

DESCRIPTION OF MUSEUM OF TOLERANCE EXPANSION PROJECT & IMPACTS

The following description is taken directly from the Draft Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”). Page numbers refer to page numbers in the DEIR.

- **FLOOR AREA & SETBACK:** “The Museum is proposing an expansion of its existing facilities to approximately **100,000 square feet** of floor area” (p. I-60). There would be a “**20-foot wide landscaped buffer** along the southern boundary of the project site” [i.e., reduced from the currently required 100 feet] separating the Museum building from the adjacent single-family home. (p. I-14). “An approximately **840 square foot water feature [with “minimal sound”]** would also be provided adjacent to the . . . buffer area.” (p. I-15 and Figure II-10)
- **CAPACITY:** “The proposed expansion . . . **could accommodate a total of 1,071 occupants** in a lecture setting and 500 occupants in a banquet setting (p. I-5). The proposed project would allow events with up to 500 guests between 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM on weekdays and Sundays and events with up to **800 guests after 7:00 PM on weekdays, after sundown on Saturdays, and from 7:00 AM to midnight on Sundays.**” (p. I-60). [Note: the applicant’s figures do not appear to take into account the *additional* 100+ “occupants” comprising the catering staff and waiters, security guards, entertainers/musicians, and valets].
- **PARKING:** “As part of the proposed project, the **parking garage would be *reduced* to 202 parking spaces.** Parking would be expanded . . . by the provision of 40 valet spaces, for a total of 242 spaces.” (p. I-60). In addition, off-site parking would be available at 1399 Roxbury Drive There would be 99 parking spaces and 20 valet parking spaces available . . . at this building. . . . More specifically, 97 (plus 20 valet) would be available on Saturday after sundown and on Sunday from 7:00 AM to midnight; only 85 (105 with valet) would be available after 7:00 PM on weekdays.” (p. I-6). Note: there is no information as to how many spaces are compact vs. regular-sized spaces, so this is at *best* a total (including valet) of 359 spaces (or only 347 spaces weekdays after 7:00 PM) for 800 to 1,071 people. “As a worst case analysis, it was assumed 179 occupants would be waiting for valet for a period of more than 15 minutes *between 12:00 AM and 2:00 AM.*” (p. I-47).
- **HOURS OF OPERATION:** “The Museum areas other than the Exhibition Space would be open **Sunday through Thursday from 7:00 AM until midnight**, Friday from 7:00 AM to sundown, and **Saturday from after sundown until midnight.**” (p. I-6).
- **USES:** “The proposed project would . . . allow the private use of the facility, including on a rental basis.” (p. II-4). “The proposed project would . . . result in larger interior spaces for . . . receptions [and] banquets” (p. II-4) “The applicant proposes to allow private third-parties to use these new and improved spaces for catered receptions, banquets and other events. . . families will be able to use the Museum of Tolerance as the venue for their own important events.” (p. II-5). “The Museum is currently unable to host third-party events, which are a SOURCE OF REVENUE” (p. II-7).
- **AESTHETICS:** “The planted parkway [on Roxbury Drive] would . . . include cast-in-place colored **concrete benches** and planters.” (p. I-7). “[These] concrete benches provide seating for students and visitors and act as security bollards.” (Figure II-10). “The proposed expansion would replace the existing Museum façade with a light-weight, **fiber cement panel**, a non-reflective painted metal panel, and **glass storefront windows** the second floor would also consist of fiber cement panel and would feature a large **monolithic glass window**; the ground and second floors would be bisected by a non-reflective vertical aluminum panel; the third floor would also consist of **eight-foot tall fiber cement panels** and would feature a large glass window. An ‘MOT’ **identification sign** would also be placed on this façade.” (p. I-15). “The sign . . . would be **illuminated by lighting** at night. **The proposed sign would cover an area of approximately 15 feet by 45 feet.**” “The existing Museum contains horizontal banding that de-emphasizes the scale of the building. The proposed project would replace this with a number of metal panels and wall systems that contain a

vertical line, thereby **increasing the perceived height and scale of the building**. Given the one- and two- story nature of the residential neighborhood to [the] west/southwest, there would be a significant impact with respect to the scale and massing of the proposed project.” (p. I-18).

- **NOISE:** “As part of the proposed project, a section of the Museum would accommodate events for as many as 800 people, including live music that would occur as late as midnight.” (p. I-48).
- **IMPACTS:**
 - “. . . the proposed expansion would represent a contrast with the surrounding residences and visual impacts related to architectural design as viewed from the south would be significant.” (p. I-15).
 - “. . . though the architectural style of the proposed expansion would be consistent with the existing Museum . . . it would represent a contrast with the surrounding residences. Therefore, impacts related to architectural design as seen from [the southeast] would be significant.” (p. I-15).
 - “One- to two- story single-family residences front Roxbury Drive to the west and southwest of the project site. The architectural style of these residences differs substantially from the more contemporary architecture of the existing Museum and would also differ substantially from [the] modern design of the proposed expansion. Nonetheless, while the proposed expansion would be consistent with the existing Museum . . . it would represent a contrast with the surrounding residences and visual impacts related to architectural design as viewed from [the west and southwest] would be significant” (p. I-15 to I-16).
 - “. . . the height of the proposed expansion would contrast with the one- to two- story residences to the south, east and west.” (p. I-16)
 - “. . . the proposed increase in massing of the Museum would contrast with the one- to two- story residential uses to the south, east and west.” (p. I-16).
 - “The proposed expansion would represent a change in character with respect to massing and scale on the southern portion of the project site.” (p. I-17)
 - “. . . the project would represent a substantial increase in the overall mass and scale of the Museum when compared with the dominant scale found in the surrounding residential neighborhood. Therefore, impacts as seen from [the southeast] would be significant.” (p. I-17).
 - **“NO FEASIBLE MITIGATION MEASURES HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED TO REDUCE THE IMPACT RELATED [TO] THE HEIGHT AND MASSING AS THE PROPOSED HEIGHTS AND SETBACKS OF THE EXPANSION COULD NOT BE REDUCED WITHOUT COMPROMISING THE OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT. . . . NO FEASIBLE MITIGATION MEASURES HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED TO REDUCE THE IMPACT RELATED OR [S/C] TO VISUAL CHARACTER TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL.”** (p. I-19)
“IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WITH RESPECT TO VISUAL CHARACTER AS WELL AS THE MASSING AND THE HEIGHT OF THE PROPOSED EXPANSION AS IT WOULD CONTRAST WITH THE NEIGHBORING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCES. THIS IMPACT WOULD REMAIN SIGNIFICANT AS THERE ARE NO FEASIBLE MITIGATION MEASURES THAT WOULD REDUCE IMPACTS TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL” (p. I-20).
 - “The proposed project would create new sources of interior and exterior light, including illuminated signage, and would likely increase nighttime ambient illumination levels onto the surrounding light-sensitive residential properties.” (p. I-23).
 - “Noise generated from the combined construction activities of [the MOT and Yeshiva] project is anticipated to result in short-term [Note: the applicant defines two or more YEARS as “short term”] significant impacts to nearby sensitive receptors. As such, the proposed project would make a considerable contribution to short-term cumulative construction impacts. While these impacts would be short-term [i.e., two or more years] in duration, they would be significant and unavoidable.” (p. I-50).
 - “. . . project-related and cumulative construction associated noise levels would exceed thresholds contained in Appendix G to the State CEQA Guidelines and in the L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide and impacts would remain significant and unavoidable . . . project-related and

cumulative construction activities would result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance . . . or applicable standards of other agencies; exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels and a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project . . . construction associated vibration levels would exceed thresholds of the FTA and impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. All feasible mitigation measures were considered to reduce ground borne vibration to the [Yeshiva] during construction. After carefully considering all feasible mitigation measures and implementing those listed above, ground borne vibration impacts to the [Yeshiva] would remain significant and unavoidable.” (p. I-52) [Note: the same applies to the residences adjacent to the Yeshiva, particularly during the warmer months when residents keep the windows open in their non-airconditioned homes].

- “. . . the proposed project would result in significant impacts to the following FIVE intersections: [Olympic & Beverwil, Pico & Beverwil; Pico & Beverly Drive; Pico & Robertson; and Monte Mar & Beverwil] . . . LADOT determined that mitigation recommended for the four study intersections within its jurisdiction . . . would be infeasible. . . . As such, impacts at the four study intersections within the City of Los Angeles would be significant and unavoidable.” (p. I-59) “If the City of Beverly Hills does not approve the mitigation measure recommended for potential impacts to the Olympic Boulevard and Beverwil Drive [intersection], impacts to this intersection would remain significant and unavoidable.” (p. I-66)

- **DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS AND APPROVALS:** “The applicant is requesting approval of the following discretionary actions from the City of Los Angeles and/or other agencies:

- “General Plan Amendment on three lots . . . from Low Density Residential land use designation to Neighborhood Commercial land use designation”
- “General Plan Amendment on four lots . . . to amend Footnote No. 1 to include ‘institutional property at southeast corner of Pico Boulevard and Roxbury Drive’ in the list of exceptions to Height District 1”
- “Vesting Zone Change and Height District Changes to change the three R1-1 zoned lots . . . to [Q]C4-2D-0”
- “Vesting Zone Change and Height District Change on existing commercial lot . . . from C4-1VL to [Q]C4-2D-0”
- “Zoning Administrator Approval . . . to permit buildings on lots in the C Zone to exceed the maximum heights set by LAMC Section 12.21 A.10”
- “Site Plan Review Approval for change of use and net increase in average daily trips”
- “A Plan Approval to amend the conditions of the Conditional Use Permit” [Note: what is being sought is basically a wholesale revocation of the 1986 CUP]
- “Zoning Administrator Approval . . . for Height and Area Relief”
- “A Zoning Administrator’s Determination regarding Shared Parking at 1399 Roxbury Drive”
- “CPC Authorization for Reduced On-Site Parking with Remote Off-site Parking”
- “Approval for Public Benefit Project for museum use”
- “Vesting Tentative Tract map for airspace subdivision”
- Any additional actions as may be determined necessary or desirable”

YET, notwithstanding ALL of the above “discretionary actions” required, the applicant states: “The proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on land use planning”! (p. I-45).

THERE IS NO NEED TO READ ALL 2,892 PAGES OF THE DEIR. THERE IS SIMPLY NO JUSTIFICATION FOR THIS PROJECT. IT WILL DESTROY THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR ALL OF THE MUSEUM’S NEIGHBORS, ESPECIALLY FOR THE MANY ELDERLY RESIDENTS, AND IT IS A REPUGNANT TRANSFORMATION OF A HOLOCAUST MUSEUM AND MEMORIAL INTO A PARTY VENUE. VOTE ‘NO’ ON THE MUSEUM OF TOLERANCE EXPANSION!!