundwater From Construction and Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties.

The ESAs were used in order to determine if any COPCs existed at the Site.

Based on the above information, there are no known contaminants at the Site and therefore would not result in human health impacts for potential future receptors. No further investigation is necessary.

1. Introduction

This Preliminary Endangerment Assessment (PEA) has been prepared for the City of Los Angeles' Department of City Planning for the 4311 Sunset project (Project) described herein.

1.1 Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this PEA is to consolidate the information from various available reports into a PEA using guidance from the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) PEA Guidance Manual (DTSC, 2015). The objective is to facilitate the redevelopment of the properties. The focus of this effort is on information regarding known hazardous materials and the potential for adverse effects on people or the environment. The focus does not include repeating all details provided in the Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) conducted for the Site. The reader is referred to the reference documents cited herein for site details not relevant to the risk analyses provide herein.

Overall objectives of this report include the following:

- Evaluate any soil or groundwater sampling data, if any;
- Identify chemicals of potential concern (COPCs), if any;
- Estimate the human health impacts from exposure to any identified COPCs;
- Provide recommendations to reduce risk and determine if further action/investigation is needed.

Note that the 2007 ESA concluded that a Phase II site investigation with soil and groundwater sampling was not needed (Terracon 2007b). Based on that conclusion, soil or groundwater sampling has not been conducted for this Site.

1.2 Scope of Work

Armbruster Goldsmith & Delvac, LLP, the attorneys for the project developer, has requested the preparation of a PEA in support of redeveloping the Site that comprises the Project in the City of Los Angeles, California (see **Figure 1**). Phase I ESAs were conducted for the Site. This existing information was used to prepare this PEA using guidance from the DTSC PEA Guidance Manual dated October 2015.

A Conceptual Site Model (CSM) is typically prepared to identify pathways that represent a potential route of human exposure. Potential human health risks are characterized by comparing project-specific data to screening levels. Screening levels are used based on DTSC's Human and Ecological Risk Office (HERO) Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) Note 3, the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFBRWQCB) environmental screening levels (ESLs), and United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Regional Screening Levels (RSLs).

1.3 Assumptions and Exclusions

It is assumed that the existing Phase I ESAs are sufficient to support the PEA, including the human health and ecological screening evaluation. Data Quality Objectives (DQOs) and rationale for sampling methodology are not needed because no sampling was conducted. Also, an ecological risk assessment was not conducted as the Site is not suitable habitats for ecological receptors.

It is assumed that public participation would occur separately through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process, in the event that a Remedial Action Plan (RAP), Removal Action Workplan (RAW), or similar document would be needed as a result of this PEA.

1.4 Information Provided from User/Owner/Landowner

The Project developer provided the reports cited in Chapter 12 References. These reports consist of the 2007 and 2014 Phase I ESAs and the 2007 recommendation for no sampling.

2. Site Description

This section describes the physical setting of the Site and their relation to surrounding areas.

2.1 Site Identification

The Site consists of a number of contiguous parcels. The Site and parcel information is listed below in **Table 1**. The parcels within the Site are shown on **Figure 2** in Appendix A.

TABLE 1
PROJECT SITE DESCRIPTIONS

| Address | APN | Current USEPA or Other Agency Identification Number, if any | Zoning | Land Use Designation |
|-------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|
| 4311 Sunset | | | | |
| 4301, 4003 Sunset | 5429-007-012 | None | [Q]C2-1VL | Neighborhood Commercial |
| 4311 Sunset | 5429-007-00600 | None | | |
| 4300 Effie | 5429-007-011 | None | R4-1VL | |
| 4306, 4308 Effie | 5429-007-010 | None | | |
| 4312, 4314 Effie | 5429-007-009 | None | | |

SOURCE: City of Los Angeles, 2016

2.1.1 Contact Person

The main contact person and mailing address for the Sunset Junction Project is listed below.

Mr. Dave Rand
Armbruster Goldsmith & Delvac LLP
12100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1600
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(310) 209-8800

2.1.2 General Property Location and Description

The Site is located on the corner of Sunset Boulevard and Bates Avenue (see Figure 1). The Site consists of several parcels, as identified in Table 1. The Site is located within the completely developed urban area of City of Los Angeles. The Site and constituent parcels are currently entirely developed with the zoning and land use designations identified in Table 1 and shown on Figure 2. Other than minor landscaping, the properties have no natural habitat or streams. Chapter 3 provides details of each sites current and previous uses. The Site's latitude and longitude and elevation are listed below in **Table 2**.

TABLE 2
SITE LOCATION AND ELEVATION

| Latitude | Longitude | Approximate Elevation (feet) |
|-----------|-------------|---------------------------------|
| 34.095186 | -118.282604 | 350 |

2.2 Site Geology and Hydrogeology

The regional and site-specific geology and hydrology information summarized below is adapted from the Phase I ESAs (Terracon 2007, 2014, unless otherwise cited).

2.2.1 Regional Geology

The Site is located within the western corner of the triangular Northeastern Block of the Los Angeles Basin. The Los Angeles Basin represents a transition between the Peninsular and the Transverse Range Geomorphic Provinces in Southern California. Geologic structures within the Transverse Range Province trend mostly east-west, in contrast to the prevailing northwest trend elsewhere in the state, including the Peninsular Range Province.

The Northeastern Block is bounded by the active Hollywood Fault about one mile to the north of the Site, the active Newport Fault about eight miles to the southwest, and the San Jacinto Fault about 50 miles to the east. The geology within the block consists of up to 24,000 feet of marine sedimentary rocks (Yerkes et al, 1965).

2.2.2 Site Geology and Hydrogeology

Beneath the varied surficial conditions (grass, concrete, and asphalt), approximately 2 to 5 feet of existing fill were encountered, consisting of sandy clays, clayey silts with sand, and silty sands. The fill material is underlain by native alluvial soils consisting of clayey silts, silty sands, sandy silts, sandy clays, lean clays, and fat clays. The native alluvial soils are in turn underlain by siltstone, silty sandstone, sandy claystone, and sedimentary claystone to the maximum depth explored, approximately 56-½ feet below ground surface (bgs). The borings were monitored for groundwater while drilling and immediately after completing the drilling operations.

Groundwater was not encountered or measured in the borings to the maximum depth explored, approximately 56-½ feet bgs. Based on research of other sites in this area, historical groundwater has been as shallow as 20 feet bgs (CDMG 1998).

3. Background

3.1 Site Status/Historical Site Information

The current and historical uses are summarized below by parcel, where information is available. The following information on current and historical uses at the Site are from the 2007 and 2014 Phase I ESAs (Terracon 2007a, 2014).

The existing development on the Site consists of the Bates Motel, a vacant auto electric shop, one single-family residence, and two duplex residential homes. Other Site improvements include, asphalt and concrete paved areas, driveways, landscaped grounds, and utilities.

The Site was developed as early as 1901 with residential dwellings. The current residential buildings were constructed in 1906, 1924 and 1953. The former auto electric shop (Mario's Electric Auto Shop) building and vacant hotel were constructed in 1952 and 1964 and have remained relatively unchanged through the present. Historical Site use consisted of residential, auto electric, auto speedometer repair, and auto air-conditioning repair shop from the early 1950s through the mid-2000s. The Site was also used for motel purposes from the mid-1950s through the late 1990s to early 2000s.

3.2 Hazardous Material/Substance/Waste Management Information

Based on the results of the 2007 Recommendation for no investigation and 2014 Phase I ESA, the consultants concluded there are no recognized environmental conditions (RECs) and recommended no further investigation (Terracon, 2007b, 2014).

3.3 Current and Historical Use(s) of Surrounding Properties

Based on a review of the Sanborn maps, an auto repairing (1919) and some dry cleaning operations were identified approximately 180 feet north and in an upgradient position relative to the Site; however, these offsite land uses did not appear to constitute RECs (Terracon, 2014a).

3.4 All Appropriate Inquiries Required Information

3.4.1 Fair Market Value

The 2014 ESA concluded the Site did not have any suspected contaminants. Based on this, property values of the Site would not be impacted and the evaluation of the relationship of the purchase price to the fair market value is not warranted.

3.4.2 Commonly Known or Reasonably Ascertainable Information about the Property

The Phase I ESAs conducted for the Site included extensive reconnaissance, which included interviews of individuals with knowledge of the sites' conditions. These individuals consisted of site owners and leasing managers. Based on this, all known or reasonably ascertainable information about the properties was acquired.

3.4.3 Records Review Information

The relevant results of the records review were incorporated into the previous sections and are described in further detail in the 2007 and 2014 Phase I ESA in Appendix B.

3.4.4 Site Reconnaissance

The relevant results of the site reconnaissance conducted by various consultants were incorporated into the previous sections and are described in further detail in the 2007 and 2014 Phase I ESA in Appendix B.

3.4.5 Interviews

The relevant results of interviews conducted by various consultants were incorporated into the previous sections and are described in further detail in the 2007 and 2014 Phase I ESA in Appendix B.

4. Apparent Problem

As previously discussed, historical land uses on the Site did not have any onsite historical land uses associated with RECs. The 2007 and 2014 Phase I ESAs performed by Terracon indicated that offsite historical land uses such as auto stations and dry cleaning services were in the surrounding areas. It was determined that RECs were not present onsite and the offsite land uses did not appear to constitute RECs (Terracon, 2014).

5. Conceptual Site Model

The Conceptual Site Model depicts the potential chemical sources present, transport mechanisms, exposure mediums, and exposure routes to potential receptors. It includes the potential sources of contaminants. However, based on the 2014 Phase I ESA performed for the Site, it was determined that RECs were not present onsite and therefore Project-specific data was determined not necessary, a CSM was not prepared for the Site.

5.1 Factors Related to Soil and Air Pathways

The Site is developed with a hotel, an auto electric shop, and residences. There are no potential chemical sources of concern on the Site, therefore the airborne pathway was not evaluated.

5.2 Factors Related to Water Pathways

The Site lies in the Hollywood Subbasin within the Coastal Plain of the Los Angeles Groundwater Basin. Groundwater flow in the Hollywood Subbasin is generally westward and is mainly produced from the Pleistocene age alluvial sands and gravels at approximately 35 feet bgs (DWR 2004). The nearest drinking water well is located more than 2 miles northeast from the Site (LACDPW 2018). Based on this and the lack of receptors, groundwater is considered an incomplete pathway.

Storm water runoff from the Site enters the Los Angeles County storm drain system that ultimately discharges into the Los Angeles River (LADWP 2018). The Los Angeles River is located over 2 miles east of the Site. Storm water runoff from the Site flows north along Bates Avenue where there is potential entry into a storm drain at the corner of Bates Avenue and Effie Street. Although there is documented recreational use along the Los Angeles River, there are no known surface water intakes present (CLA 2019, LACDPW, 1996). Based on this and the lack of receptors, surface water is considered an incomplete pathway.

6. Sampling Activities and Results

6.1 Summary of Activities

Since no RECs were associated with the Site, soil or groundwater sampling was not warranted. (Terracon 2014).

6.2 Sample Collection

No sampling activities were performed at this Site.

6.3 Discussion of Results

No COPCs were identified nor suspected at the Site. No further investigation is necessary.

7. Human Health Screening Evaluation

7.1 Risk Characterization Summary

Based on the results of 2014 Phase I ESA conducted for the Site; COPCs were not identified and a human health screening evaluation was not warranted.

8. Ecological Screening Evaluation

8.1 Biological Characterization

The Site is proposed for a residential and commercial development. The proposed development would not maintain or be suitable for wildlife habitat.

8.2 Ecological Pathway Assessment

The Site would not have significant amounts of wildlife based on the proposed development, therefore, an assessment of potential exposure to sensitive ecological receptors is unnecessary.

8.3 Ecological Screening Evaluation Summary

Based on the development being located in a highly urbanized area that is highly disturbed, the proposed land uses would not support or be suitable for wildlife, therefore, an ecological screening evaluation was not conducted.

9. Community Profile

It is assumed that further public participation would occur separately through the CEQA process, in the event that a RAP, RAW, or similar document would be needed as a result of this PEA.

10. Environmental Professional Opinion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

11.1 Summary Opinion and Conclusions

No COPCs were identified at the Site. No further investigation is necessary.

11.2 Recommendations

Based on the above-stated conclusion that there are no COPCs at this Site, no recommendations are necessary.

11.3 Data Gaps

No data gaps were identified.

12. References

- California Department of Water Resources (DWR) 2004. South Coast Hydrologic Region, *Coastal Plain of Los Angeles Groundwater Basin, Hollywood Subbasin*, revised February 27, 2004.
- City of Los Angeles (CLA), 2019, LA Sanitation & Environment, Los Angeles River Quality, https://www.lacitysan.org/san/faces/home/portal/s-lsh-wwd/s-lsh-wwd-wp/s-lsh-wwd-wp-cwmp/s-lsh-wwd-wp-cwmp-wq/s-lsh-wwd-wp-cwmp-wq-larq?_adf.ctrl-state=1d235hw2fh_298&_afLoop=8796290266230303#!
- City of Los Angeles, undated, Los Angeles Dewatering Discharges; available at https://www.lacitysan.org/cs/groups/sg_cw/documents/document/y250/mdmx/~edisp/cnt031145.pdf
- Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), 2015, *Preliminary Endangerment Assessment Guidance Manual*, revised October 2015
- Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW), 2018, GIS Data Portal, <https://egis3.lacounty.gov/dataportal/?s=active+wells>
- Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) 2018, Storm Drain System, <http://dpw.lacounty.gov/fcd/stormdrain/disclaimer.cfm>
- Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW) 1996, *Los Angeles River Master Plan*, <http://dpw.lacounty.gov/wmd/Watershed/LA/Larmp/> June 1996.
- Office of Environmental Health Hazards Assessment (OEHHA). 2004. *Public Health Goal for Arsenic, April 2004*.
- Terracon, 2007a, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Proposed Mixed Development, 4301-4311 Sunset Boulevard & 4300-4306 Effie Street, Silverlake, Los Angeles County, California*, May 1
- Terracon, 2007b, *Recommendation Not to Perform Limited Site Investigation (LSI) at Proposed Mixed Use Development, 4301 Sunset Blvd, Los Angeles, California*, May 31
- Terracon, 2014, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Proposed Mixed Use Development, 4301 – 4311 W. Sunset Boulevard and 4300 – 4314 N. Effie Street, Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California*, November 7
- Yerkes, R.F., T.H. McCulloh, J.E. Schoellhamer, and J.G. Vedder, 1965, *Geology of the Los Angeles Basin – An Introduction*, USGS Professional Paper 420-A

13. Signatures and Qualifications of Environmental Professionals

This section includes qualification statements of the environmental professionals responsible for conducting the PEA.

Mr. Michael Burns, PG, CEG, CHG, of ESA conducted the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment portion of this PEA. Mr. Burns has over 30 years of experience in environmental site investigations, characterizations, and assessments, including Phase I Environmental Site Assessments.

Ms. Heidi Rous, CPP, of ESA conducted the Risk Assessment portion of this PEA. Ms. Rous has over 25 years of experience in conducting Risk Assessments.

Mr. Burns and Ms. Rous declare that, to the best of their professional knowledge and belief, they meet the definition of Environmental Professional as defined in 40 CFR §312.10. We have the specific qualifications based on education, training, and experience to assess a property of the nature, history, and setting of the subject property. We have developed and performed the all appropriate inquiries in conformance with the standards and practices set forth in 40 CFR Part 312.

Geologist:

Michael G. Burns, PG #4532, CEG #1846, CHG #280

December , 2020

Risk Assessor:

Heidi Rous, CPP

December , 2020