

2.0 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

This chapter of the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) contains all comments received on the Draft EIR for the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert New Community Plan (Proposed Project) during the public review period, as well responses to each of those comments. In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15088, the Los Angeles Department of City Planning (DCP) has evaluated the comments on environmental issues received from agencies and other interested parties and has prepared written responses to each comment pertinent to the adequacy of the environmental analyses contained in the Draft EIR. In specific compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(b), the written responses address the environmental issues raised. In addition, where appropriate, the basis for incorporating or not incorporating specific suggestions into the Proposed Project is provided. In each case, DCP has expended a good faith effort, supported by reasoned analysis, to respond to comments. Although some letters may raise legal or planning issues, these issues do not always constitute significant environmental issues. Therefore, the comment has been noted, but no response has been provided. Generally, the responses to comments provide explanation or amplification of information contained in the Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR was prepared and initially circulated for a 45-day review period beginning on September 13, 2012 and closing on October 29, 2012. However, in response to requests by interested parties, the review period was extended to 60 days, closing on November 13, 2012. During this period, 15 comment letters regarding the Draft EIR for the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert New Community Plan (NCP) received from public agencies, organizations, and individuals. Two additional comment letters were received after the close of the Draft EIR review period, but still have been included.

2.1 COMMENTS RECEIVED

Each comment letter has been assigned a number. The body of each comment letter has been separated into individual comments, which also have been numbered. This results in a tiered numbering system, whereby the first comment in Letter 1 is depicted as Comment 1-1, and so on. These numbered comment letters are included in their entirety, followed by the corresponding responses. Copies of the comment letters are included in Appendix J of this Final EIR.

The following presents the list of comment letters received on the Draft EIR during the public review period from public agencies, organizations, and individuals:

1. California Restaurant Association
2. Community Health Councils (CHC)
3. CHC and the Undersigned Organizations and Individuals
4. Neighbors United, Faircrest Heights Community
5. Los Angeles Conservancy
6. United Neighborhood of the Historic Arlington heights, West Adams, and Jefferson Park Communities Neighborhood Council (UNNC)
7. UNNC Stakeholder
8. Craig Lawson & Co. (on behalf of Kaiser)
9. D. Varnado
10. Joyce Dillard
11. Plains Exploration & Production Company
12. South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)
13. Scott A. Ginsberg
14. Walter Marks
15. West Adams Heritage Association

Two additional comment letters were received after the close of the Draft EIR public review period:

16. CHC
17. UNNC

2.2 MASTER RESPONSES

A number of the comments raise common issues, so rather than respond to each comment individually this Final EIR includes the following five Master Responses:

- Master Response 1: Baseline (Base Year) Population and Housing
- Master Response 2: Transportation Baseline (Base Year)
- Master Response 3: Traffic Impact Analysis Methodology
- Master Response 4: Displacement/Affordable Housing
- Master Response 5: Parks and Open Space

MASTER RESPONSE 1: BASELINE (BASE YEAR) POPULATION AND HOUSING

Comments. A number of comments were received related to the existing population estimate used in the Draft EIR. Specifically, the comments question the use of a 2008 estimate for baseline, or Base Year existing conditions instead of Census 2010 data. The comments also question why the 2030 Proposed Project population capacity is greater than Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) projections and why the South Los Angeles Planning Subregion, which includes the subject CPA, is anticipated to receive a large proportion of the City's population growth.

Introduction. The CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR include a description of the Base Year conditions against which project-related impacts are compared. Normally, the Base Year is the physical environmental condition that exists when the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published. However, the CEQA Guidelines recognize that the date for establishing a Base Year cannot be rigid because environmental conditions may vary over time and it may be more appropriate for disclosing impacts to select an alternative baseline. Therefore, the use of a Base Year that differs from the date of the NOP is appropriate when doing so results in a more accurate environmental analysis. Conversely, there is no specific timeline established by the CEQA Guidelines that dictate how much time may pass before the established Base Year physical environmental conditions are no longer acceptable for use as the Base Year.

Land use planning for the West Adams NCP officially began in the year 2006. The NOP for the West Adams NCP Draft EIR was published on February 1, 2008. Following the general rule in CEQA Guidelines Section 15125, DCP selected the year 2008 as the Base Year physical environmental conditions against which project-related impacts are compared. The Final EIR, including the Draft EIR and Appendix M, indicates that the City relied on the best available data and reasonable assumptions to determine the 2008 conditions in the various impact areas, including population and employment data.

Notwithstanding the City's legally and factually supported selection of the 2008 baseline data, in an effort to respond to comments, the City is providing supplemental data and additional discussion on the more current data to demonstrate that the analysis in the Draft EIR is further validated. Baseline data is comprised of demographic data which is not static. Shifts in demographic data occur continually through the process of analyzing a project. A point in time must be selected to represent the existing conditions. The 2010 Census was released in April 2011 during the preparation of the Draft EIR. The 2010 Census revealed that there were 7,543 fewer persons in the West Adams Community Plan Area in 2010 than were estimated in 2008 (an approximately four percent difference). The 2010 Census also revealed that there were 158 more dwelling units than estimated in 2008 (an approximately 0.2 percent difference). Although there is a difference between the 2008 Base Year population and housing estimates, and the 2010 Census data, the difference does not constitute a significant material change to the scope of the Proposed Project. As discussed in this

Master Response 1 and the supplemental discussion in Chapter 3.0, the difference does not change the impact conclusions presented in the Draft EIR. Therefore, the continued use of the 2008 Base Year population and housing condition is appropriate and reasonable for the EIR. (For more information on the City's methodology for establishing baseline related to demographics, refer to Final EIR Appendix M.)

It is important to note that while an EIR must include a description of the Base Year conditions against which project-related impacts are compared, the "delta", or difference between the Base Year 2008 conditions and the future 2030 build-out conditions of the Proposed Project is generally assessed in terms of dwelling units or threshold other than population. Changes in population factor into portions of the analysis for 6 of the 16 impact areas which include Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Noise, Population, Housing and Employment, Public Services and Transportation. Additionally, as described in the Draft EIR, for the majority of the impact areas, the "delta" is not used to determine whether the implementation of the Proposed Project, which has a 20-year planning horizon, would result in significant environmental impacts. Rather, the determination of significance of impacts is based primarily on the end-state condition, or in this case, whether future conditions under the Proposed Project's 2030 capacity would exceed established thresholds of significance, as described in the Draft EIR on pages 4.13-10 and 4.13-11. But for those areas where the delta is relied on, additional review and supplemental analysis is provided, which demonstrates that the use of the 2010 Census data, or even more recent population and housing estimates for the CPA, would not result in different environmental impact determinations than those in the Draft EIR. Further discussion regarding the changes that have occurred within the West Adams CPA since 2008 with respect to population, housing, and traffic are provided below. Supplemental analyses of the other environmental topics evaluated in the Draft EIR with respect to the Base Year 2008 conditions are presented in Chapter 3.0, Section 3.2 of this Final EIR. The supplemental analysis concludes that the impact determinations presented in the Draft EIR would not change if the Base Year was moved to a more recent date for the purposes of an evaluation of environmental impacts caused by the implementation of the Proposed Project through the year 2030.

Population and Housing Base Year Conditions. The State of California requires that cities plan for changes that can effect population, housing demand and employment. If growth is anticipated, each city must accommodate a share of the region's projected growth. The regional growth projections are developed by the City of Los Angeles in concert with the SCAG, the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the six-county region. SCAG is mandated by federal and State governments to prepare the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), a long-range regional transportation plan that addresses regional growth based on an analysis of past and future regional trends. Using the SCAG 2004 RTP, the population and housing numbers for the 2008 Base Year in the West Adams NCP Draft EIR was estimated to be 182,600 persons and 66,415 housing units.

The 2008 Base Year population estimate for the West Adams CPA represented a 9,687 person growth from the 2000 Census. As mentioned above, the 2010 Census revealed that there were 7,543 fewer persons in the West Adams CPA in 2010 than were estimated for the 2008 Base Year (an approximately four percent difference). It was also revealed that there were 158 more housing units than were estimated for the 2008 Base Year (an approximately a 0.2 percent difference). Since development activity in the CPA between 2008 and 2010 was minimal, with no general plan land use amendments occurring during this period, and no changes to the existing zoning, factors such as increases in the vacancy rate due to the Great Recession could account for the difference, still others warrant consideration. For example, following the release of the 2010 Census, a Congressional Report found that there had been an undercount predominately of Blacks and Hispanics nationwide. Using the factors outlined in the Congressional Report, the difference between the Draft EIR's 2008 population estimate and 2010 Census data for the West Adams CPA indicates a reduction by as much as 3,015 persons, or roughly 40 percent (instead of the 7,543 person difference identified in the 2010 Census).¹

¹The 2010 Decennial Census: Background and Issues Report for Congress, Congressional Research Service, October 18, 2012 (see Appendix N for additional data and supporting exhibits).

In addition to the above, modifications to the Proposed Project involving down zoning and down planning in certain residential neighborhoods was part of the City Planning Commission motion recommending approval of the Proposed Project. Should the City Council adopt these requested modifications, the Proposed Project's overall capacity would be reduced by 1,861 dwelling units and 4,729 persons², reducing the "delta" between Census 2010 data and the Proposed Project's 2030 plan capacity from 43,683 to 38,954; closer to the 36,141 person 2008 to 2030 "delta" currently described in the Draft EIR.

Additionally, DCP's 2014 *Growth & Infrastructure Report* estimates that population and housing within the West Adams CPA has increased by an additional 2,875 persons and 41 housing units since 2010, bringing the totals within the CPA to 177,932 persons and 66,614 units as of 2014, more in line with prevailing Census trends for the area. Refer to Tables 6 and 7 of the report for a comparison of the Census data and 2014 estimates.

Regardless of the above noted fluctuations in population and housing growth due to factors such as vacancy rates, possible undercounts, or modifications to the Proposed Project; these increases (or decreases) do not change the conclusions presented in the Draft EIR about population and housing impacts. As described through the Thresholds of Significance Section of the Draft EIR, and in particular the City CEQA Thresholds Guidelines listed on page 4.13-10, analysis of population and housing impacts is not based on the "delta" between Base Year conditions and the 2030 end-state conditions, but instead focuses on the end-state capacity of the Proposed Project; its ability to accommodate SCAG's projected citywide population and housing allocation through the horizon year; and its EIR's ability to adequately address the determination of significance of impacts and established thresholds of significance listed on page 4.13-10, analyzed on page 4.13-11 with supplemental analysis included in Chapter 3.0 of this Final EIR.

Forecasted Population and Housing Capacity. The analysis of impacts in the EIR with regard to population and housing is based on the end-state condition of the 20-year planning horizon to determine whether or not the West Adams NCP accommodates SCAG's projected growth for the year 2030. Referring to paragraph 3 on page 4.13-12 of the Draft EIR, the SCAG 2004 RTP population and housing forecasts for 2030 as adjusted by the DCP for the West Adams CPA are 201,220 persons and 79,074 housing units. However, the West Adams NCP Draft EIR evaluates a population and housing capacity of 218,714 persons and 86,118 housing units in order to adequately consider the potential population increases anticipated within this urbanized area along its key transportation corridors, and in particular, those associated with the establishment of two new light rail transit lines featuring 10 station areas serving the West Adams CPA and linking it to nearby major employment centers such as Downtown Los Angeles, the University of Southern California, West Los Angeles and Downtown Santa Monica. This is consistent with the General Plan Framework Element policies and State mandated policies to promote infill development near transit and reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Therefore, the population and housing capacity of the West Adams CPA that was evaluated for the Draft EIR is based on assumptions about the level of development that can be expected to occur during the 20 year planning horizon of the West Adams NCP. Given the proposed Community Plan's land use designations and development regulations that allow greater density at major intersection sites and at light rail transit stations in order to create transit-oriented development (TOD) throughout the Community Plan Area, the evaluation of a greater end-state capacity than the target projection(s) provided by SCAG was performed to consider potential growth that the SCAG trend forecasts did not take into account for the horizon period, and the EIR discloses the potential impacts associated with build-out of the Proposed Project's unique set of land use recommendations.

As described more fully in Final EIR Appendix M (Methodology), the provision of increased population and housing capacity under the West Adams NCP, as evaluated in the Draft EIR, does not explicitly mean that the CPA would be developed to planned levels if demand for the land uses does not exist. The analysis of impacts using projected capacity numbers is a disclosure of potential development levels that could exist at the forecasted end-state based on the land uses and policy changes proposed under the West Adams NCP.

²Refer to Chapter 3.0, Section 3.2 of this Final EIR, Revisions to Draft EIR, Appendix B.

MASTER RESPONSE 2: TRANSPORTATION BASELINE (BASE YEAR)

Comments. A number of comments question the use of 2005 traffic count data to represent the 2008 Base Year traffic conditions and how those Base Year conditions influence the air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) analysis. The comments suggest that 2012 or 2013 traffic data should be used to represent Base Year traffic conditions.

Response. Traffic in the West Adams CPA is regional and not limited to the conditions solely existing in the West Adams CPA, and the travel demand forecasting model (Travel Model) used to evaluate potential traffic impacts of the West Adams NCP uses regional SCAG land use forecasts for areas outside of the CPA and the land use assumptions existing therein. Forecasts of future traffic conditions are not solely dependent on base year traffic data. Rather, forecasts of future traffic conditions are based on the land use projections for the reasonable expected development build-out of the West Adams CPA.

Although land use planning for the West Adams NCP officially began in 2006, traffic counts were first collected as early as 2005 to develop the Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Plan (TIMP) for the West Adams NCP. Therefore, the Travel Model used to develop the TIMP for the West Adams NCP was initially calibrated and validated to Year 2005 traffic conditions in the AM and PM peak hours. To determine if the traffic counts collected in 2005 were acceptable to represent 2008 conditions, additional traffic counts were collected at like locations in 2008 (Counts for later years have also been collected and will be discussed below). A comparison of the counts indicated that traffic counts in 2005 were generally similar to 2008 traffic counts. In fact, the 2005 traffic counts were slightly higher than those collected at the same locations in 2008. Specifically, as shown in **Table 2-1**, traffic counts conducted in 2005 were approximately four and nine percent higher in the AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

TABLE 2-1: COMPARISON OF 2005 AND 2008 TRAFFIC COUNTS		
Measure	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Sum of 2005 Traffic Counts	39,250	43,400
Sum of 2008 Traffic Counts	37,564	39,491
Difference (2008 – 2005)	-1,686	-3,909
Percent Difference	-4.3%	-9.0%
SOURCE: Fehr & Peers, <i>New Community Plan Program West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan Area Draft Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Program</i> , August 2012.		

Because the 2005 traffic counts are higher than the 2008 counts, and the forecast adds future growth in travel demand to Base Year traffic counts, the traffic forecast used as the basis of the traffic impact analysis represents a more conservative assessment of future conditions, as future growth in travel demand was added to higher Base Year traffic conditions. Therefore, DCP, in consultation with the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) and the Traffic Consultant, determined that the 2005 model calibration was valid for use in the West Adams TIMP, and 2005 traffic counts were used to represent existing (Year 2008) traffic conditions.

With the release of this Final EIR, DCP has evaluated the latest traffic volume data available from LADOT at street intersections within the West Adams CPA between 2008 and the second quarter of 2012. **Table 2-2** provides a comparison of traffic data between 2008 to 2012, which reveals negligible changes (increase in morning peak hour traffic by less than two percent, and decreasing in the afternoon peak hour traffic by less than two percent), meaning that traffic in the West Adams CPA has not changed significantly in this timeframe.

TABLE 2-2: COMPARISON OF TRAFFIC COUNTS FROM 2008, 2010, AND 2012						
Intersection	Peak Hour	2008/ (2005)	2010	2012	2008-2010 Difference / Percent Difference	2010-2012 Difference / Percent Difference
Venice Blvd. east of La Cienega Blvd.	AM	3,755	3,319	3,302	-436 / -11.61%	-17 / -0.51%
	PM	3,491	3,021	3,028	-470 / -13.46%	7 / 0.23%
National Blvd. east of Robertson Blvd.	AM	2,375	2,208	2,388	-167 / -7.03%	61 / 2.34%
	PM	2,608	2,669	2,498	180 / 8.15%	-171 / -6.41%
Cattarugus Ave. south of Venice Blvd.	AM	290	516	693	226 / 77.93%	14 / 6.09%
	PM	230	244	341	177 / 34.30%	97 / 39.75%
Venice Blvd. west of Burchard Ave.	AM	3,179	3,883	2,659	704 / 22.15%	281 / 8.95%
	PM	3,138	3,419	2,691	-1,224 / -31.52%	-728 / -21.29%
Washington Blvd. west of Thurman Ave.	AM	2,093	2,635	2,191	542 / 25.90%	-167 / -8.25%
	PM	2,025	1,858	1,756	-444 / -16.85%	-102 / -5.49%
Adams Blvd. west of Fairfax Ave.	AM	878	1,575	1,417	697 / 79.38%	677 / 88.27%
	PM	767	1,444	835	-158 / -10.03%	-609 / -42.17%
Angeles Vista Blvd. north of Slauson Ave.	AM	1,078	1,083	1,247	5 / 0.46%	240 / 22.99%
	PM	1,044	1,284	1,400	164 / 15.14%	116 / 9.03%
West Blvd. north of Slauson Ave.	AM	476	445	366	-31 / -6.51%	-79 / -17.75%
	PM	613	632	648	19 / 3.10%	16 / 2.53%
Crenshaw Blvd. north of Slauson Ave.	AM	2,568	2,743	2,400	175 / 6.81%	384 / 13.20%
	PM	2,909	3,293	3,043	-343 / -12.50%	-250 / -7.59%
Van Ness Ave. north of Slauson Ave.	AM	1,078	1,342	1,057	264 / 24.49%	298 / 21.05%
	PM	1,416	1,714	1,365	-285 / -21.24%	-349 / -20.36%
Crenshaw Blvd. north of Hyde Park Blvd.	AM	2,090	2,302	2,347	212 / 10.14%	68 / 2.71%
	PM	2,510	2,578	2,627	45 / 1.95%	49 / 1.90%
West Blvd. north of Hyde Park Blvd.	AM	805	1,276	990	471 / 58.51%	2 / 0.16%
	PM	1,284	1,286	1,389	-286 / -22.41%	103 / 8.01%
Total 2008-2010 Percent Difference					AM	12.88%
					PM	6.39%
Total 2010-2012 Percent Difference					AM	-9.73%
					PM	-7.77%
Total 2008-2012 Percent Difference					AM	1.90%
					PM	-1.88%

SOURCE: Fehr & Peers, 2012, LADOT, 2014.

This stability in the area’s traffic volumes is a key consideration because existing traffic volumes are used in the traffic impact model calibration process where trips generated from existing land uses (based on commonly accepted trip generation rates) are formulaically distributed onto the West Adams CPA’s street network and compared to existing street traffic volumes. The model is calibrated when the estimated traffic volumes derived from the model are substantially the same as actual counted traffic volumes. Therefore, although the population decreased slightly between the 2008 estimate and the release of the 2010 US Census, development activity in the CPA was minimal, with no general plan land use amendments, zone changes, or notable changes in area traffic volumes occurring during this period. As a result, the 2008 travel demand model represents a reasonable traffic Base Year for the West Adams NCP, and the continued use of the 2008 Base Year traffic analysis for the West Adams NCP is justified as the use of more recent traffic data would not change the transportation and traffic impact conclusions presented in the Draft EIR which remain significant and unavoidable. Furthermore, this supports the conclusions for Air Quality (Draft EIR Section 4.3) and Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Draft EIR Section 4.7) which were evaluated in terms of whether the implementation of the West Adams New Community Plan would result in substantial temporary or permanent increases in air emissions occurring within the West Adams CPA and which substantially rely on the traffic modeling and outputs for their analysis.

MASTER RESPONSE 3: TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

Comments. A number of comments questioned the traffic impact analysis methodology, the use of the 2005 Base Year traffic conditions, vehicle trip reduction techniques (such as the 4Ds as described in Final EIR Appendix M - Transportation), and the TOD areas.

Background. Section 4.15, Transportation & Traffic Section of the Draft EIR, pages 4.15-1 through 4.15-28, was prepared utilizing the data, analysis and findings of the Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Program (TIMP) Report prepared for the West Adams New Community Plan update. As part of the TIMP, a traffic analysis was undertaken in accordance with the City of Los Angeles guidelines. As described through Chapter 3 of the TIMP Report (Draft EIR, Appendix G) a travel demand forecasting model (Travel Model) was used to forecast future (Year 2030) operating conditions of the transportation network with the Proposed Project land use changes. Traffic forecasts for the West Adams CPA were then analyzed using the City's criteria for roadway segments. Referring to the Roadway Level of Service analysis beginning on page 4.15-23 of the Draft EIR, the resulting analysis identified that the majority of roadway segments would operate at a satisfactory level of service (LOS) (C or better) under future (Year 2030) operating conditions both with and without the TIMP. However, a number of roadway segments would operate at unsatisfactory LOS under both conditions. The findings of this analysis were then compared to existing (Year 2008) conditions to determine the impact of the Proposed Project. As discussed in Master Response 2 a comparison of traffic data between 2008 to 2012 revealed negligible changes (less than two percent), indicating that traffic in the West Adams CPA had not changed significantly in that timeframe.

Traffic Impact Analysis. The traffic impact analysis follows City of Los Angeles guidelines for assessment of transportation impacts relating to Community Plans. A multi-modal level of service methodology has not yet been adopted by the City as part of its guidelines. However, the City recently adopted Mobility Plan 2035, and is in the process of evaluating methodologies to assess multi-modal priority and identify significance thresholds against which a project can be evaluated pursuant to the passage of Senate Bill 743. Therefore, the transportation analysis does not currently employ a multi-modal level of service analysis methodology to analyze street segments for significant traffic impacts.

Although the required City of Los Angeles methodology, which focuses on the automobile mode, was applied in the analysis, the TIMP included measures to reduce vehicular travel and encourage the use of active transportation modes and includes the following types of measures/policies:

- Bicycle facility improvements
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies
- Residential Neighborhood traffic management plans
- Transportation System Management (TSM) strategies
- Public transportation improvements

Proposed Project Policies and Programs. The Proposed Project contains several policies and programs to reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) through increased land use integration with alternative modes of transportation (such as pedestrian paths, bicycle lanes, and public transportation). The Proposed Project is also required to comply with Senate Bill 375. This bill is intended to implement Assembly Bill 32's greenhouse gas reduction goals by targeting transportation-related emission reductions through better integration of land use and transportation planning. Regions must adopt a "Sustainable Communities Strategy" which demonstrates that their housing and transportation plans reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG), the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) region wherein the City lies, adopted their Sustainable Communities Strategy in April 2012. To further the goals of Senate Bill 375 and SCAG's Sustainable Communities Strategies, the Proposed Project includes new goals, policies and programs that address these important objectives through:

- Expanded mass transit systems that provide safe and efficient access to jobs, services, recreation and other community assets so that automobile dependence can be reduced.

- Decreased single-occupant automobile demand and reduced VMT (which would improve air quality and health of residents) that would otherwise occur as a result of growth under the existing plan.
- Alternatives to automobile use through the integration of “Complete Street” and “Complete Neighborhood”³ principles that enhance convenient use of the area’s emerging transit system through the provision of safe and accessible, pedestrian and bicycle linkages throughout the area, as well as land use incentives that encourage the location of a greater variety of neighborhood amenities within close proximity to residential areas.

The Proposed Project fosters regeneration of complete neighborhoods that strive to meet all of the day-to-day needs of area residents by promoting convenient access to goods and services, recreation and jobs, and by advancing development practices that will enhance and sustain the overall health and well-being of current and future generations. In particular, the Proposed Project focuses significant attention on the elimination of urban decay through the revitalization of underutilized asset sites; conserving prevailing neighborhood character; making walking, bicycling and public transportation convenient, safe and enjoyable, and providing strategies to fuse previously disconnected neighborhoods together, socially, culturally, as well as structurally. To this end, the Proposed Project includes policies and programs that:

- Enable existing commercial, industrial and transit-oriented opportunity areas to accommodate future growth in a manner that improves economic vitality as well as the physical conditions of the CPA’s commercial corridors.
- Implement clear and predictable land use regulations and development standards that promote a healthy, viable and sustainable mix of neighborhood amenities and community services located within a safe and walkable environment.
- Promote a continuous network of enhanced vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian linkages to nearby local and regional recreational open space opportunities.

The Community Plan Implementation Overlay District (CPIO) details specific, localized design regulations and guidelines in accordance with the Proposed Project’s policies and programs. The importance of the Proposed Project lies in its ability to shape positive community change by harmonizing the West Adams CPA’s unique character by encouraging sustainable land use patterns as introduced through citywide policies, regional initiatives, and the Proposed Project’s implementation programs as administered through the West Adams CPIO District and amended Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan:

- *Program P41 Integrated Mobility Hubs:* The emergence of Integrated Mobility Hubs are recommended at several TOD areas within the West Adams CPA.
- *Program P104 Complete Neighborhoods:* The Community Plan is consistent with the goals and policies of the City’s Housing Element in supporting efforts to ensure the facilitation of housing that fosters neighborhoods which are livable and sustainable for all segments of the community.
- *Program P180 Non-Conventional Housing Policy:* The Community Plan is consistent with the goals and policies of the City’s Housing Element in supporting efforts to facilitate non-conventional housing that fosters neighborhoods which are livable and sustainable for all segments of the community.
- *Program P273 Transportation Management Associations:* Encourage the formation of sustainable Transportation Management Associations to implement the TDM plans.

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Areas. In addition to the many Proposed Project programs that foster sustainable land use patterns and reduced vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled, the Proposed Project has identified several TOD areas. These TOD areas are located directly adjacent to Phase I Expo Light Rail Transit (LRT) stations at Exposition/Crenshaw Boulevards, La Brea/Farmdale Avenues, Jefferson/

³Complete neighborhoods provide walkable access to basic necessities for living. In planning terms, a comfortable walking distance is thought to be approximately one quarter-mile. When residents have access to a range of goods and services that are typically utilized on a daily basis within this radius, neighborhoods are considered “complete.” Appendix H, Policy Document, page 3-3.

La Cienega Boulevards, and Venice/Robertson Boulevards. Additional TOD areas are considered at station areas along the Crenshaw/LAX Corridor LRT Project at the intersections of Crenshaw/Exposition Boulevards, Crenshaw/Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevards, Crenshaw Boulevard/Vernon Avenue, and Crenshaw Boulevard/Slauson Avenue. All of these TODs would allow for an increase in both jobs and housing through their increased height and density characteristics. Locating jobs near housing can help reduce commute times and increase walking and biking rates.

Vehicle Trip Reductions and 4Ds. The analysis of traffic conditions accounts for the changes in land use, along with two new Light Rail Transit (LRT) lines along Exposition and Crenshaw Boulevards in the West Adams CPA. The literature on travel behavior (see Appendix M Transportation Methodology) indicates that built environment variables such as land use Density, land use Diversity, pedestrian Design, and access to regional Destinations (known as the “4 Ds”) have a significant effect on travel demand. The main analytical tool for forecasting the long-term effects of land use on transportation networks is the travel demand forecasting model (travel model). Typical travel models are insensitive to most smart growth development characteristics, such as infill and dense mixed-use sites with walkable, compact streets and lot design integrated with or closer to jobs, shopping, and community amenities. This is because the 4Ds are based on highly localized variables, while travel models are generally based on regional data. Traditional travel models do well at predicting travel demand characteristics of homogenous areas with standard land uses, but tend to overestimate the number of vehicle trips from smart growth areas.

The 4Ds process has been developed to reflect the benefits of smart growth development (e.g. mixed use development, walkable environment, etc.) more accurately. The purpose of the 4Ds adjustment process is to enhance the sensitivity of conventional models, which consider personal automobiles to be the primary mode of travel, and provide policy makers with more reliable forecasts of the likely effects of their smart growth policies. The 4Ds are intended to predict relative changes in vehicle trips resulting from changes in built environment variables that have been shown in national research to reduce per-capita automobile use. The following four built environment variables were used to estimate vehicle trip reductions:

- *Density:* Residential and non-residential development per acre;
- *Diversity:* Mix of residential and non-residential development;
- *Design:* Connectivity and walkability of the transportation network; and
- *Destination Accessibility:* Relative location of land use to major regional attractions, as infill sites generate fewer and shorter vehicle trips than fringe area development.

The 4Ds are an elastic process using each of the built environment variables to predict vehicle trip reductions between two alternative land use scenarios. Elasticities that quantify the 4D effects are based on research, original analysis of household travel surveys in several regions, and a Delphi process including the guidance of six national experts in land use/ transportation interactions have been developed and applied. For the NCP, the 4Ds elasticities (based on approved EPA research – Index 4D Method, Technical Memorandum, October 2001, See Appendix M, Transportation) were applied to the trips generated by the land use differences between the existing (Year 2008) conditions and the Year 2030 (Proposed TOD Plan with 4Ds) land use scenarios due to the concentrations of TODs along major corridors and around proposed transit stations and the inclusion of parking reductions.

The 4Ds analysis in the TIMP represents the changes in density and land use mix resulting from implementation of the Proposed Project. These density and land uses changes are described in Section 3.4 Project Description of the Draft EIR, beginning on page 3-11. The 4Ds elasticities were applied to the trips generated by the land use changes between the year 2008 and the year 2030 Proposed Project for a half mile radius around the existing Expo LRT and the future Crenshaw/LAX LRT transit stations. **Table 2-3** describes the magnitude of the trip reductions applied in the aforementioned areas.

TABLE 2-3: VEHICLE TRIP REDUCTIONS APPLIED IN THE TIMP BASED ON 4Ds ANALYSIS		
Location	Vehicle Trips	Vehicle Miles Traveled
Crenshaw/Expo	3%	3%
Expo at La Brea	0%	0%
Expo at La Cienega	11%	12%
Expo at Washington	6%	7%
Crenshaw at MLK	5%	6%
Crenshaw at Slauson	4%	4%
Crenshaw at Florence/West	5%	6%

SOURCE: Fehr & Peers, *New Community Plan Program West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan Area Draft Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Program*, February 2012.

The way that 4Ds is applied in the context of a community plan and travel model is different from the standard trip reduction methodology applied to single development project. It is based on the land use mix and density at different locations in the community plan area, which results in a more conservative estimation of trip reduction. For a full description of the 4Ds methodology, please refer to the technical memorandum prepared for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Smart Growth Index, 4D Method, October 2002 included in Appendix M to this Final EIR document. This documentation summarizes the methodology and assumptions regarding the application of the 4Ds process and effect on vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled resulting from different land use plans.

Conclusion. The foregoing represents a discussion of the traffic impact analysis methodology utilized in the preparation of the TIMP for the Proposed Project. It is intended to address comments received concerning the use of 2005/ 2008 Base Year traffic conditions and vehicle trip reduction techniques (such as the 4Ds), applied to areas such as the TODs. It is not intended to revise the Draft EIR which concluded that impacts related to transportation and traffic for certain road segments in the Community Plan area would be significant and unavoidable since no feasible mitigation measures were identified to reduce the circulation system and Congestion Management Plan impacts to a less-than-significant level despite the Proposed Project’s emphasis on complete streets, complete neighborhoods, increased availability of alternative modes of transportation and implementation of TOD through the CPIOs.

MASTER RESPONSE 4: DISPLACEMENT AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Comments. A number of comments questioned the displacement of residents, the loss of affordable housing, and the Proposed Project’s lack of affordable housing provisions.

Draft EIR. As described on page 4.13-13, the Draft EIR determined that adoption of the Proposed Project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to the displacement of housing or people. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project would result in a significant impact if the project would displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Appendix G does not include a threshold of significance related to the loss of affordable housing. However, the City’s CEQA Threshold Guidelines states that the following factors should be considered when determining the significance of a project with regard to the displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing or people:

- The total number of resident units to be demolished, converted to market rate, or removed through other means as a result of the Proposed Project, in terms of net loss of market-rate and affordable units
- The current and anticipated housing demand and supply of market rate and affordable housing units in the project area;
- The land use and demographic characteristics of the project area and the appropriateness of housing in the area; and

- Whether the project is consistent with adopted City and regional housing policies such as the Framework and Housing Elements, HUD Consolidated Plan and CHAS policies, redevelopment plan, Rent Stabilization Ordinance, and the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCP&G).

The City's CEQA Thresholds Guidelines specify that these factors should be considered when the project would result in a net loss of housing. The adoption of the Proposed Project would not result in the net loss of housing, and therefore would not reasonably be expected to result in the displacement of existing residents or housing. To the extent that the commenters are arguing that the Proposed Project will result in a displacement of low income residents, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(e) states that economic and social changes resulting from a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. Economic or social changes may be used, however, to determine that a physical change shall be regarded as a significant effect on the environment.

The Proposed Project does not include any physical changes. As discussed below, the removal, demolition, or conversion of existing housing would not foreseeably occur as a direct or indirect result of the Proposed Project. Referring to the Project Description, Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project would increase the housing capacity of the CPA through a series of land use changes within Active Change areas. These Active Change areas would accommodate growth within highly urbanized areas that serve a broad cross-section of the community. The proposed changes anticipate projected growth and market demand for housing and jobs in commercial and industrial areas that, although are well served by transit, currently do not accommodate residential uses. The proposed land use changes would allow future uses similar to those already found in the area but with increased heights and intensities. Through these proposed changes, the Proposed Project aims to add, not replace, housing stock while maintaining capacity for jobs in the same area. No specific residential units are proposed to be demolished, converted to market rate, or removed through other means as part of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project may cause a temporary reduction in housing stock as new buildings are built in place of older ones or as existing buildings are renovated. Ultimately, these land use changes would allow for an overall increase of 17,842 housing units compared to existing conditions. Within the CPIO District, areas currently designated and zoned for residential land uses would remain designated and zoned to allow for residential land uses; however, in some cases, permitted residential densities would be increased. For example, in the La Brea/Farmdale Expo Line Station Area, the majority of the multi-family residential properties are not proposed for any land use and zoning changes. This area was not recommended for land use and zoning changes in order to maintain established neighborhood character and avoid displacement of a concentration of rental housing units, many of which, due to the age of the buildings, have rent levels protected by the Rent Stabilization Ordinance (RSO). The RSO generally applies to multi-family properties constructed prior to 1978. Over 85 percent of the existing multi-family built parcels in the Project Area constructed prior to 1978 are not included in the areas of proposed change. Within the "Active Change" areas of the CPIO District and amended Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan, for the most part, the proposed land use changes would allow for mixed-use residential development along underutilized commercial and light industrial corridors where housing currently does not exist. Accordingly, adoption of the Proposed Project would not result in the net loss or displacement of housing. Rather the Proposed Project would create capacity to accommodate more housing units than currently exist, creating opportunities for additional housing of all types to be constructed in the CPA. Therefore, the Draft EIR determined that impacts related to the displacement of housing or persons would be less than significant.

Proposed Project. The Proposed Project is consistent with other adopted City and regional housing policies designed to protect low-income housing and provide relocation assistance for displaced households as described through the programs listed in the Regulatory Framework Section, pages 4.13-1 through 4.13-6, of the DEIR. Additionally, the General Plan Framework and Housing Elements contain objectives and policies that would minimize the risk of permanent displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing units. These policies include General Plan Framework Element Objectives and Policies 3.4.1, 3.5, and 4.3, and Housing Element Policies 1.2.1 and 2.4.3, which seek to conserve existing stable residential neighborhoods

and promote preservation of neighborhood character in balance with facilitating new development. In addition, the policy document of the Proposed Project includes the following policies related to affordable housing and displacement of housing and residents:

- *Policy LU6-1 Neighborhood Continuity:* Strive to maintain neighborhood continuity by targeting new proposed affordable housing to serve existing residents and be designed to complement the established neighborhoods character.
- *Policy LU9-1 Affordability:* Prioritize housing that is affordable to a broad cross-section of income levels and that provides the ability to live near work and achieve homeownership.
- *Policy LU9-2 Mixed-income Neighborhoods:* Strive to eliminate residential segregation and concentrations of poverty by promoting affordable housing that is integrated into mixed-income neighborhoods.
- *Policy LU9-5 Housing Near Schools:* Provide a range of housing types and affordable housing units around schools.
- *Policy LU10-1 Neighborhood Continuity:* Promote neighborhood continuity by targeting new affordable, market-rate and workforce housing for existing residents and tailoring development standards to established neighborhood character.
- *Policy LU10-5 Minimize Displacement:* Encourage that new housing opportunities minimize displacement of existing residents, in particular extremely-low, very low and low-income households.
- *Policy CF9-8 Minimize Displacement.* Plan and design the expansion of existing facilities and the acquisition of new sites in a manner that minimizes the displacement of housing and the relocation of the residents.

The CPIO District and Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan amendments both contain a regulation that clarifies the City's Density Bonus ordinance such that the maximum 3:1 FAR available to affordable housing projects in Height District 1 shall also apply to such projects located on sites zoned Height District 2. Furthermore, in response to the 2013 City Planning Commission's recommendations, DCP staff created an Affordable Housing Working Group to assist in further refining the proposed Community Plan's affordable housing policies and programs. The policy revisions call for diminishing displacement of existing low-income residents, retaining local businesses and providing for a range of housing types including affordable homeownership available to a mix of income types. Refinements to the Community Plan also included a future implementation program that addresses "no net loss".

Conclusion. The Draft EIR concluded that impacts related to displacement would be less than significant, as the adoption of the Proposed Project would not directly result in physical changes that would cause the displacement of housing. Regardless of affordability, the Proposed Project generally does not involve Active Changes in areas zoned or designated exclusively for residential use, and would allow for a variety of new housing types in areas previously zoned and designated exclusively for commercial and/or industrial uses. Adoption of the Proposed Project in and of itself would not be expected to result in the loss of existing affordable housing because the Proposed Project aims to add, not replace, housing stock. No specific residential units are proposed to be demolished, converted to market rate, or removed through other means as part of the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project may cause a temporary reduction in housing stock as new buildings are built in place of older ones or as existing buildings are renovated. NCP policies would encourage targeted new development to include affordable housing and strengthens the provision of an affordable housing density bonus associated with the City's Density Bonus Program, Ordinance No. 179681, as incorporated into the West Adams CPIO District. Accordingly, no revisions to the Draft EIR related to the displacement of housing are necessary.

MASTER RESPONSE 5: PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

Comments. A number of comments questioned whether the adoption of the Proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to parks and open space. Many of the comments expressed concern that the Proposed Project does not do enough to address the existing deficit of parks and open space in the West Adams CPA. Other comments questioned the absence of mitigation measures in the Draft EIR to reduce impacts to parks and open space.

Corrections. In response to comments received on the Draft EIR related to the acreage of Leimert Park and Kenneth Hahn State Recreation Area listed in Draft EIR Table 4.14-13, the City of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation and the County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation were contacted to verify park acreages. This resulted in revisions to Draft EIR Section 4.14 Public Services included in Chapter 3.0, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR. The discussion of existing parks and open space conditions provided below reflects these revisions.

Background. There are 26.62 acres of neighborhood parks, 67.37 acres of community parks, and 338 acres of regional parks for a total of 431.99 acres of parkland within 0.25 mile of the West Adams CPA. The revised total park acreage is greater than the total park acreage used as the basis of analysis in the Draft EIR (414.39 acres) due to an increase in regional park acreage and a reduction in the acreage of neighborhood and community parks. As discussed below, this adjustment to the acreages does not change the EIR's analysis or conclusion for this impact which remains significant and unavoidable.

A deficit of parks and recreational facilities currently exists in the West Adams CPA and the City, as a whole. Based on the City's Public Recreation Plan parkland standards, a deficit currently exists of 341.38 acres of neighborhood parks, 297.63 acres of community parks, and 757.00 acres of regional recreational facilities in the West Adams CPA. This deficit is acknowledged in the Draft EIR, the Community Plan policy document, and the City's Framework Element. As described on page 4.14-28 of the Draft EIR, a significant proportion of the Proposed Project increase in population is planned to occur within 0.3 miles of the 19 parks that serve the area, thereby increasing the service demands associated with existing park, open space and recreation facilities serving the CPA. As described in the Regulatory Framework subsection beginning on page 4.14-22, numerous parkland creation programs exist within the City in order to implement the State Quimby Act, which assesses fees on new development to help fund parks and recreation facilities.

Existing Standards and Policies. The Public Recreation Plan of the City of Los Angeles provides the official guide for considering minimum needs of neighborhoods and communities for recreational sites. The City's Public Recreation Plan establishes parkland standards of two acres of neighborhood park space, two acres of community park space, and six acres of regional park space per 1,000 residents. However, Framework Element Chapter 6 recognizes that the park standards do not reflect current conditions and needs, and explains that "existing open space standards and acquisition policies do not sufficiently recognize the full range of potential open space resources at the neighborhood and community levels. As opportunities for traditional open space resources are diminished, it is important to identify areas of open space that have not traditionally been considered as resources. Thus, vacated railroad lines, drainage channels, planned transit routes and utility rights-of-way, or pedestrian-oriented streets and small parks, where feasible, might serve as important resources for serving the open space and recreation needs of City residents in communities where those resources are currently in short supply." Framework Element Policies related to parks and open space include:

- *Policy 6.2.1.* Establish, where feasible, the linear open space system represented in the Citywide Greenways Network map, to provide additional open space for active and passive recreational uses and to connect adjoining neighborhoods to one another and to regional open space resources. This Citywide Greenways Network is hierarchical and is composed of three levels: regional, community, and local/neighborhood. While these levels are of equal importance, they vary in scale and the degree to which

they impact the City at large. Additionally, while these levels overlap one another, they can still be differentiated and broken down as follows:

- a. The regional component of the network is composed of the beaches, the mountains, and the Los Angeles River system - the three most continuous natural features of the urban region and thus the primary elements of the network; river tributaries, arroyos and washes that take storm water to the ocean; rail lines and utility corridors, where feasible without compromising public safety or facility security, that may serve multiple purposes to become connectors to the beaches and the river and link adjacent districts to each other through the network; and all regional parks made accessible from the network. While considering open space improvements of the River and drainages, their primary purpose for flood control shall be considered.
 - b. The community component is composed of parks and civic open spaces connected to the network, including elements such as community and neighborhood parks, connected by linear, non-motorized transportation linkages such as walking and hiking trails and local bike paths.
 - c. The local/neighborhood components include pedestrian-supporting streets, open space associated with public facilities such as schools, small parks, and community gardens.
- *Policy 6.4.7.* Consider as part of the City's open space inventory of pedestrian streets, community gardens, shared school playfields, and privately-owned commercial open spaces that are accessible to the public, even though such elements fall outside the conventional definitions of "open space." This will help address the open space and outdoor recreation needs of communities that are currently deficient in these resources
 - *Policy 6.4.8.* Maximize the use of existing public open space resources at the neighborhood scale and seek new opportunities for private development to enhance the open space resources of the neighborhoods.
 - a. Encourage the development of public plazas, forested streets, farmers markets, residential commons, rooftop spaces, and other places that function like open space in urbanized areas of the City with deficiencies of natural open space, especially in targeted growth areas.
 - b. Encourage the improvement of open space, both on public and private property, as opportunities arise. Such places may include the dedication of "unbuildable" areas or sites that may serve as green space, or pathways and connections that may be improved to serve as neighborhood landscape and recreation amenities. These guidelines address both open space access
 - *Policy 6.4.9.* Encourage the incorporation of small-scaled public open spaces within transit-oriented development, both as plazas and small parks associated with transit stations, and as areas of public access in private joint development at transit station locations.

Proposed Project Policies and Programs. The Proposed Project expands on the Framework Element by including policies not only aimed at increasing the amount of parkland in the West Adams CPA but encourage access to existing resources. Access to existing resources can be achieved via enhanced pedestrian and bicycle linkages along opportunity corridors. Opportunity corridors include the Ballona Creek Greenway and its other flood channel tributaries, repurposed railroad corridors, power line rights-of-way and possibly landscaped freeway buffer areas, as described on Draft NCP page 5-22 and shown in Figure 5-5 on page 5-23. Draft NCP policies intended to increase parkland and improve access include:

- *Policy CF8-2 Increase Accessibility.* Prioritize the increase of and accessibility to open space and parkland located in the Baldwin Hills adjacent to La Cienega Boulevard and La Brea Avenue.
- *Policy CF9-2 Prioritize Park Opportunity Areas.* Target park and recreation projects in areas with the greatest opportunities.
- *Policy CF9-3 Accommodate Greenways.* Identify opportunities to increase acreage of total recreational areas by converting outdated railroad rights-of-way to accommodate greenways and bicycle trails, and by utilizing public easements for community gardens.

- *Policy CF9-4 Walkability Standard.* Set a walkability standard (e.g., a quarter- or half-mile) for residents' access to recreational facilities.
- *Policy CF9-5 Joint-use of Schools.* Pursue joint-use agreements to share facilities with schools, especially in neighborhoods that suffer a disproportionate lack of recreational facilities.
- *Policy CF9-6 Ballona Creek Greenway.* Prioritize the development of a safe, well maintained walking/ bicycling route or greenway along the banks of the Ballona Creek.
- *Policy CF 10-1 Minimize Land Acquisition through Joint-use.* In order to minimize the amount of land acquisition required for the establishment of new parks, encourage Los Angeles Unified School District, the Department of Recreation and Parks, the General Services Department, Department of Water and Power, and the Department of Transportation to jointly make facilities available to residents after school and on weekend.
- *Policy CF10-2 Acquire Vacant Land for Public Open Space.* Encourage the continuing efforts by County, State and Federal agencies to acquire vacant land for public owned open space.
- *Policy CF12-1 Retain Passive Open Space.* Encourage the retention of passive and visual open space which provides a balance to the urban development of the Plan Area.
- *Policy CF12-2 Accommodate Active Park Uses.* Accommodate active parklands, and other open space uses.
- *Policy CF12-3 Public Open Space Requirement.* Encourage development at major opportunity sites to provide public open space.
- *Policy CF12-4 Utilize Public Lands for Recreational Needs.* Coordinate with City departments, neighboring cities and County, State and Federal agencies to utilize existing public lands such as flood control channels, utility easements and Department of Water and Power properties to provide for such recreational needs as hiking, biking and equestrian trails.
- *Policy CF12-5 Walkability Standard.* Implement walkability and level of service standards for parks and recreation areas.

While the West Adams NCP includes policies that call for the creation, enhancement and ongoing maintenance of existing and potential open spaces, parks and community facilities, the West Adams NCP does not identify specific (privately owned) opportunity sites for open space and parkland creation. Rather it identifies the Department of Recreation and Parks "Needs Assessment" strategies as identified through Proposed Project Program P183 in developing a Citywide Park Master Plan implemented through a five year Capital Improvement Plan.

In addition to proposed policies, each of the CPIO TOD Subareas and the Hyde Park Industrial Corridor Subarea ordinances includes open space regulations. These regulations either require or incentivize the provision of publicly available open space for projects based on lot size.

Draft EIR. Implementation of the Proposed Project analyzed capacity for approximately 218,741 residents in the West Adams CPA, an increase of 36,141 residents compared to the estimated 2008 population. No new parks, recreational facilities, or open space areas are proposed under the Proposed Project. As a result, the existing parks and recreational facilities deficit in the West Adams CPA would not be improved under the Proposed Project. Based on the City's Public Recreation Plan standards, at capacity, the existing deficit of parks and recreational facilities in the West Adams CPA could grow to approximately 411 acres of neighborhood parks, 370 acres of community parks, and 974 acres of regional parks for a total deficit of 1,755.42 acres of parks and recreational facilities, as shown in **Table 2-4**. Population growth associated with the potential increase in capacity would create demand for an additional 361.41 acres of parkland.

TABLE 2-4: FUTURE (2030) DEMAND FOR PARKS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES IN THE CPA						
Recreational Facility Type	Acres per 1,000 residents Standard/a/	Future Population (2030)/b/	Future Ratio (Acres per 1,000 residents)	Existing Acres/c/	Needed Acres /d/	Acre Deficit
Neighborhood Parks	2	218,741	0.12	26.62	437.48	410.86
Community Parks	2		0.31	67.37	437.48	370.11
Regional Parks	6		1.54	338.00	1,312.45	974.45
Total	10		1.97	431.99	2,187.41	1,755.42

/a/ Recommended standard per the City of Los Angeles Public Recreation Plan.
 /b/ Reasonable expected population based on capacity of the Proposed Project.
 /c/ Includes parks, open spaces and recreational centers located within 0.5 mile of the West Adams CPA.
 /d/ Acres needed to meet Public Recreation Plan standards.

Impacts to parks and recreational facilities are analyzed in Draft EIR Section 4.14. As disclosed on Draft EIR page 4.14-30, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to public parks. This significant and unavoidable impact would be due to the potential population growth associated with the proposed increase in housing capacity that would create additional demand for parklands and contribute to the existing parklands and open space deficit within a ¼ mile of the West Adams CPA and Citywide. While the acreage of parks serving the West Adams CPA has been updated in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the analysis presented in Section 4.14 Public Services of the Draft EIR would remain applicable. Impacts related to parks would remain significant and unavoidable.

No mitigation measures were identified in the Draft EIR, which could minimize significant impacts related to parks and open space due to the existing deficit in parks and open space and limited availability of land that could be used for parks and open space purposes within the West Adams CPA despite the Quimby Act and other LAMC parkland dedication regulations as outlined on pages 4.14-22 and 23 of the Draft EIR. For this reason, the significant and unavoidable impact cannot be avoided, and no revisions to the impact conclusions made in the Draft EIR are required.

2.3 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS LETTERS

LETTER 1: CALIFORNIA RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION

Comment 1-1

I. Introduction

The California Restaurant Association ("CRA") submits the following comments on the City of Los Angeles' West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert New Community Plan ("West Adams NCP") Draft Environmental Impact Report (September 2012); City Case No. ENV-2008-478-EIR; State Clearinghouse No. 2008021013 ("DEIR").

II. The DEIR's Impacts Analysis is Inadequate under CEQA

As discussed below, the DEIR's analyses of transportation and traffic, air quality, greenhouse gas ("GHG"), and noise impacts are inadequate under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21000 *et seq.*). Although technical perfection in the DEIR is not required, CEQA does require adequacy, completeness, and a good-faith effort at full disclosure. (CEQA Guidelines § 15003(i)). The EIR is the "heart of CEQA" and "[i]ts purpose is to inform the public and its responsible officials of the environmental consequences of their decisions before they are made." *Laurel Heights Improvement Ass'n. v. Regents of University of California* (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 1112, 1123 (internal citations omitted). In order to satisfy the requirements of CEQA, the City must address the inadequacies in the DEIR's impacts analysis identified below.

Response 1-1

This comment contains introductory text and states that inadequacies in the Draft EIR impact analysis must be addressed. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR in this introductory paragraph. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088, 15204 (c)).

Comment 1-2

A. Transportation and Traffic Impacts

Section 4.15 of the DEIR evaluates transportation and traffic impacts associated with the proposed project. As discussed below, the DEIR improperly establishes the traffic baseline and fails to disclose assumptions underlying trip reductions used to calculate Year 2030 traffic conditions.

1. *The DEIR Improperly Establishes Year 2008 Baseline Transportation Conditions*

Under CEQA, the significance of a project's impacts cannot be measured unless the EIR first establishes the actual physical conditions on the property. Accordingly, baseline determination is the first step in the environmental review process. *Save Our Peninsula Committee v. Monterey County Bd. of Supervisors* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 99, 125. For the reasons explained below, the traffic baseline included in the DEIR is problematic under CEQA.

As a general rule, the baseline reflects existing physical conditions as they exist at the time the NOP is published. (CEQA Guidelines §§ 15125(a); 15126.2(a)). Here, a NOP for the DEIR was published on February 1, 2008. While the NOP date can establish a baseline, the date for establishing a baseline is not rigid. Because environmental conditions vary, it is necessary in certain cases to consider conditions over a range of time periods. In some cases, conditions closer to the project approval date are more relevant to a determination of environmental impacts. Courts have expressly recognized that in the context of traffic impacts, "the EIR might necessarily take into account the normal increase in traffic over time. Since the environmental review process can take a number of years, traffic levels as of the time the project is approved may be a more accurate representation of the existing baseline against which to measure the impact of the project." *Save Our Peninsula Committee*, 87 Cal.App.4th at 125-26, citing *Fairview Neighbors v. County of Ventura* (1999) 70 Cal.App.4th 238, 243 (discussing possible environmental effects of the project based on actual traffic counts would have been misleading and illusory where traffic flow for project at issue fluctuates considerably based on need, capacity and other factors). Commonly, EIRs add a "growth factor" to traffic counts to add an assumed level of growth in any intervening years from the date of the traffic count to the date of the DEIR.

The DEIR's traffic impacts analysis is based on the Draft Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Program included as DEIR Appendix G (Fehr & Peers, August 2012)("TIMP"). Chapter 2 of the TIMP documents existing (i.e., baseline) transportation conditions, including existing AM and PM peak roadway operations for year 2008. The TIMP states that Year 2005 traffic counts were used to represent existing Year 2008 traffic conditions. The TIMP explains that the Travel Model was calibrated and validated to Year 2005 traffic conditions when it was first developed, and a comparison of Year 2005 and Year 2008 traffic counts determined that counts collected in 2005 were approximately 4 and 9 percent higher in the AM and PM peak hours. Therefore, the 2005 model validation was considered to still be valid. (TIMP p. 20, § 3.2). However, the DEIR's baseline determination is improper for two reasons.

First, data used to develop the travel model was collected in 2005, seven years before the DEIR was released. Even if the data was validated in 2008 when the NOP was published, the 2005 data is nonetheless stale, and the 2008 validation is stale as well. The City is implying that traffic in 2012 is better than it was in 2005. Such an assumption makes no sense and is not the experience of your average driver. The City should not rely on such outdated data to establish baseline traffic conditions in the absence of substantial evidence that a

Year 2008 baseline derived from measurably different 2005 data properly describes the existing environmental conditions. *Communities for a Better Environment v. South Coast Air Quality Management District* (2010) 48 Cal.4th 310, 328 ("Neither CEQA nor the CEQA Guidelines mandates a uniform, inflexible rule for determination of the existing conditions baseline. Rather, an agency enjoys the discretion to decide, in the first instance, exactly how the existing physical conditions without the project can most realistically be measured, subject to review, as with all CEQA factual determinations, for support by substantial evidence.") (internal citations omitted). Moreover, the City does not explain why the 2008 verification is still valid. The DEIR should use a 2012 or 2013 existing traffic baseline, or add the least include a growth factor to account for changed conditions since 2005.

Response 1-2

Refer to Master Response 1, Master Response 2 and Master Response 3. Based on the Caltrans trip assignment guidelines for travel models used to forecast future year conditions, the traffic consultant in agreement with the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning (DCP) and Department of Transportation (LADOT) determined that the use of the West Adams CPA travel model (see *Model Development Report*, Appendix C of the West Adams TIMP, DEIR Appendix G) was considered to be the best approximation of existing conditions and valid for use in the TIMP and Draft EIR. Development activity within the CPA continues to be limited as a result of the Great Recession and a slow recovery, it is reasonable that the Draft EIR uses 2008 conditions to represent Base Year (existing) conditions for purposes of determining significant impacts. Therefore, a revised analysis based on the physical conditions of the environment at the time the Draft EIR was published (2012) is not required. However, toward further addressing the commenter's request to explain why the 2008 verification is still valid, Master Response 2 compares traffic counts at several locations throughout the Community Plan Area for the years 2008, 2010 and 2012, and the analysis revealed negligible changes.

Comment 1-3

Second, even if the City establishes on the basis of substantial evidence that it is appropriate to rely on a 2008 baseline for traffic conditions, the TIMP acknowledges that 2005 data reflects higher AM and PM peak traffic counts than were observed in 2008, when the travel model was validated. Without confirmation that the differences between Year 2005 and validated Year 2008 AM and PM traffic counts are negligible, it appears that reliance on the higher Year 2005 traffic counts could result in skewed traffic impacts analysis. For example, the analysis could potentially underestimate Year 2030 significant traffic impacts because there may be a smaller increase from Year 2005 (i.e., higher traffic counts) to Year 2030 traffic counts, compared to the increase from Year 2008 (i.e., lower traffic counts) to Year 2030 traffic counts. In turn, the LOS for a given roadway segment may not appear to deteriorate when comparing higher counts obtained in Year 2005 and Year 2030, but could appear to deteriorate when comparing lower Year 2008 traffic counts with Year 2030. Moreover, because the change in traffic baseline for Year 2012 is unknown, it is impossible to know if the 2005 counts are understating project impacts.

Although the Year 2005 traffic counts were 4 and 9 percent higher than Year 2008 counts in the AM and PM peak hours, even a comparatively small difference in the amount of increased traffic could be significant in an already congested area where many intersections are operating at unsatisfactory LOS E or F. *Fairview Neighbors v. County of Ventura*, 70 Cal.App.4th at 243 (discussion of environmental effects was misleading and illusory). At minimum, the TIMP should explain to the general public how reliance on a travel model based on higher Year 2005 traffic counts, as opposed to Year 2008 data with lower traffic counts and unknown changes in 2012, does not substantially affect the analysis of transportation impacts. *Environmental Planning & Information Council v. County of El Dorado* (1982) 131 Cal.App.3d 350, 358 ("The comparisons utilized in the EIRs can only mislead the public as to the reality of the impacts and subvert full consideration of the actual environmental impacts which would result. There are no extensive, detailed evaluations of the impacts of the proposed plans on the environment in its current state. Accordingly, the EIRs fail as informative documents.")

Response 1-3

Refer to Master Response 2 and Master Response 3 regarding the validation of the West Adams CPA Travel Model. While the Travel model is calibrated to 2005 traffic conditions, forecasts of future traffic conditions are based on demographic, land use and development factors in the future year. Forecasts of future traffic conditions are based on reasonable expected development anticipated to occur by 2030 in the West Adams CPA under the Proposed Project. The Travel Model uses regional SCAG land use forecasts for areas outside of the CPA. The Proposed Project forecast was produced by adding the future growth in travel demand from both the regional and Proposed Project land use changes to the baseline traffic conditions. These forecasts were then used in the identification of system deficiencies. In this case, using 2005 traffic counts results in higher estimated traffic in 2030. Because the 2005 traffic counts are higher than the 2008 counts, and counts taken in later years proved to be minor (see Table 2-2), the traffic forecast used as the basis of the traffic impact analysis represents a more conservative assessment of future conditions, as future growth in travel demand was added to higher baseline traffic conditions. However, regardless of the baseline traffic conditions in the Travel Model, the minor difference in baseline conditions from 2005, 2008, 2010 or 2012 would not influence the findings of the traffic impact analysis and the identified system deficiencies resulting from the reasonably expected build-out of the Proposed Project would not change. The Draft EIR found significant and unavoidable impacts from traffic increases. As discussed in Master Response 2, although the updated traffic counts suggest relatively minor differences, the traffic impact analysis measures total projected traffic by the year 2030, so the "delta" between years is not the key measure of significance and ultimately would not change the significant impact conclusions in the DEIR. For this reason, the traffic impact analysis does not understate the significance of traffic-related impacts and the Draft EIR does not fail as an informative document.

Comment 1-4

2. The Traffic Impacts Analysis Fails to Sufficiently Inform the Public of the Assumptions Underlying Trip Reductions Applied to Year 2030 Traffic Conditions

The DEIR and TIMP rely on Year 2030 traffic conditions calculations to analyze the effectiveness of the TIMP and to evaluate impacts related to the circulation system and the Congestion Management Program ("CMP"). (DEIR pp. 4.15-13 - 4.15-27). However, as discussed below, these Year 2030 traffic conditions include trip reductions based on changes in land use without providing any explanation for the assumed trip reductions, as fundamentally required by CEQA. Failure to provide information in an EIR as required under CEQA is a failure to proceed in a manner required by law. Failure to comply with CEQA's information disclosure requirements is a prejudicial abuse of discretion if decision makers or the public are deprived of information necessary to make a meaningful assessment of the environmental impacts. *County of Amador v. El Dorado County Water Agency* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 931, 946; *see also* Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21005.

According to the TIMP, trip reductions are based on the "4Ds" process, which uses an elasticity derived for each of four variables (density, diversity, design, and destination accessibility) to predict vehicle trip reductions between two alternative land use scenarios. (DEIR, p. 4.15-22; TIMP, p. 38, § 6.1). Here, the 4Ds elasticities were reportedly applied to land use differences between existing Year 2008 conditions and Year 2030 land use scenarios, based on concentrations of land use along major corridors and around proposed transit stations and the inclusion of parking reductions. (TIMP, p. 38, § 6.1).

The DEIR and TIMP only describe the Year 2030 TOD Plan land use scenario in general terms ("the proposed community plan updated with land use concentrated along major corridors and around proposed transit stations") and briefly explain the theory behind the 4Ds process. (TIMP, pp. 1, 38). Yet the DEIR and TIMP fail to disclose any information regarding the assumptions underlying trip reductions applied to the Year 2030 (TOD Plan with 4Ds) scenario. For example, the TIMP states that the 4Ds process includes vehicle trip reductions based on density, defined merely as "the residential and non-residential development per acre." (TIMP, p. 38, § 6.1). However, the TIMP does not identify which areas and corresponding

changes in density within the West Adams NCP were analyzed to calculate the density-based vehicle trip reduction or the basis for assuming a trip reduction because of the densification. Similarly, the TIMP does not even identify the mix of residential and non-residential development, or the location of such development, underlying diversity-related trip reductions. It is unclear whether the trip reductions accounted for all or only some of the land use changes identified in the draft CPIO subdistricts and Specific Plan change areas where "active" changes will be made, as shown on DEIR Figure 3-5 and detailed in DEIR Appendix B, or alternatively, whether trip reductions accounted for other plan or zoning changes not shown on Figure 3-5.

Although the TIMP includes many pages of numeric calculations, "[a]n adequate EIR requires more than raw data; it requires also an analysis that will provide decision makers with sufficient information to make intelligent decisions." *County of Amador* 76 Cal.App.4th at 955. It should not be necessary for the reader of an EIR to cobble together information included in and appended to the EIR. *Id.* at 956. Section 4.15 of the DEIR and the TIMP must describe the assumptions incorporated into the 4Ds process used to calculate Year 2030 traffic conditions.

By failing to explain the assumptions underlying the trip reductions applied to determine Year 2030 traffic conditions, the DEIR fails to meet its purpose "to demonstrate to an apprehensive citizenry that the agency has in fact analyzed and considered the ecological implications of its action." *No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles* (1974) 13 Cal.3d 68, 86 (internal citations omitted).

This data is critical because the proposed project results in significant and unavoidable traffic impacts, taking into account trip reductions. Accordingly, trip reductions applied through the 4Ds process mask even more significant impacts that would occur if those reductions were not applied. It is fundamental for the public to understand how the West Adams NCP alleviates traffic impacts, because without the assumed trip reductions, the traffic impacts would be even more significant. Under CEQA, the DEIR cannot blindly incorporate into the Year 2030 traffic analysis trip reductions based on the 4Ds process without clearly explaining the facts, methodology, and assumptions used to calculate those assumed trip reductions. Moreover, without a plain language explanation of the assumptions about TOD underlying Year 2030 trip calculations, the public cannot meaningfully understand or comment on these assumptions (e.g., whether the assumptions are reasonable or too aggressive). (Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21003(b)). As such, the DEIR should be revised to provide this basic explanation and recirculated so that the public can comment on the fundamental issue of traffic impacts. (CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5).

In failing to include this information, the City has not upheld its procedural mandate under CEQA and as such it has abused its discretion.

Response 1-4

Refer to Draft EIR page 4.15-22 regarding the estimation of trip reductions. In order to account for the benefits of smart growth, the 4Ds process has been applied in the traffic impact analysis for the Proposed Project. The 4Ds analysis in the TIMP represents the changes in density and land use mix resulting from implementation of the Proposed Project. These density and land uses changes are described in Draft EIR Section 3.4 Project Description, beginning on page 3-11. The 4Ds methodology was applied to the land use changes between the year 2008 and the year 2030 Proposed Project for the areas around the existing Expo LRT and the future Crenshaw/LAX LRT transit stations. **Table 2-3** of Master Response 3, describes the magnitude of the trip reductions applied in the aforementioned areas. The way that 4Ds are applied in the context of a community plan is different from the standard trip reduction methodology applied to a single development project. It is based on the land use mix and density at different locations in the West Adams CPA which results in a more conservative estimation of trip reduction. Refer to Appendix M of this FEIR document for further resources regarding the "4D Method". Therefore, the Draft EIR need not be recirculated to provide an explanation of trip reductions applied to year 2030 with Proposed Project forecasts. Refer also to Master Response 3 regarding trip reductions applied to Year 2030 traffic analysis.

Comment 1-5

B. Air Quality

Section 4.3 of the DEIR and Appendix C (Air Quality Calculations) evaluate air quality impacts associated with the proposed project. The air quality impacts analysis is inadequate under CEQA for the reasons discussed below.

1. The Air Quality Impacts Analysis Fails to Sufficiently Inform the Public of Assumptions Underlying Existing Baseline Conditions for Operational Emissions

Table 4.3-7 in the DEIR shows estimated mobile and area source operational emissions associated with existing Year 2008 conditions and future Year 2030 emissions at project build-out. (DEIR, p. 4.3-17). However, as with traffic impacts, the DEIR and Appendix C (Air Quality Calculations) do not inform the public of the assumptions and methodology underlying calculation of existing Year 2008 conditions. *No Oil, Inc.*, 13 Cal.3d at 86.

The information in Table 4.3-7 is based on Air Quality Calculations included in DEIR Appendix C. The Air Quality Calculations include a table labeled "Estimated Operational Emissions - Existing 2008," which identifies operational emissions associated with residential, commercial, public facility, and industrial land uses. However, the Air Quality Calculations do not include any explanation of the land use assumptions used to calculate existing (2008) estimated operational emissions. The DEIR's discussion of operational emissions impacts and Appendix C should explain the assumptions used to calculate area source emissions for the existing conditions (2008) scenario. A reader of the DEIR should not be forced to cobble together information included in and appended to the DEIR in order to understand the assumptions used to determine area source emissions. *County of Amador* 76 Cal.App.4th at 955-56.

Additionally, if the calculation of existing area source emissions relied on DEIR Table 3-2 (Existing West Adams CPA Land Uses) or DEIR Table 3-4 (West Adams CPA Existing and Proposed Land Use Comparison), it is noted that these tables appear to be based on 2009 GIS data from the City of Los Angeles. If the Year 2008 existing conditions area source emissions were based on 2009 data, the DEIR must explain why it is appropriate to use 2009 data to describe 2008 conditions. Such information is required in order for the DEIR to be meaningful and useful to the public. (Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21003(b)). Furthermore, the City should not rely on outdated Year 2008 or 2009 data to establish baseline area source emissions if conditions closer to the date of project approval are more relevant to a determination of air quality impacts. *Save Our Peninsula Committee*, 87 Cal.App.4th at 125-26. Therefore, the DEIR should use a 2012 or 2013 existing area source emissions baseline, rather than a 2008 or 2009 baseline, unless the City can show that conditions have not changed such that reliance on this baseline is appropriate under CEQA.

Response 1-5

Referring to Master Response 2 and Master Response 3, transportation and land use baseline conditions for the reasonable expected build-out of the Proposed Project were used as the basis of the Air Quality (Draft EIR Section 4.3) and GHG (Draft EIR Section 4.7) analysis, including the updated trip counts which inform the air quality and GHG analysis. The use of 2009 GIS land use data to represent 2008 baseline conditions for purposes of the Draft EIR is reasonable given there were no changes in existing land uses or zoning in the CPA during this one year period. Based on the discussion in Master Response 1, the use of the 2008 baseline was reasonable and supported by substantial evidence.

Comment 1-6

2. The Air Quality Impacts Analysis Fails to Sufficiently Inform the Public of Key Assumptions Underlying Mobile Source Emissions Calculations

The DEIR and Appendix C (Air Quality Calculations) indicate that operational mobile source emissions were calculated according to VMT. The DEIR's discussion of mobile source emissions is problematic for two reasons.

First, Appendix C states that daily VMT was not available, and AM and PM peak hour VMT (obtained from the traffic study) was used to calculate daily VMT. The DEIR states that it was assumed that AM and PM peak hour VMT combine to represent 14 percent of daily VMT. (DEIR, p. 4.3-16). However, the DEIR does not point to any evidence supporting the assumption that AM and PM peak hour VMT represent 14 percent of daily VMT.

Response 1-6

Existing mobile source emissions were estimated using VMT data provided by the traffic consultant and emission rates obtained from the California Air Resources Board's California Emission Factor model (EMFAC2007 was the current version at the time of the analysis, DEIR Appendix C). The AM and PM peak hour VMT was used to estimate the daily VMT of 3,559,800 using the Travel Model. Referring to page 13 regarding the Model Development Report of the West Adams TIMP (DEIR Appendix G). The development of this model followed established comparison techniques and guidelines for accuracy as validated by LADOT. After consultation with the traffic consultant, it was reasonably assumed that each peak hour was seven percent of the daily VMT. These factors were based on data from major arterials that represented the number of vehicle trips during the morning and afternoon peak hours compared to trips over the day.

Comment 1-7

Second, the DEIR states that VMT accounts for potential TOD areas in specified locations. (DEIR, p. 4.3-16). Although it is not clearly stated, presumably TOD was only incorporated into Year 2030 VMT calculations. Similar to problems with the DEIR's traffic impacts analysis noted in Section II.A.2 of this letter, DEIR Section 4.3 (Air Quality) and Appendix C (Air Quality Calculations) fail to disclose the assumptions about TOD that were used to calculate Year 2030 VMT, which were then used to calculate Year 2030 mobile source emissions. The DEIR simply states "[t]his VMT accounts for TOD" and generally describes the location of potential TOD areas in the West Adams NCP. (DEIR, p. 4.3-16). It is completely unclear what aspects of TOD development are accounted for in VMT calculations. By failing to explain the assumptions about TOD that were incorporated into VMT calculations, which were in turn used to calculate Year 2030 mobile source emissions, the DEIR fails to meet its basic purpose to inform the public about the project's environmental impacts. *Laurel Heights Improvement Ass'n.*, 6 Cal. 4th at 1123.

Under CEQA, the DEIR cannot incorporate TOD assumptions into VMT calculations used to calculate operational mobile source emissions -- especially that take credit for reductions in emissions -- without clearly explaining to the public what those TOD assumptions are. Moreover, a reader of the DEIR should not be forced to cobble together information included in and appended to the DEIR in order to understand the TOD assumptions, which even then remain incomprehensible. *County of Amador* 76 Cal.App.4th at 955-56. Section 4.15 of the DEIR and the TIMP must clearly explain all the assumptions incorporated into the 4Ds process and why those assumptions justify a reduction in VMT as the basis for Year 2030 traffic conditions.

Without an explanation of the TOD assumptions underlying VMT calculations, the public cannot meaningfully understand or comment on these assumptions (e.g., whether the assumptions are reasonable or too aggressive) as they relate to air quality impacts. (Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21003(b)). As with traffic, this explanation should be added to the DEIR and the document should be recirculated for public comment. (CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5).

In failing to include this information, the agency has not upheld its procedural mandate under CEQA and as such has abused its discretion.

Response 1-7

Refer to Response 1-4 and Table 2-3 of Master Response 3 regarding trip reductions associated with the proposed TODs analyzed under the Proposed Project traffic forecasts which estimated a VMT used to calculate Year 2030 mobile source emissions.

Comment 1-8

C. Greenhouse Gas

Section 4.7 of the DEIR and Appendix G (Greenhouse Gas) evaluate GHG impacts associated with the proposed project. The GHG impacts analysis is inadequate under CEQA for the reasons discussed below.

1. The GHG Impacts Analysis Fails to Inform the Public of Assumptions Underlying Construction Emissions Calculations and Underestimates Construction Impacts

Table 4.7-2 in the DEIR provides an estimate of average annual GHG emissions that could be associated with construction under the proposed project. The DEIR states that there is sufficient data available to determine the types of construction that may occur (e.g., residential, commercial, and industrial) and associated square footage, but does not identify those assumptions. Construction emissions are calculated as an average of emissions each year between 2008 and 2030, with individual projects constructed "evenly" during the entire plan horizon. (DEIR, p. 4.7-12). Even if the NOP was issued in 2008, it was unreasonable for the EIR to calculate construction impacts based on construction starting in 2008, because it would take some time for construction to begin under the West Adams NCP. By assuming that construction will occur over a longer time horizon (2008 to 2030) than will actually occur (2013 to 2030), the DEIR improperly underestimates average annual GHG emissions. In this way, the construction impacts discussion is potentially misleading in contravention of CEQA. *Fairview Neighbors*, 70 Cal.App.4th at 243 (discussion of environmental effects was misleading and illusory).

Response 1-8

The GHG significance conclusion in the Draft EIR would not change regardless of the base year. Use of a longer horizon (2008 to 2030) instead of (2013 to 2030), or (2016 to 2030), would not affect acceleration of development activity which is dependent on other factors such as the economy. As stated on Draft EIR page 4.7-12, construction emissions are directly related to new development in the West Adams CPA. Implementation of the Proposed Project as analyzed would increase development capacity of the West Adams CPA by 3.8 million square feet of commercial space, 2.3 million square feet of public facility, and 19,703 dwelling units. Strong economic years would typically lead to increased development projects and above average emissions. Conversely, weak economic years would experience fewer projects and below average emissions. In addition, equipment emissions would decrease in future years as engines become more efficient under new regulations. As described on page 4.7-12 of the DEIR, the Proposed Project would not increase construction GHG emissions beyond what is anticipated for construction GHG emissions under the existing West Adams Community Plan. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to construction GHG emissions.

Comment 1-9

2. The GHG Impacts Analysis Fails to Sufficiently Inform the Public of Key Assumptions Underlying Operational Emissions Calculations

The DEIR and Appendix E (Greenhouse Gas) indicate that operational mobile GHG emissions were calculated according to VMT. The DEIR's discussion of mobile GHG emissions is problematic for two reasons that are similar to the problems related to air quality calculations as discussed in Section II.B.2 of

this letter. In failing to include the information noted below, the City has not upheld its procedural mandate under CEQA and as such it has abused its discretion.

First, the DEIR states that it was assumed that AM and PM peak hour VMT combine to represent 14 percent of daily VMT. (DEIR, p. 4.7-13). However, the DEIR does not point to any evidence supporting the assumption that AM and PM peak hour VMT represent 14 percent of daily VMT.

Second, the DEIR states that estimated future VMT under the proposed project does include reductions that would result from the TIMP and in particular, an increase in the modal split that will be facilitated through implementation of TOD. (DEIR, p. 4.7-13). The methodology used to incorporate trip reductions is especially important in the context of GHG impacts analysis, because the majority of GHG emissions within the West Adams CPA can be attributed to automobile exhaust. (DEIR, p. 4.7-11). Similar to problems with the DEIR's traffic impacts analysis noted in Section II.A.2 of this letter and with air quality impacts noted in Section II.B.2 of this letter, DEIR Section 4.7 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions) and Appendix E (Greenhouse Gas) fail to disclose the assumptions about the TIMP and TOD that were used to calculate Year 2030 VMT, which were then used to calculate Year 2030 mobile GHG emissions.

Moreover, the TIMP includes measures that do not appear to be mandatory mitigation, including for example TDM strategies that are *recommended* as part of a specific TDM program for the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert TIMP. (DEIR pp. 4.15-16 - 4.15-19; TIMP Section 5.2.1, pp. 28-30)(emphasis added). Measures that are recommendations only cannot be relied upon as they are not required mitigations. These measures must either be mitigation measures or cannot be relied upon in calculating GHG reductions. Cal. Pub. Res. Code §21081.6(b); CEQA Guidelines §15126.4(a)(2); *Woodward Park Homeowners Ass'n v. City of Fresno* (2007) 150 Cal.App.4th 683, 730 (mitigation must be an enforceable requirement).

As stated elsewhere in this letter, the DEIR is required to explain to the public the TOD assumptions incorporated into VMT calculations. Without this information, the DEIR fails to meet its basic purpose to inform the public about the project's environmental impacts. *Laurel Heights Improvement Ass'n.*, 6 Cal. 4th at 1123. Since this information is necessary for the public to meaningfully comment on the assumptions underlying GHG and other impacts analyses, this section should also be recirculated so that the public can comment on the GHG emissions reductions. (Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21003(b); CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5).

Response 1-9

Refer to Response 1-6 regarding the assumption that AM and PM peak hour VMT represents 14 percent of daily VMT. Refer to Response 1-4 regarding trip reductions associated with proposed TOD that was applied to Future Year 2030 with the Proposed Project traffic forecasts which estimated VMT used to calculate Year 2030 mobile source emissions. Referring to DEIR, page 4.7-13, no TIMP recommended TDM measures were used in the estimation of GHG emissions which was based on square footage of proposed land uses.

Comment 1-10

D. Noise

Section 4.12 of the DEIR and Appendix F (Noise Calculations) analyze whether the proposed project would significantly increase mobile noise levels in the West Adams CPA, comparing existing (2008) and future with project (2030) conditions. Appendix F includes mobile noise calculations for certain roadway segments, but does not specify the source of vehicle counts used for those calculations. Appendix F should confirm the source of vehicle counts used for noise calculations. A reader of the DEIR should not be forced to search throughout the DEIR in order to understand the basis for mobile noise calculations, and even after searching, we cannot confirm the information. *County of Amador* 76 Cal.App.4th at 955-56.

Additionally, the DEIR and Appendix F are silent regarding whether Future Plus Project (Year 2030) conditions include trip reductions for TOD, as were incorporated into traffic, air quality, and GHG impacts

analyses. The methodology used to calculate Future Year 2030 vehicle counts for noise impacts analysis should be consistent with the methodology used elsewhere in the DEIR and must be clearly disclosed and explained. As stated above, the DEIR must clearly explain any trip reductions used to calculate future traffic. As with the impact analyses discussed above, this explanation should be added to the DEIR and this section should be recirculated for public comment. (CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5). By failing to include information about trip reductions in the context of noise impacts analysis, the City has not upheld its procedural mandate under CEQA and as such it has abused its discretion.

Response 1-10

In addition to Master Response 2 and Master Response 3, as well as the preceding individual responses that address the issues raised through this comment, consistent with the traffic analysis performed in the Draft EIR, the mobile noise calculations for existing conditions used 2005 vehicle counts, as further validated for later years through Master Response 2. Also see Appendices C (Model Development Report) and F (Roadway Segment Level of Service Tables) of the TIMP - Draft EIR Appendix G for further clarification of vehicle counts. The mobile noise analysis was based on peak hour volumes from the Proposed TIMP's "Year 2030 NCP (Proposed TOD Plan with 4Ds scenario with "Alternative Bike Lanes" applied (Table 4.15-6 and 7, DEIR page 4.15-23).

Comment 1-11

III. Other Sections of the DEIR are Inadequate under CEQA.

In addition to the problems identified above relating to the DEIR's traffic, air quality, GHG, and noise impacts, other sections of the DEIR are inadequate under CEQA for various reasons identified below.

A. Cultural Resources

Section 4.5 of the DEIR evaluates cultural resources impacts of the proposed project, and includes mitigation measures for construction related to future capacity within the West Adams CPA. The DEIR identifies five mitigation measures related to archaeological resources, which would be included as conditions of approval for any Discretionary or "Active Change Area Project" as defined in DEIR Section 3.4. (DEIR pp. 4.5-22 - 4.5-23). The mitigation measures are inadequate under CEQA because they fail to acknowledge that feasible preservation in place must be adopted to mitigate impacts to historical resources of an archaeological nature unless the City determines that another form of mitigation is available and provides superior mitigation of the impacts. CEQA Guidelines § 15126.4(b)(3); *Madera Oversight Coalition v. County of Madera* (2011) 199 Cal.App.4th 48, 87.

The DEIR is silent regarding preservation in place and implies that the resources could be removed from the site, without explaining or requiring the City to explain with respect to a particular Discretionary or Active Change Area Project how removal from the site would provide superior mitigation of impacts. Specifically, Mitigation Measure CR8 provides that if any find were determined to be significant by the archaeologist, the City and archaeologist would meet to determine the appropriate course of action. Mitigation Measure CR9 provides that the City shall require that all cultural materials *recovered from the site* would be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and a report prepared according to current professional standards (Mitigation Measure CR9). (DEIR p. 4.5-23)(emphasis added). These Mitigation Measures should be revised to reflect the preference for preservation in place.

Response 1-11

As described throughout the Draft EIR, the West Adams CPA is located in a highly urbanized area that is almost entirely built out. As a result, future development would occur almost exclusively on previously developed sites that have been highly disturbed. Any archeological resources that may have existed at the surface of those sites have likely been damaged or previously removed. Regardless, the Draft EIR

acknowledges on page 4.5-20, that given the well-documented occupation of the Los Angeles Basin by indigenous tribes, there is a reasonable potential that development occurring under the Proposed Project would be located on a site with previously unknown archaeological resources. To reduce significant impacts to archeological resources to less than significant, Mitigation Measures **CR5** through **CR9** listed on Draft EIR pages 4.5-22 through 4.5-23 have been identified.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(A) states, "Preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impact to archaeological sites. Preservation in place maintains the relationship between artifacts and the archeological context." Because the archeological context of the West Adams CPA is no longer apparent due to the highly urbanized nature of the area, it was determined that preservation in place was not the appropriate form of mitigation to address potential impacts resulting from implementation of the Proposed Project as the initial development and subsequent redevelopment of sites would have disturbed or significantly altered the archeological context. As such, Mitigation Measures **CR8** and **CR9** shall not be revised to reflect the preference for preservation in place, as requested by the commenter.

Comment 1-12

B. Alternatives Analysis

The DEIR must describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(a)). The DEIR identifies two alternatives: the no project alternative, which is required under CEQA, and the proposed project without TOD (which would not shift development intensity to focused TOD areas, resulting in less intense development and exclusion of TOD-specific regulations). (DEIR, pp. 5-4 - 5-5).

The DEIR concludes that the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to aesthetics (shade and shadow), air quality (construction regional and localized emissions), GHG emissions (operational GHG emissions), noise (construction and vibration), public services (public parks and libraries) and transportation and traffic (circulation system and congestion management plan). (DEIR pp. 2-2 - 2-3). The DEIR is therefore required to consider alternatives that would alleviate these significant impacts. The DEIR acknowledges that accommodating growth closer to the core of a major urban area can shorten commute trips, and reduce traffic, air pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions. (DEIR p. 5-16).

The range of alternatives analyzed in the DEIR is inadequate because it fails to include an increased TOD alternative, which would likely meet all of the project objectives and would potentially lessen significant GHG and traffic and transportation and traffic impacts to a greater degree than the proposed project. *Watsonville Pilots Ass'n v. City of Watsonville* (2010) 183 Cal.App.4th 1059 (City violated CEQA because FEIR failed to analyze an alternative that would have provided decision makers with information about how most of the project's objectives could be satisfied without the level of environmental impacts that would flow from the project). The DEIR's alternatives analysis should be revised to include an increased TOD alternative. *Sierra Club v. County of Napa* (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1505, fn. 5 ("An EIR, however, is required to make an in-depth discussion of those alternatives identified as at least potentially feasible.") (emphasis in original).

The public must have an opportunity to meaningfully comment on the DEIR's alternatives analysis. Accordingly, this section should also be recirculated. (Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21003(b); CEQA Guidelines § 15088.5).

Response 1-12

Draft EIR Chapter 5 contains a discussion about potential alternatives initially considered but rejected for the reasons stated therein. The Draft EIR describes six potential alternatives to the Proposed Project. Four of

those alternatives were eliminated from further consideration either because they were not feasible, would not reduce significant impacts or would not meet most or the primary purpose of the proposed project. The four alternatives that were not fully analyzed are described on Draft EIR page 5-3 with further discussion presented in FEIR Section 3.4, “Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR”. The remaining two alternatives considered were: (1) the No Project Alternative and (2) the Proposed Project Without TOD Alternative, which were analyzed in detail in Draft EIR Section 5.3.

Although its title suggests that it would not address TOD, Alternative 2 is considered a “Decreased TOD Alternative” because it applies the less intense Major Intersection Nodes CPIO development parameters to properties proximate to LRT stations. An Increased TOD Alternative in excess of the Proposed Project was not contemplated in the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project which would accommodate an additional 36,141 persons between 2008 and 2030 was analyzed as the most aggressive TOD scenario. Furthermore, contrary to the commenter’s statement, an Increased TOD Alternative would not likely lessen GHG and traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level. Until more people use transit, an increased TOD Alternative would likely increase the severity of significant and unavoidable impacts because the density of development in TOD areas is typically higher and would consequently contribute to higher traffic volumes and potentially increase impacts associated with the provision of adequate public infrastructure and services as analyzed through DEIR sections 4.14 and 4.16, and supplemented through FEIR Section 3.2.

Based on this, the City rejects the Increased TOD Alternative from consideration. 15126.6((f)(3) (lead agency may reject alternative whose implementation is remote and speculative).

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) states the following:

“An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project...which would feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives but would substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project...An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation...”

Primary considerations made by the Lead Agency, DCP, in the selection and evaluation of alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIR were adequate in addressing the potential to feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives while substantially reducing any of the significant effects of the project, and reasonably informing the decision-maker. Accordingly, as required by CEQA, the Draft EIR considered a range of reasonable alternatives. The absence of an Increased TOD Alternative does not deem the alternatives analysis provided in the Draft EIR as inadequate.

Comment 1-13

C. Later Project-Specific Environmental Review

The DEIR explains that project-specific environmental review would be able to tier from the Program EIR under CEQA Guidelines 15152(d)). (DEIR, p. 3-24). This section of the DEIR omits a discussion of how future projects would be examined in light of the program EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168(c)-(e). The discussion must be included in order for the DEIR to be meaningful and useful to decision makers and the public in accordance with CEQA Section 21003(b).

Response 1-13

In response to this comment the following text on Draft EIR page 3-24 has been revised as follows:

Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15152, ~~Project~~ project-specific environmental review would be able to “tier” from this ~~Program~~ EIR, potentially expediting the discretionary planning approval process through the

incorporation of environmental analyses and mitigation measures contained within this program-level EIR and focusing the environmental review on the issues specific to the project.

This ~~Program~~ EIR identifies environmental impacts that could occur upon implementation of the Proposed Project proposed West Adams New Community Plan. It is important to note that the CPIO districts and amendments to the Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan contain two types of development standards, administrative (by-right) and discretionary. If future projects will require discretionary review ~~of their development standards or if the project meets or exceeds the thresholds for a major project involving 50 units or 50,000 square feet of floor area, as defined by the City's Site Plan Review process,~~ the projects must be reviewed by the City on a case-by-case basis, and any applicable environmental clearance as is the current procedure when Site Plan Review is shall be required. ~~In the event of a future project needing discretionary review or Site Plan Review, environmental review would occur on a case-by-case basis.~~ Review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15125, for a tiering provides that when the initial study or other analysis finds that the project may cause significant effects on the environment that were not adequately addressed in the EIR per CEQA Guidelines Section 15152(d), a more focused environmental analysis would likely be required that would concentrate on the environmental effects that:

- Are capable of being further mitigated; or
- Were not analyzed as significant effects on the environment in this ~~Program~~ EIR.

Additionally, Public Resources Code Section 21166 provides that when an EIR has been adopted, no subsequent EIR or MND is required "unless one or more of the following events occurs:

(a) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the environmental impact report.

(b) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken which will require major revisions in the environmental impact report.

(c) New information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the environmental impact report was certified as complete, becomes available."

A lead agency may prepare an addendum to the EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in PRC Section 21166 or CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR are prepared.

Nothing in the DEIR is intended to limit or change the requirements or authority provided in CEQA for environmental review of future projects in the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan area. The City expressly reserves the ability to avail itself of any streamlining tools available under CEQA to review projects.

Comment 1-14

IV. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, CRA suggests that the City address the inadequacies in the DEIR outlined in this letter and recirculate the DEIR for public review and comment in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 because failing to address these issues would violate CEQA.

Response 1-14

The Draft EIR is not inadequate for the reasons described in the responses to this comment letter, above. Accordingly, recirculation of the Draft EIR would not be necessary. However, all comments will be forwarded to decision-makers for their consideration.

LETTER 2: COMMUNITY HEALTH COUNCILS

Comment 2-1

The comments provided in this letter are submitted by Community Health Councils and were developed in collaboration and consultation with West Adams–Baldwin Hills–Leimert Park community plan area stakeholders.

For more than a decade, Community Health Council (CHC) has been at the forefront of work to eliminate health disparities by expanding healthcare coverage, increasing access to quality healthcare, physical activity and improving healthy food options in under-resourced communities. CHC engages, supports, and gives voice to marginalized, low-income and under-served populations through coalition building and community mobilization. Our dynamic network of coalitions comprising the African-Americans Building a Legacy of Health Consortium is composed of neighborhood leaders, consumer advocates, healthcare providers, social services, educational and faith-based organizations serving communities in South Los Angeles. These stakeholders recognize the impact of the built environment on the health of individuals and communities, and identify the community plan update as a powerful mechanism to encourage healthy and sustainable development throughout the community.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines state that the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) is an informative document composed to “inform public agency decision makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of the project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project.”¹ California environmental law further states that the DEIR is intended “to demonstrate to an apprehensive citizenry that the agency has, in fact, analyzed and considered the ecological implications of its action.”²

We gratefully acknowledge the City of Los Angeles’ intended objective to conduct an in-depth analysis of the environmental health implications of the proposed West Adams New Community Plan (NCP). However, the DEIR falls short of meeting the objectives stated above due to: 1) the failure of the agency to acknowledge the many environmental health impacts associated with exempting Council District 10 (CD 10) from fast food density limitations; 2) impacts and implications to affordable housing and displacement; 3) impacts to open space; and 4) impacts to transportation contained in the NCP. This letter details areas in which the DEIR fails to meet required standards as established by CEQA and its enforceable agencies, particularly with respect to its omission of environmental analysis of the aforementioned issues.

According to CEQA guidelines, an agency is required to recirculate an EIR if significant new information is submitted to the EIR that was not contained in the original DEIR analysis. CEQA defines significant new information as:

- 1) “A new significant environmental impact resulting from the project or from a new proposed mitigation measure”
- 2) “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 DEIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.”³

This letter contributes new information to the agency that questions the DEIR’s analysis and presents empirical evidence conveying the environmental effects on the following:

- CD-10 EXEMPTION FROM COMMUNITY’S CURRENT FAST FOOD DENSITY POLICY (Section 1)
- AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND DISPLACEMENT (Section 2)
- OPEN SPACE (Section 3)

- TRANSPORTATION (Section 4)

As a result of these additional findings and CEQA precedent (Section 5), we respectfully request the revision and recirculation of the DEIR in compliance with CEQA.

Response 2-1

This comment contains introductory text and requests that the Draft EIR be revised and recirculated in compliance with CEQA to address omitted environmental analysis. Refer to the responses provided below that address specific comments made in this letter.

Comment 2-2

SECTION 1: CD-10 EXEMPTION FROM COMMUNITY’S CURRENT FAST FOOD DENSITY POLICY

Background

In 2008, an Interim Control Ordinance (ICO) placed a moratorium on the by-right issuance of building permits for new stand-alone fast food restaurants in the West Adams, South LA, and Southeast LA Community Plan Areas. According to the Los Angeles Municipal Code, fast food restaurants are defined as:

“Any Establishment which dispenses food for consumption on or off the premises, and which has the following characteristics: a limited menu, items prepared in advance or prepared or heated quickly, no table orders, and food served in disposable wrapping or containers.”⁴

However, only fast food restaurants designated as —stand-alone (or restaurants that do not share a wall with another establishment) were subject to the moratorium. The intentions of the policy were to reduce some of the negative environmental implications associated with South LA’s over-concentration of fast food establishments. This disproportionate proliferation is evidenced by the US Census County Business Patterns data, which reveal that limited service, or fast food, establishments comprise 71.8 % of the establishments in South Los Angeles, compared to 40.8% of West Los Angeles establishments and 47.7% of Los Angeles County establishments.⁵

Despite the numerous nutritional health implications of fast food restaurants, these establishments, and stand-alone establishments in particular, were identified by the planning department as having copious land-use related effects on South LA’s environment including: auto-centric design, high volumes of trash/litter, high vehicular trip generation, and reduction of opportunity sites for more community-benefiting uses (such as grocery stores).⁶ The planning department determined that the poor urban design of stand-alone fast food restaurants was “detrimental to the quality of life of the residents, which, if unabated, may lead to eroding public welfare and good planning.”⁷

New stand-alone fast food restaurants within the Council District 15 (CD 15) portion of the South LA community plan areas (Watts) were exempted from the moratorium.⁸ Justifications for the CD 15 exemption resulted from assertions that the area had a relatively low concentration of fast food restaurant establishments as compared to other South Los Angeles communities.⁹ Furthermore, due to the relatively small geographic area that the CD 15 portion of South Los Angeles encompassed, the exemption was presumed to not have a significant impact on the effectiveness of the fast food limitation.

The temporary “Fast Food Moratorium” was extended twice and expired on September 14, 2010.¹⁰ In lieu of a community plan update, the Los Angeles City Council approved a General Plan footnote in December of 2010 that required new stand-alone fast restaurants to meet six criteria aimed at addressing both fast food overconcentration, and needed improvements in community aesthetics and pedestrian mobility.^{11,12} These criteria include:

- 1) That the Project is not within a half mile radius, or 2,640 linear feet, from any existing Fast Food Restaurant.
- 2) That the Project provides a continuous building wall along the street frontage and along the sidewalk.
- 3) That the height, bulk, and massing of the Project is compatible with the surrounding area.
- 4) That parking for the Project is located at the rear or sides of the building, and partially screened from view from any public street by a minimum 36" tall decorative solid wall and/or dense vegetation of the same height.
- 5) That a minimum of 7% of the total area of the surface parking lot is landscaped with planting materials and the project has a coordinated landscape plan that includes abundant trees and shrubs.
- 6) That the Project has an adequate trash disposal plan to contra/litter including: sufficient trash receptacles on-site and frequent trash collection and disposal.
- 7) That trash enclosures should be enclosed by a minimum six-foot high decorative masonry wall and be located to provide minimum negative impact, physical and aesthetic, on pedestrians, traffic flow, or adjacent uses.

The qualifying criteria place design and density guidelines on stand-alone fast food restaurants, and aim to improve the quality of development in the South LA community. However, during the adoption of the General Plan Amendment by City Council, the exempted area was expanded beyond Council District 15 to also encompass the portion of Council District 10 north of the I-10 freeway. This exemption was based on the assumption that fast food proliferation was not present in the portion of Council District 10 north of the I-10 freeway.¹³

The Los Angeles City Planning Department states that the General Plan Amendment is intended to "protect the environment by placing regulations on by-right Fast Food Establishments that are found to have adverse impacts on the built environment due to their design, site planning, amenities, parking layout, drive-thrus, and minimal landscaping. In addition, the over concentration of Fast Food Establishments is found to be inconsistent with the respective Community Plans."

These actions were analyzed for consistency with CEQA Guidelines and were determined to be authorized by CEQA Guidelines Article 19, Section 15308, Class 8 which allows for "actions taken by regulatory agencies, as authorized by state or local ordinance, to assure the maintenance, restoration, enhancement, or protection of the environment where the regulatory process involves procedures for protection of the environment."¹⁴

The Los Angeles City Planning Department also concluded that the over-concentration of fast food restaurants "has the effect of reducing the opportunities for new grocery stores and full service restaurants in a dense, urbanized neighborhood where land is limited."¹⁵ Currently, potential restaurants not meeting the footnote criteria that desire to locate within designated South LA areas can apply for an exemption from the regulation through a conditional-use permit (CUP) process.¹ An analysis of South Los Angeles Area Planning Commission Hearings and Los Angeles City Planning Commission Hearings reveals that the General Plan Amendment has been successful in curbing the continued proliferation of new stand-alone fast food restaurant development. Since the 2008 ICO, only 1 new stand-alone fast food restaurant has been exempted from the policy. Meanwhile, since 2008, 6 new grocery stores have developed within the 3 South LA community plan areas.¹⁶ This change in development patterns is consistent with the West Adams community's desires to support a greater diversity of food retail options within the area.¹⁷

According to the West Adams DEIR, one of the objectives of the West Adams NCP is to "Establish use limitations for such things as alcohol sales, free standing fast food restaurants, automotive uses, swap meets, pawn shops, and gun shops." The aforementioned fast food limitations include:

"No more than one (1) establishment permitted within a ¼ mile radius of another free standing establishment" (CPIO sub-districts)"

- 1) “Prohibits ... all new free standing fast food establishments seeking to locate directly adjacent, across a street, alley or intersection from a public elementary, middle or high school, including charter and magnet schools” (*CPIO sub-districts*)
- 2) “No more than one (1) establishment permitted within a ½ mile (2640 linear feet) radius of another free standing establishment ... **all corridors and nodes except for those in CD 10**” (*CPIO commercial corridor*)
- 3) “Drive through fast food establishments shall be limited to a maximum of 1 within a 750 foot radius of an existing free standing fast food use” (*Crenshaw Specific Plan Amendment*)
- 4) “In all sub-areas except for those in CD 10, free standing fast food establishments shall be limited to a maximum of one within a ½ mile (2640 linear feet) radius of another free standing establishment” (*Crenshaw Specific Plan Amendment*)
- 5) “For those TOD areas within Council District 10, Free Standing Fast Food Establishments shall be limited to a maximum of one within a ¼ mile (1320 foot radius) of an existing free standing fast food use” (*Crenshaw Specific Plan Amendment*).

Although the Draft West Adams NCP does in fact incorporate language from the general plan amendment that limits the density of new stand-alone fast food restaurants within the area, the document also includes language that exempts the CD 10 portion of the Community Plan from fast food density regulations, with the exception of small transit-oriented districts contained within the accompanying Community Plan Implementation Overlay (CPIO) document of the plan (see figure 2). Unlike the CD 15 exemption from the General Plan Amendment, there is currently a high concentration of fast food restaurants in the CD 10 area, and the large portion of the West Adams community plan area that CD 10 encompasses (see figure 1).

CEQA Guidelines state that “only through an accurate view of the project” can the “public and interested parties [can] balance the proposed project’s benefits against its environmental costs, consider appropriate mitigation measures, assess the advantages of terminating the proposal and properly weigh other alternatives.”¹⁸ The glaring omission of an assessment of the “ecological implications” of the CD 10 exemption on the community plan area demonstrates the failure of the agency to adequately comply with CEQA requirements. The inconsistencies and omissions in the analysis of aesthetics, air quality, and land use, etc. are as follows.

Response 2-2

The Proposed Project no longer includes a proposal for a fast food exemption in CD 10 as discussed in Comment 2-1. Therefore, the commenter’s arguments related to impacts and analysis required by the policy proposal are no longer relevant.

Comment 2-3

Aesthetics

Based upon the Los Angeles CEQA Threshold Guide, development that “detracts from the existing valued aesthetic quality of a neighborhood ... by conflicting with important aesthetic elements or the quality of the area” may have the potential to exceed the CEQA significance threshold on community aesthetics.¹⁹ Although the DEIR suggests that the West Adams NCP would result in “no significant impacts” on aesthetics, this determination does not weigh the impact the CD 10 exemption has in perpetuating continued stand-alone fast food restaurant proliferation in a significant portion of the community plan.

The West Adams CPU explicitly identifies free-standing fast food restaurants as a use that is:

“detrimental to the health and welfare of the community due to nuisance, proliferation, or reliance on a standardized development typology often dominated by excessive automobile orientation.”²⁰

The “excessive automobile orientation” of stand-alone fast food restaurants conflicts with the “existing *valued* aesthetic quality of [the] neighborhood” because it contradicts current and pending efforts to preserve and expand the community’s multi-modal accessible urban design.

According to the Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide, “Visual character can be defined in terms of the overall impression formed by the relationship between perceived visual elements of the built, urban environment existing in the potentially impacted area. Elements contributing to this impression include the following:

- The nature and quality of buildings
- The compatibility between uses and activities with the built environment
- The quality of streetscape, including roadways, sidewalks, plazas, parks, and street furniture
- The nature and quality of landscaping that is visible to the general public.”²¹

This section will discuss how continued fast food restaurant development is incompatible with the West Adams community’s valued visual character due to its inconsistency with the visual character elements stated above.

Incompatibility of Stand-Alone Restaurants

The Aesthetics section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report contains an analysis of existing land-use documents, highlighting various use and aesthetic principles that convey the West Adams Community’s existing valued aesthetic quality. Contained in this analysis are objectives from the Los Angeles General Plan that promote pedestrian orientation as a component of a community’s visual aesthetics. These objectives include:

- “Objective 5.8- Reinforce or encourage the establishment of a strong pedestrian orientation in designated neighborhood districts, community centers and pedestrian-oriented subareas within regional centers, so that these districts and centers can serve as a focus of activity for the surrounding community and a focus for investment in the community.”²²

However, the LA City Planning Department’s analysis of the Fast Food General Plan Amendment states that “the proliferation of standalone fast food restaurants along corridors and at major intersections in the region may have, if unchecked, negative impacts on the residents’ ability to walk and shop within their neighborhoods.”²³ The DEIR does not reference the Fast Food General Plan Amendment in its analysis of the current aesthetic-related regulatory framework. This omission is a severe oversight. The amendment contains numerous aesthetics-related land-use justifications that are consistent with the West Adams overall valued aesthetic character. These justifications include the policy’s projected improvements on: “design, site planning, amenities, parking layout, [reduced] drive-thrus, and [reduced] minimal landscaping.”²⁴

CHC conducted a survey of the fast food environment in South Los Angeles in a soon-to-be published South LA Fast Food Health Impact Assessment (HIA). Preliminary findings from CHC’s South LA Fast Food Health Impact Assessment (HIA) reveal specific details about the incompatibility of most stand-alone fast food restaurants with efforts to promote more pedestrian orientation. Results from the Fast Food HIA’s survey of all fast food restaurants within the 90008 zip code reveal that drive-thru windows are only present at free-standing fast food restaurants. Drive-thru windows are only utilized by automobiles and are subsequently considered to have “excessive automobile orientation” by urban planning standards. Additional findings from the South LA Fast Food HIA restaurant survey reveal that all drive-thru lane exits and/or entrances intersect with pedestrian sidewalks throughout the surveyed area.

A 2006 report from the Los Angeles City Department of Transportation states that 13 of every 100,000 deaths in South LA result from pedestrian collisions.²⁵ This is over twice the number of deaths due to pedestrian collisions in West LA, which amount to almost 6 per 100,000. Furthermore, these estimates may

be conservative due to the recent resurgence in bicycle usage and other active forms of transit in both South LA and throughout the City. Numerous factors could contribute to the higher rates of pedestrian collisions in South LA including South LA's higher concentration of alcohol outlets, high population density, car biased design, and limited infrastructure for multi-modal transit.²⁶ However, many studies reveal that auto-centric designs and a lack of pedestrian-oriented infrastructure contribute to increased pedestrian injury risk in communities.²⁷

Other transit research concludes that marked crosswalks in uncontrolled intersections, for example those without traffic lights or signs, have been associated with higher rates of pedestrian injuries as well.²⁸ Fast Food HIA survey results reveal that over 44% of the drive-thru windows at fast food restaurants intersect with a marked pedestrian crossing. However, none of the drive-thru windows analyzed contained signs indicating a potential pedestrian crossing. Therefore, these pedestrian pathways may be more vulnerable to pedestrian injuries and should thus be deemed as "pedestrian un-friendly."²⁹

Based upon this evidence, the typically auto-centric typology of stand-alone fast food restaurants could have negative implications on the pedestrian-friendly design of the community and ultimately the aesthetic characteristics of the area. The effects of continued stand-alone fast food restaurant development within a majority of the West Adams community plan area must be adequately analyzed by the DEIR in order to make informed projections about the impacts of the plan on the pedestrian-friendly aesthetic design components of the West Adams NCP.

Although the West Adams NCP DEIR recognizes that fast food restaurant density promotes "adjacent incompatible uses" with the community's pedestrian-friendly design elements, the Aesthetics section contains an extremely sparse analysis of the impacts of the NCP's policies towards fast food restaurant development on the community's visual character. In fact, findings from the DEIR only acknowledge fast food establishment's incompatibility with the design elements of limited areas within the CPIO and Crenshaw Specific Plan sections of the Community Plan Area (CPA). The DEIR states that changes made within the New Community Plan:

*"would help maintain the existing character of these land uses with the West Adams CPA. ...changes are proposed in the CPIO sub-districts and Specific Plan Amendments that would limit adjacent incompatible uses. Examples include limitations of off-site alcohol sales, **fast food establishments**, storage buildings for household goods, swap meets, and gun and pawn shops²." (4.10-26)*

Although the CPIO sub-districts and Specific Plan Amendments' limitations on fast food establishments can be potentially impactful, the DEIR's recognition of fast food restaurants design incompatibility with multi-modal development is incomplete because it fails to recognize that pedestrian accessibility is an aesthetic value that extends beyond the limited geographic scope of the CPIO and Specific Plan. The aforementioned policies only regulate new free standing fast food development in significantly limited portions of the larger community plan area (see figure 2). However, contrary to the assertions made in the DEIR's Aesthetics chapter, efforts to promote greater pedestrian orientation and multi-modal accessibility extend throughout the West Adams CPA.

Initiatives to support more multi-modal accessible design are evidenced by recent improvements to the area's Bus Rapid Transit system (BRT) and pending sidewalk improvements to increase the area's walkability³⁰. Further support for the community's existing values of encouraging "smart growth"³¹ urban design principles is demonstrated through the plethora of comments conveyed during the West Adams Community Plan's 2008 scoping meetings that address the community's desires for:

- 1) "Increase[d] walkability"
- 2) "Enhance[d] character of retail by providing a better mix of neighborhood amenities including healthy food options"
- 3) "Promot[ing] pedestrian friendly parking standards along commercial corridors"

- 4) "Eliminat[ing] urban blight through enhanced streetscape and implementation of *Main Street Concepts*"
- 5) "Enhance[d] walkability by creating pedestrian friendly environments."

As a result of the DEIR's incomplete analysis of the valued visual character of the West Adams CPA, it fails to acknowledge the aesthetic degradation resulting from the significant portion of the West Adams CPA that would be vulnerable to continued fast food restaurant proliferation due to the CD 10 exemption (see figure 1).

Cumulative Impacts

In accordance with CEQA guidelines, to determine a project or program's potential exceedance of significance thresholds for aesthetics, the agency must incorporate an analysis of the project's "cumulative impacts". Based on the City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide, determining cumulative impacts requires the agency to:

"review the list of related projects and identify those projects that would result in the removal, alteration, or destruction of similar aesthetic features as the proposed project, and/or would add structural or other features that would contrast conspicuously with the valued aesthetic character of the same area as the project³¹."

The DEIR improperly determines that there will be no cumulative impacts on aesthetics in the community, due to its negation of continued fast food proliferation as an impact on the area's aesthetic quality. However, these findings are inaccurate due to the DEIR's lack of consideration of cumulative impacts related to future/pending economic development investments on fast food restaurant development trends within the area.

Findings from the South LA Fast Food Health Impact Assessment reveal that increases in fast food restaurant development parallel with increases in overall retail development trends within the area. To determine South LA's retail development patterns, the South LA Fast Food HIA study utilized data from the Los Angeles City Planning Department's Demographic Research Unit on retail floor space and compared it with US Census County Business Patterns data on the number of limited service restaurants within the South Los Angeles Area Planning Commission (South LA APC) Region³². The developments contained in the City Planning Retail Development analysis include all new commercial retail developments- including both stand-alone and non stand-alone fast food establishments.

Results from the analysis reveal that from 2003 to 2004, the square footage of retail developed in the South LA APC almost doubled- the largest rate of increase in retail development between 2003 and 2008. When compared with U.S Census County Business Patterns data on limited service restaurants (see figure 3), between 2003 and 2004 there was a 10% increase in limited-service (or fast food) restaurants. This growth of limited-service restaurants was also the highest rate of growth during the analyzed time period. Therefore, this data suggests that the rapid increase in fast food restaurants during 2004 may partially result from the significant growth in overall retail development in South LA during that same time interval. This is notable because it supports the presumption that as retail development overall increases in the area, so does the establishment of fast food restaurants. For this reason, investments in the community resulting in potential increases in development throughout the area must safeguard against the community's greater vulnerability to additional growth in fast food proliferation.

Although the NCP protects specific TODs from fast food restaurant proliferation through the CPIO and Crenshaw Specific Plan, the aesthetics section does not recognize the impacts of future light rail investment on fast food restaurant development throughout the entire West Adams community. The pending Crenshaw Light Rail project (see figure 2) is expected to result in a total public investment of between \$1.6-\$1.8 billion into South LA's transportation infrastructure. This project is dated to break ground in 2018, and is considered to be the single largest economic development investment in South LA's history³³. Although the proposed transit nodes along the upcoming Crenshaw line are incorporated into the designated TOD areas in the Crenshaw Specific Plan Amendment, and will be subject to limitations on new fast food restaurants

development, light rail investments have catalytic effects on economic development that can extend well beyond the official ¼ mile radius of a TOD boundary.

An empirical analysis of transportation development trends nationwide reveals that light rail is rapidly gaining popularity throughout the Country not only as a transportation alternative, but as a supporting tool for economic development³⁴. Each light rail stop is a potential node for more dense development, greater investment, and increased patronage for nearby businesses³⁵. Furthermore, these significant investments have the potential to spur development throughout the community plan area, which can be beneficial from an economic development standpoint, but can also subject the community to greater fast food proliferation vulnerability.

Mitigation Recommendation

Although the DEIR concludes that the New Community Plan would not result in any significant impacts on the aesthetics of the community, the omission of the implications of the CD 10 exemption from the analysis invalidates these findings. Based upon the aesthetic qualities of the West Adams community as defined by principles contained in the Los Angeles General Plan, Draft West Adams Community Plan, and West Adams Community Plan Scoping meeting comments- the continued over-concentration of auto-centric free standing fast food restaurants is incompatible with the community's aesthetic values.

CEQA Guidelines require that: "Each public agency shall mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment of projects that it carries out or approves whenever it is feasible to do so³⁶." Based upon these guidelines, CHC recommends that the agency alleviate inconsistencies in the visual character of the West Adams Community Plan Area by eliminating Council District 10's unfounded exemption from fast food density limits contained in the West Adams New Community Plan.

Response 2-3

Refer to Response 2-2.

Comment 2-4

Air Quality

The West Adams New Community Plan DEIR finds that the operations of the CPU would not have implications on air quality that would result in any exceedances of city and/or state air quality thresholds. However, this analysis is incomplete because it does not contain a disaggregated analysis of the air quality implications associated with commercial development by use or type. The South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Handbook identifies the square footage thresholds for various commercial uses based upon the potential implications of their operations on air quality limits. This CEQA analysis includes the size thresholds for drive-thru fast food restaurants as compared to other food retail outlets (see figure 4).

Findings from this analysis reveal that drive-thru restaurants generate more vehicular trips than other commercial establishments of the same square footage, and therefore may have more negative implications on air quality. As demonstrated in figure 4, drive-thru fast food restaurants larger than 2,800 square feet may generate enough vehicular trips to potentially exceed daily air quality thresholds³⁷. The typical drive-thru fast food restaurant in Los Angeles is close to 5,000 square feet large. Therefore, by these standards most drive-thru fast food restaurants within the West Adams Community Plan Area can potentially generate enough vehicular trips to exceed CEQA thresholds. Moreover, fast food restaurants without drive-thru windows above 3,500 square feet may generate enough vehicular trips to potentially exceed daily air quality thresholds as well. This size limitation is significantly smaller than the threshold for sit-down restaurants, which is at 23,000 square feet. Based upon these statistics, drive-thru restaurants generate an estimated 20% more

vehicular trips than fast food restaurants without drive-thrus and over 7 times more vehicular trips than sit-down restaurants.

The Draft Environmental Impact Report for the West Adams/Baldwin Hills/Leimert Park Community Plan reveals that in the community plan area, motor vehicles are the primary culprits for poor air quality³⁸. In fact, the DEIR explains that in the Los Angeles Basin where the West Adams CPA is located, Carbon Monoxide exposure (CO) is almost solely due to motor vehicles. Areas with higher motor vehicular traffic often times have higher concentrations of CO and other harmful air pollution chemicals. Copious health conditions including: respiratory diseases, cancer, and cardiovascular disease can be attributed to poor air quality³⁹. Although a number of environmental factors contribute to air quality, transportation-related air pollution is the most dominant impact on the quality of air in a community⁴⁰. In fact, the estimated costs of transportation-related air pollution in Los Angeles County were \$1,807,866,900 in 2001⁴¹.

In addition to CO, exhaust from auto-mobiles produces a number of other harmful chemicals including O₃ (Ozone) PM_{2.5} (fine particulate matter) and PM₁₀ (course particulate matter). Some of these chemicals contribute to increases in greenhouse gases, which lead to harmful environmental impacts, as well as increases in negative health externalities⁴². Research contained in the DEIR reveals that state standards for the pollutants CO, NO₂ (Nitrate Dioxide) and SO₂ (Sulfate Dioxide) were not exceeded in the West Adams Community Plan area between 2008 and 2010. However, state standards for O₃, fine particulate matter and course particulate matter in the West Adams area were minimally exceeded at points during the same 2 year interval. These chemicals are most often derived from motor vehicle exhaust as well, but can also result from industrial activities⁴³.

As previously mentioned, findings from the South LA fast food restaurant analysis reveal that all drive-thru restaurants are stand-alone restaurants. Therefore, increases in the development of stand-alone restaurants will most likely result an in the increase in the development of drive-thrus as well. Empirical research suggests that car idle time contributes to significant increases in pollutant car emission exposure as well. Considering the assumption that total drive-thru window waiting time is averaged at 4 minutes, then based upon empirical study calculations, cars waiting in drive-thru windows can generate, on average, car exhaust emission levels equivalent to driving 2 miles⁴⁴.

Therefore, the aforementioned findings suggest that the CD 10 exemption will allow for continued fast food restaurant development that can result in numerous implications on air quality. Although the DEIR does contain an analysis of the air quality implications of increased commercial development, SCAQMD findings reveal that fast food restaurants generate significantly more vehicular trips than other retail establishments of the same size. The air quality implications mentioned above must be adequately assessed in order to determine accurate assumptions about the West Adams NCP's impact on air quality. For these reasons, we assert that the DEIR's analysis of the West Adams NCP's impacts on air quality is incomplete and must be both reanalyzed and recirculated with a disaggregated assessment of additional commercial development's impacts on air quality.

According to CEQA Thresholds guidelines, a project that exposes "sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations" may contribute to a CEQA threshold exceedance. The DEIR states that sensitive receptors to poor air quality include: young children, the elderly and pregnant women. Although the DEIR acknowledges the West Adams area's high concentration of children/youth, a disaggregated demographic analysis of the area's population reveals that the community also contains a high percentage of women of child-bearing age. The exposure of pregnant women to chemicals such as SO₂ and PM_{2.5} is associated with premature births and low birth weights⁴⁵. These factors were not taken into account during the DEIR's analysis of sensitive receptors and must be appropriately considered.

Furthermore, the DEIR fails to recognize the changes in future demographic trends and its implications on the presence of sensitive receptors in the area. A report composed by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) reveals potential changes in the population composition of the Los Angeles region by

2015(see figure 5)⁴⁶. These changes may result in an increase in populations most vulnerable to high concentrations of air pollutants. SCAG's projections suggest that the most profound changes in age demographics within the next few years will actually occur in the senior citizen population group. Figure 5 illustrates that the senior population is expected to grow from encompassing 7% of Los Angeles's total population share to 11.2% of the population share. This increase in sensitive receptors was also not analyzed and should be taken into consideration in order to accurately determine the West Adams CPA's air quality impacts.

Mitigation Recommendations

More safeguards are needed to reduce the exposure of sensitive receptors to air quality pollution. These mitigation strategies should include efforts to reduce the concentration of establishments that have disproportionately higher amounts of vehicular trip generation than other establishments of the same square footage. Stand-alone fast food restaurants, particularly those with drive-thru windows, are amongst this group. For this reason, the community plan should ensure safe guards that restrict stand-alone fast food restaurant development also encapsulate areas within the CD 10 boundaries.

Response 2-4

Referring to Response 2-2, the Proposed Project no longer includes a proposal for a fast food exemption within CD 10. The DEIR's analysis of Air Quality acknowledges SCAQMD "Air Quality Handbook" thresholds as they relate to sensitive receptors, including pregnant women and women of child-bearing age, and addresses these thresholds in responding to Comment Letter 12.

Comment 2-5

Land-Use

Based upon CEQA Guidelines, a project that would "conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect" may be considered to have significant effects on the environment⁴⁷. Although the DEIR determines that the West Adams New Community Plan does not result in any significant impacts on the Land-Use consistency of the area, the DEIR's analysis does not assess the inconsistency of the CD 10 exemption with the West Adams Community's existing policies.

As stated by the City Planning Department, the fast food "general plan amendment is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent and provisions of the General Plan and is in conformity with public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice in that it provides protections to the South Los Angeles community by regulating the issuance of permits related to the establishment of new Fast food Establishments, and creates a relief mechanism for projects that do not meet initial findings."⁴⁸

Furthermore, the City Planning Department asserts that South Los Angeles's current "over concentration of Fast Food Establishments is found to be inconsistent with the respective Community Plans."⁴⁹ The Planning Department finds that the Fast Food General Plan Amendment is consistent with the following Commercial Objectives of the West Adams- Baldwin Hills-Leimert, South Los Angeles and Southeast Los Angeles Community Plans, as shown in the following table:

Based upon these objectives, the CD 10 exemption will significantly undermine the impacts of the Fast Food General Plan Amendment on promoting greater consistency with the goals of the existing South LA General Plan Framework. The continued fast food restaurant development concentration perpetuated by the CD 10 exemption conflicts with the General Plan Frameworks objectives to promote the health and welfare of the community and encourage greater commercial diversity in the area.

Findings from the South LA Fast Food Health Impact Assessment reveal that Fast food is growing as a dominant component of the average American's diet. Consumption of food prepared away from home almost doubled from 18% in the period between 1977 and 1978 to 32% in the period between 1994 and 1996⁵⁰. Unfortunately, the growth of the fast food industry parallels with the increased rates of nutrition-related chronic diseases such as diabetes and obesity⁵¹. Fast food restaurants typically have menus inundated with items that are nutritionally deficient, high in caloric content, energy dense, and overridden with sugar⁵². A study conducted by the Harvard School of Public Health reveals that the high percentage of unhealthy fats and other non-nutritious substances contained in processed foods typically served at fast food restaurants creates a greater risk for coronary heart diseases than unprocessed foods⁵³. Consumption of these unhealthy fats is also linked to weight gain, which can lead to obesity⁵⁴. Children are most vulnerable to the negative health impacts of fast food consumption⁵⁵. In the U.S, the percentage of obese children between the ages of 2 and 5 tripled between the past 30 years and quadrupled for children between the ages of 6 and 11⁵⁶.

Although fast food restaurant patrons often have a choice to purchase lower-calorie meals, these meals are often more expensive and less extensively advertised and promoted⁵⁷. Additionally, many fast food restaurants have exclusive contracts with soft-drink manufacturers and as a result, heavily promote and discount sugar-laden sugar-sweetened beverages as well⁵⁸. Targeted marketing strategies are also utilized to attract specific demographics to purchase fast food- particularly African-Americans and children⁵⁹. The World Health Organization emphasizes that the targets of the fast food industry's strategic marketing can experience "serious consequences" due to the findings of growing research concluding that targeted marketing to children is exploitation⁶⁰. The American Academy of Pediatrics states that advertising targeting children under the age of eight is "inherently deceptive" and "exploitation" due to advertisement's ability to manipulate the preference and choices of young children⁶¹.

In South LA⁴, youth represent an average of 32% of the population. Based on 2009 California Health Interview Survey data, fast food consumption in South LA is highest amongst teens between the age of 11-17⁶². Only 10.9% of teens surveyed did not consume fast food within the week (see figure 7). The fast food consumption rate for South LA children under 5 is also high. According to the California Health Interview Survey (CHIS), over 50% of South Los Angeles children ages 2 to 5 eat fast food at least once a week.

Furthermore, as previously mentioned according to U.S Census County Business Patterns data, in 2008, 71.8% of South LA restaurants were limited-service fast food restaurants in 2008, while West LA only had 40.8% and LA County had 47.7%⁶³ (see figure 8).

A number of studies have revealed that proximity to fast food restaurants can be associated with poor health outcomes^{64,65}. A study conducted by Purdue University finds that individuals living within a ½ mile of fast food restaurants experienced an average increase in BMI by 0.15⁶⁶. The closer the individuals lived to the fast food restaurants, the higher the BMI.

Children are also impacted by the geographic proximity of fast food restaurants to their environments⁶⁷. One California study examined the potential relationship between obesity rates amongst ninth graders in California and the distance between their school and fast food and full-service restaurants. The results from the study indicate that schools located within 0.10 of a mile experienced an increase in obesity rates by 5.2%⁶⁸.

Based on the average population density per square mile in South LA, there are approximately 10,949 people in every ½ mile radius of the area⁶⁹. Therefore, according to the findings of the Purdue study, nearly 11,000 South LA residents on average could be vulnerable to BMI increases with the development of just 1 new fast food restaurant in the community.

A study of LA County adults reveals that in most circumstances, individuals without access to private automobiles typically have lower BMIs than individuals living in the same community with cars⁷⁰. However, the same study reveals that individuals without cars that live in close proximity to fast food restaurants

weighed approximately 2 BMI units more than those living in the same areas that owned cars. Research from the ESRI's Business Analyst Online indicates that 25.9% of South Los Angeles residents do not have cars, while only 7.9% of West LA residents do not have cars⁷¹. This disparity is even higher in specific communities within South Los Angeles.

These findings emphasize the strong nutrition-related health implications of even a limited reduction in potential fast food restaurants within the South LA community. Therefore, if the CD 10 exemption allows for the most conservative estimate of 1 additional fast food restaurant being developed in the West Adams CPA, this may have substantial implications on the nutritional health of a significant portion of the area's population.

As previously mentioned, the General Plan Amendment has been effective in reducing the continued proliferation of stand-alone fast food restaurants from the South Los Angeles area. The CD 10 exemption will significantly undermine the positive impacts that the General Plan Amendment has made on the health and wellness of the West Adams community- and is therefore inconsistent with the existing General Plan Framework's goals of ensuring greater health and wellness in the area.

According to the City Planning Department, "*the Existing General Framework and the community plans for South Los Angeles region call for land use policies that encourage and promote diverse retail and commercial establishments along the corridors, thereby giving residents more opportunities to access a variety of retail and office uses.*" This value is also evidenced by the West Adams community's scoping concern to "*Enhance the character of retail by providing a better mix of neighborhood amenities including healthy food options*"⁷².

The LA City Planning Department has determined that fast food restaurants' "over-concentration has the effect of reducing the opportunities for new grocery stores and full service restaurants in a dense, urbanized neighborhood where land is limited⁷³." Therefore, the continued perpetuation of the West Adams Community's disproportionate proliferation of fast food restaurants contributes to the areas lack of commercial diversity. A lack of diversity of uses is not only an aesthetic deterrent for economic development, but it is also inconsistent with principles contained in both the General Plan and within the scoping concerns of the West Adams community. For these reasons, the failure of the DEIR to assess the impacts of the CD 10 exemption on the land-use consistency of the West Adams New Community Plan has resulted in an oversight of the exemption's inconsistency with existing land-use guidelines around commercial diversity as well.

Mitigation Recommendations

To alleviate inconsistencies with the existing General Plan Framework around promoting health and wellness and greater commercial diversity in the community, we suggest the elimination of the CD 10 exemption from the West Adams CPA in an effort to preserve the community's limited land for the development of healthier food retail alternatives.

Response 2-5

Refer to Response 2-2.

Comment 2-6

SECTION 2: IMPACT of TODs on AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND DISPLACEMENT

Background

As stated in the DEIR, 21,577 of the affordable units within the City of Los Angeles are at-risk of losing their affordability covenants between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2018 (page 4.13-9). In addition, the cost of

housing is high compared to other areas within the state (page 4.13-7). The preservation and provision of affordable housing was also outlined as an important factor to the community during the community planning process. However, the DEIR determines that the West Adams NCP would result in less-than-significant impacts on displacement in the community. This conclusion is incomplete because it does not take into account the impacts that the plan's lack of affordable housing provisions can have on gentrification and displacement. These impacts can result in potentially significant effects on population and housing as well as air quality.

As part of the Federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), the County of Los Angeles received a 2 year grant from the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to sponsor the *Renew Environments for Nutrition, Exercise, and Wellness* in Los Angeles County (RENEW) projects. (RENEW Los Angeles (CPC-2008-1553-CPU/ ENV-2008-1780-EIR))

Project RENEW consisted of 10 health-based initiatives throughout Los Angeles County. The Los Angeles County Department of Public Health contracted with several municipal agencies and community-based organizations, including LA City Planning, Public Health Foundation Enterprise (PHFE) and Community Health Councils to accomplish the goals of the CDC through the RENEW programs.

One initiative was to reduce the incidence of obesity, diabetes and other chronic diseases by overcoming barriers to exercise and promoting physical activity. This goal was intended to be accomplished through the design of 9 Transit Oriented Design Plan (TOD's) in the City of Los Angeles. The TOD Plans included:

- Land use, urban design standards and streetscape design that improve pedestrian and bicycle access to the transit stations and major neighborhoods destinations such as parks, grocery stores, libraries and other community facilities.
- Alternative mobility options at each of the stations areas to improve access to and from stations and decrease the use of vehicles and parking demand.
- Policies and implementation measures that will be adopted in the South/Southeast Los Angeles Community plans.

Los Angeles City Planning and its lead contractor, PHFE, spearheaded creating each of the 9 TOD Plans. These plans were located in four sub-districts near Downtown Los Angeles, a portion of South Los Angeles near the Alameda Corridor, the Watts community of Los Angeles, and the South West region of South Los Angeles. Community Healthy Councils worked with City Planning on community engagement throughout the process. This process included cultivating transportation goals and objectives from community and formulating recommendations for development in areas adjacent to transit stations that addresses community needs and incorporates alternative transit strategies and funding models.

The policy recommendations derived from the community engagement process were collected and compiled into a report made by the Los Angeles City Planning Department on March 8, 2012. These recommendations were submitted to the City Planning Commission for review, and a hearing to consider the advancement of the policies' adoption is currently pending. The proposed policies include specific strategies to:

- Create perceptibly safe transit neighborhoods that have daytime and nighttime commercial activity
- Improve walkability near transit stations by enhancing pedestrian environments
- Complement the existing character of transit neighborhoods while maximizing the housing and retail potential of nearby stations
- Use health, recreation and retail amenities to improve local quality of life in transit neighborhoods
- Promote environmental sustainability through multi-modal transportation and resource-efficient design
- Create mixed-income communities as an alternative to displacement
- Streamline the Environmental review process for development projects near transit stations that meet basic design requirements

Although the policies contained in the RENEW staff report are not legislated, they represent the priorities of the community around transit-oriented development and multi-modal accessibility. Therefore, it is important to consider these policy recommendations within the analysis to insure the West Adams NCPs consistency with the values of the greater community.

Response 2-6

Please also refer to Master Response 4 regarding displacement and affordable housing. The objectives, goals and policies of the Proposed Project, as well as its implementing ordinances are consistent with the RENEW policy recommendations. However, it should be noted that the RENEW policies as recommended by the City Planning Commission, were tailored to specific geographic issues and context within portions of the Southeast and South LA CPAs and would need to be further refined to reflect the unique issues and context existing in the West Adams CPA.

Comment 2-7

Population and Housing

According to CEQA threshold guidelines, significance for population and housing can be assessed by determining whether a project or program would "result in the net loss of any existing housing units affordable to very low- or low-income households (as defined by federal and/or City standards), through demolition, conversion, or other means". Furthermore, CEQA law requires that the agency consider "the forecasted economic or social effects of a proposed project." (Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. City of Bakersfield (1994) 124 Cal. App. 4th 1184, 1205 (citing Friends of Davis v. City of Davis (2000) 83 Cal.App.4th 1004, 1019 (Friends of Davis); Citizens for Quality Growth v. City of Mt. Shasta (1988) 198 Cal.App.3d 433, 445-446 (Mt. Shasta).)

The West Adams New Community Plan incorporates Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) within the land-use policy contents. Although this form of development is beneficial for promoting healthy, active transportation that can benefit a community, without the proper safeguards it can also result in negative impacts on the displacement of a population. According to a recent study, "newly transit rich neighborhoods" often experience "unintended consequences in which core transit users—such as renters and low income households—are priced out in favor of higher-income [households]"⁷⁴. The West Adams NCP does contain language that promotes affordable housing development, however, several of the Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zones (CPIOs) (including the Venice / National Transit Oriented Development Subdistrict and Commercial Corridors and Major Intersection Nodes Subdistrict) do not include any mention of strategies to preserve affordable housing. These CPIOs also do not include incentives to build new affordable housing units.

According to the City of Los Angeles, "many of the City's fair housing issues, particularly those faced by renters, stem from a lack of affordable housing choice for lower income households. The shortage of affordable housing is not a fair housing concern in itself; however this situation created a market condition that is conducive to discriminatory practices. With an abundance of willing takers and short housing supply, landlords are more likely to discriminate and screen out undesirable tenants"⁷⁵. " Section 4.13 Population, Housing & Employment of the DEIR does not adequately analyze the West Adams NCP's effects on housing and displacement because it omits any consideration of the implications associated with the plan's lack of substantive affordable housing preservation measures. Therefore, this oversight has resulted in an inaccurate assessment of the impacts of the NCP on the health and welfare of the existing community.

For these reasons, it is imperative that policies are implemented within the West Adams NCP that support the establishment and preservation of affordable housing within the community. Therefore, we request that the DEIR is recirculated with an accurate evaluation of:

- The number of affordable housing units lost within the West Adams CPA, including how the Plan and CPIOs will support or discourage the protection of units
- A more complete analysis of anticipated number of new affordable housing units built given the current floor area ratios, parking requirements, heights, setbacks, fees etc., in each CPIO, including justification and evidence for how these values will provide adequate affordable housing; and

A more accurate assessment of possible housing displacement (including substantiation with values of rents, net affordable housing units, and unit-type diversity) to substantiate the statement that the "adoption and implementation of the proposed project would not lead to the displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing".

Response 2-7

Refer to Master Response 4 regarding displacement and affordable housing. The analysis contained in Draft EIR Section 4.13 addresses all thresholds of significance related to population and housing identified by CEQA and the City.

Comment 2-8

Air Quality

The inability of the agency to adequately analyze the impacts of the NCP on displacement has also resulted in an inaccurate assessment of the impacts of the plan on air quality. The DEIR bases its air quality assessment on the assumption that TOD will automatically result in a reduction in automobile usage. The DEIR states that the West Adams NCP "TODs would allow for an increase in both jobs and housing. Locating jobs near housing can help reduce commutes, increase walking and biking rates, thereby creating a benefit for public health⁷⁶." This statement is based upon the presumption that the jobs provided near the housing meet the skill sets and needs of the individuals living in those households. According to the Bureau of Labor and Statistics, the dominant industries within the West Adams Community Plan Area are related to clothing retail and food retail services⁷⁷. These industries predominantly serve the job needs and skill sets of working class families. However, as previously mentioned, TODs often promote the displacement of these typically lower-income households. Therefore, although the plan promotes "locating jobs near housing", without the appropriate mechanisms aimed at combating displacement this may not result in a net reduction in commutes.

Furthermore, additional research demonstrates that when gentrification occurs, often times "vehicle ownership becomes more common" due to the wealthier incomes of the communities residents⁷⁸. This means that without effective gentrification mitigation measures, TODs may not only contribute to a potential net increase in work-to-home commutes, but they may also contribute to a net increase in motor vehicular trips as well. This may have significant implications on vehicular emissions, which could invalidate the original findings of the DEIR⁷⁹. For this reason, the "less-than-significant" impacts on air quality findings from the DEIR are based upon incomplete evidence and necessitate a reanalysis.

As stated in Community Health Council's DEIR Comment Letter on the Council District 10 exemption from fast food regulations, the DEIR also provides an inadequate assessment of sensitive receptors to air quality impacts (see CHC DEIR Fast Food Comment Letter). In addition to children, expectant mothers and seniors, individuals with pre-existing chronic diseases are also vulnerable to the negative health impacts associated with air pollution exposure. Residents within the West Adams New Community Plan area currently have disproportionately high levels of chronic disease such as asthma, diabetes and heart disease which can be exacerbated by mobile source air pollution⁸⁰. As a result of these findings, we also recommend that the DEIR analysis include a more in-depth assessment of the implications of the added vehicular emissions resulting from gentrification on sensitive receptors in order to accurately determine the air quality impacts of the West Adams New Community Plan⁸¹.

Response 2-8

See Response 2-2 related to the fast food exemption for CD 10. The commenter has not provided substantial evidence to support claim that the establishment of a TOD will result in a significant impact on air quality. In addition, the commenter has not provided substantial evidence to support claim that the establishment of a TOD will result in a significant impact on affordable housing and displacement. Please refer to Master Response 4 and Response 2-6 regarding the Draft EIR's conclusion that the Proposed Project would not result in less-than-significant impacts related to the displacement of persons or housing. The commenter has not provided specific comment to demonstrate that the EIR analysis or conclusion are in error.

Through proposed land use changes such as increased densities, mixed-use zoning, and affordable housing density bonus incentives and parking reduction incentives near LRT stations, the West Adams NCP would allow for the provision of new jobs and housing in proximity to transit and existing jobs and housing. These jobs could be filled by existing or new residents living in proximity, by individuals that take advantage of public transit, or individuals who choose to drive. Refer to Master Response 3 regarding Traffic Impact Analysis Methodology as well as FEIR Appendix M for further discussion of the "4D" TOD trip reduction methodology utilized in preparing the TIMP. The assumption that the proposed TOD CPIO subareas would create greater air quality impacts than disclosed in the Draft EIR due to the displacement of existing affordable housing has not been substantiated. Also refer to Master Response 3 regarding displacement and affordable housing.

The air quality analysis includes a detailed quantitative assessment of construction and operational emissions in accordance with guidance provided by the SCAQMD. The mobile source analysis, based on VMT and the EMFAC model, concluded that operational vehicular emissions would result in a less-than-significant impact. Construction emissions and exposure to toxic air contaminants were determined to result in potentially significant impacts. The Draft EIR Section 4.3 air quality regulatory controls and mitigation measures were designed to reduce community exposure to construction emissions and operational toxic air contaminant emissions.

Comment 2-9

Mitigation Recommendations

To mitigate the potential negative impacts of the NCP's TOD provisions on displacement in the community, we recommend that the New Community Plan expand upon its affordable housing provisions by adopting the policy recommendations contained in the RENEW Los Angeles report around promoting mixed-income communities. In the LA City Planning Department's RENEW Los Angeles Report to the Planning Commission, it acknowledges displacement is "not a required outcome of TOD. Policies that encourage, and sometimes require, the development of affordable housing can preserve the place of a neighborhood's existing residents, even as new residents move in"⁸². Therefore, pursuant to the RENEW Los Angeles Report, we recommend that the city:

"Incorporate incentives into TOD overlay zones that encourage mixed-income housing development.

- Offer floor-area ratio (FAR) bonuses for development projects that provide a minimum portion of income-restricted units (based on percentage of area median income).
- Offer minimum parking reductions for development projects that provide a minimum portion of income-restricted units (based on percentage of area median income).

Preserve the existing stock of income-restricted units near transit stations.

- Require new development projects to replace all of the site's preexisting income-restricted units (either on-site or in another location).

- Allow affordable housing developers and tenant cooperatives first right-of-refusal upon the sale of any residentially or commercially zoned properties within TOD overlay zones (under agreement that existing income-restricted units will remain so at the same percentage of area median income).

Exact linkage fees from development projects that do not include a minimum portion of income-restricted units (based on percentage of area median income). Require that proceeds from linkage fees be used to subsidize affordable housing development within the same TOD sub-district.

Response 2-9

Although this comment refers to mitigating the potential negative impacts of TOD, this comment is directed at the provisions of the Proposed Project and not the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. The commenter has not provided substantial evidence to support claim that the establishment of a TOD will result in a significant impact on affordable housing and displacement. Please refer to Master Response 4. Impacts related to displacement were determined to be less than significant as adoption of the Proposed Project would not presumably result in the net loss of housing units. Rather, adoption of the Proposed Project would increase housing capacity over existing conditions. Accordingly, no mitigation is required to reduce significant impacts to a less than significant level. Recommendations aimed at encouraging the provision of mixed-income housing and preserving existing income-restricted housing will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 2-10

SECTION 3: OPEN SPACE

Background

Study after study has highlighted the important role that open space plays in mitigating the effects of environmental and health impacts in dense urban communities^{83,84,85,86}. However, the DEIR lacks an examination of the "whole record"⁸⁷ in regards to the presentation of substantial evidence about impacts to open space and the development of feasible mitigation measures. Given the reliance on open and green space as a principal tool for promoting healthy, vibrant, and green neighborhoods in the NCP, the DEIR is insufficient in disclosing the full extent of impacts to open space and omits a thoughtful discussion of measures to mitigate said impacts.

Furthermore, in 2009 the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, as a first step in preparing a citywide park master/strategic plan, developed a Community Needs Assessment (Needs Assessment) "to help identify, quantify, and preliminarily prioritize the tremendous need for recreation and open space" in areas of high need. Some findings from the needs assessment reveal that:

- The City lacks the appropriate levels of neighborhood and community parks that are close to home and parks are not equitably distributed
- The amount of park land available in the City is low for the level of density in the City and people would like more land for mini-parks, neighborhood parks, community parks and downtown parks. More parks are needed in redevelopment areas and we should look to use brownfields that could be restored for public parks
- Concern that some parks are unsafe and controlled by gangs and lack significant security, keeping people from using the park in a productive manner
- Parks are in need of infrastructure improvements such as: restrooms, parking areas, playgrounds, picnic facilities, sports courts, security lighting, irrigation systems, sports fields and general site conditions which encourages vandalism and keeps the community from using the parks in a positive manner
- Sports fields are a needed amenity. This is a desire that the community felt the Department had not adequately addressed. The needs are great for sports facilities for both youth and adults

- Sustainable landscapes in parks are an important design element that the Department should incorporate into design standards
- Some existing parks are outdated in design. The Department needs to develop new design standards for parks in the future and customize the parks to the people living in the area that will be using the park
- Walkability of the City and the ability to walk in City parks. Loop and park perimeter trails are an amenity the community feels needs to be addressed by the Department in order to fight obesity and promote health and wellness. Recreation programs can be added to promote health and fitness, such as nutrition, cooking and physical activity classes
- The Department must create a balance of park types and manage by park and amenity standards that promote equal access

In South Los Angeles in particular, the needs assessment determined that:

- More parks are needed
- Safety and security are key issues
- Access to existing parks difficult
- Need more diversity of programs

The findings from the Parks Needs Assessment in respect to South Los Angeles are consistent with other open space resource studies that demonstrate that South Los Angeles is “park poor”. In fact, one analysis reveals that in South Los Angeles, there are only 1.2 acres of open space per 1,000 people as compared to 100 acres in West LA and 40 acres throughout LA County⁸⁸.

To address some of the disparities mentioned above, the Parks Needs Assessment recommended both policy level and programmatic solutions/strategies including:

- Remove amenities that are not well used or are in disrepair and replace with amenities the community desires
- Develop land acquisition strategies to include:
 - Outright purchases
 - Partnerships with other agencies
 - Land leases from other government or not for profit agencies, or others
 - Developer impact agreements based on the standards for open space desired
- Develop integrated planning and design criteria and processes so that park planning becomes a highly valued and integral part of the City’s General Plan and Community Plan updates.

Although some of the recommendations above are not within the purview of the West Adams New Community Plan’s scope, other components may be more easily facilitated through alignment and consistency with community plan provisions. For this reason, the West Adams New Community Plan provides the city with an opportunity to address some of the stark disparities in park and open space access in the West Adams portion of South LA through its support of some of the Recreation and Parks Department’s recommendations stated above.

Public Services

By relying on park and recreation facility standards that are more than thirty years old⁸⁹ and generally considered as deficient⁹⁰, the DEIR fails to adequately assess the impacts to open space facilities under the proposed NCP for current and future park users. Since 1980 park service standards have been altered markedly by reliable experts and must be examined in light of the proposed community plan. In fact, the National Parks and Recreation Association developed new guidelines that take into consideration supply, usage, demand, and population characteristics when determining level of service guidelines. Using a uniform guideline across community plan areas is insufficient and inappropriate. In 2008, CHC found that more

South Los Angeles residents depend on public open space and recreational facilities for physical activity than compared to other areas in Los Angeles.⁹¹ Finally, according to a report published by the City Project, council districts that make up the West Adams CPA and South Los Angeles Planning Area have a significantly lower number of acres of parkland per 1,000 residents than compared to all other council districts in Los Angeles.⁹² Under CEQA, "when adopting thresholds of significance, a lead agency may consider thresholds of significance previously adopted or recommended by other public agencies or recommended by experts..."⁹³ Under these nationally accepted guidelines, the DEIR fails to adequately analyze the unmet demand of open space. Furthermore, no analysis exists in the DEIR to support other open space facilities such as basketball courts, swimming pools, and community gardens. In fact, even though the Community Plan contains 5 policies specific to the promotion and implementation of community gardens⁹⁴ – no analysis exists in the DEIR to guide policy implementation.

Finally, the technical assessment of park access and quality is considerably flawed under the DEIR's current analysis. Significantly, 68.9% of the open space in the West Adams CPA can be classified as a regional park serving the entire Los Angeles region. This disproportionate amount of green space abuts the western edge of the CPA and cannot be determined to be centrally accessible to all residents. Moreover, access to open space is highly disparate for neighborhoods in the plan area—access to parks within .5 miles of residences ranges from 0 acres per 1,000 people to 240 acres per 1,000.⁹⁵ It cannot be assumed that parks are equally accessible to all users just because they are within a quarter mile of the West Adams CPA given the high variability of public safety concerns, car ownership, public transit access, and hillside grade (especially for access to Kenneth Hahn State Recreation Area). The DEIR also fails to study the impact of demand on current park facilities by assuming that the "majority of the population visiting the regional park would come from a 2-mile radius." The DEIR provides no substantial evidence how this conclusion was made. Impacts from region-wide increases in population and density on the park cannot be ignored in this analysis. A more accurate analysis of park access would rely on parks within walking distance of residents within the CPA. Finally, the report acreage of park and recreational facilities within a quarter-mile of the CPA seems to be inconsistent with other measures reported by California Department of Parks and Recreation. For example, the DEIR lists Leimert Park as 2.66 acres while CADPR lists it as 1 acre.

Mitigation Recommendations

Open Space and green space serves as a viable and feasible mitigation measure to address impacts to the aesthetic, air quality, biologic resource, cultural resource, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology and water quality, noise, and transportation environments. The DEIR omits a discussion of measures to mitigate significant impacts as a result from increased population and density in the CPA which belies the intention and spirit of CEQA⁹⁶. The City must discuss and develop mitigation measures in a process that is open and accessible to the public and, in particular, the affected community. In fact, "the development of mitigation measures, as envisioned by CEQA, is not meant to be a bilateral negotiation between a project proponent and the lead agency after project approval; but rather, an open process that also involves other interested agencies and the public."⁹⁷ Furthermore, given the severe and pressing shortage of open space in the West Adams CPA the DEIR must discuss mitigation measures to expand access to open space and if infeasible, must provide substantial evidence for their infeasibility.

Response 2-10

Regarding the acreage of parks listed in Draft EIR Table 4.14-13, the City of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation and the County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation were contacted to verify the acreage of each park. This resulted in corrections to Section 4.14 Public Services of the Draft EIR. These corrections are shown in Final EIR Section 3.4, "Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR". According to the City of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation, the actual acreage of Leimert Park is 1.01 acres.

With regard to analysis of uses not listed in the DEIR, open space and recreation facilities as analyzed in Section 4.14, include all appurtenant uses such as basketball courts and swimming pools. Community Gardens as identified in the Community Plan policy document are primarily considered for their viability as locations providing access to healthy food options.

Finally, with regard to the use of the 1980s park and open space facility standards, the City used the current adopted standard for analysis. The comment related to the City's assumption of a service radius of 2 miles applied to regional parks is instead related to community parks within the Community Plan Area (see Draft EIR page 4.14-24 paragraph 2). Also, refer to Master Response 5 regarding the significant and unavoidable impacts and mitigation related to parks and open space identified in the Draft EIR.

Comment 2-11

SECTION 4: TRANSPORTATION

Background

The West Adams Community Plan strives to support active transportation infrastructure by increasing the access to and quality of multi-modal facilities— including pedestrian and bike infrastructure. However, the DEIR relies on an outmoded metric to evaluate impacts on transportation and traffic in the CPA. The DEIR should restudy the transportation and traffic impacts to support multi-modal level of service as evidenced by a review of case law and existing policies in California and the City of Los Angeles conducted by the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition and Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld, LLP⁹⁸ reveals the following:

- Cities across the United States are incorporating less auto-centric metrics into their environmental review process.
- CEQA affords agencies great deference in choosing environmental review and methodologies and thresholds of significance.
- The Los Angeles CEQA Threshold Guide requires the City to evaluate environmental impacts using —the best information and evaluation methods available.

The use of less auto-centric metrics is supported by case law, expert opinion, and state and local policy imperatives.

Transportation and Traffic

The DEIR currently uses vehicle-level-of-service (LOS) to study transportation and traffic impacts in the CPA. However, because LOS only considers the impacts to vehicle traffic—vehicle miles travelled (VMT) or vehicle hours travelled (VHT)—plans and policies that favor increasing vehicle capacity will perform better than those that encourage biking and walking. By not evaluating the plan's effect on bicyclists and pedestrians, the DEIR fails to provide substantial evidence of the "whole record"⁹⁹ regarding environmental impacts. To facilitate an accurate analysis and account of environmental impacts, the DEIR must reflect policies contained within SB 375, the Sustainable Communities Act; AB 1358, the Complete Streets Act; Regional Transportation Guidelines. Furthermore, the DEIR fails to address AB 2245 which exempts bicycle infrastructure improvement under the CEQA process. Furthermore, as stated previously, the City of Los Angeles has great leverage in selecting environmental review methodology in the presence of alternative arguments provided by reliable experts. One such approach is taken by the California Natural Resources Agency which advises that LOS is not always the best way to analyze environmental impacts. According to the LA County Bicycle Coalition, "The Agency explained that an increase in traffic, by itself, is not necessarily an indicator of a potentially significant environmental impact, and that in some cases the use of LOS can lead to traffic mitigation that may actually lead to greater environmental impacts."¹⁰⁰

Response 2-11

Refer to Master Response 3 regarding the traffic impact analysis included in the Draft EIR. The traffic impact analysis follows City of Los Angeles guidelines for assessment of transportation impacts relating to New Community Plans (Community Plan Updates). A multi-modal level of service methodology has not yet been adopted by the City as part of its guidelines. Therefore, the traffic impact analysis included in the Draft EIR need not be revised to employ a multi-modal LOS methodology.

Comment 2-12

Transit Access to Community Services

Furthermore, residents of low-income communities must rely on public transportation to navigate the city since many do not own personal vehicles. The infrastructure to support light rail and buses must be designed to ensure that residents can access essential services, such as: healthcare, employment, and other community resources. Residents with multiple chronic conditions such as, diabetes or heart disease, who require frequent medical attention, may be unable to access clinics and hospitals quickly due to unavailable or unreliable public transportation options. The DEIR states that "specific land use designations" are determined by the community plan and will be used to "encourage and accommodate growth" of "mixed-use districts, centers and boulevards...in proximity to transportation corridors and transit stations (DEIR 4.10-3). These land use designations and transportation plans should take into account the location of clinics and hospitals to ensure that the population most likely to rely on public transportation can access the care that they need. This provision will also support greater consistency between the NCP and the General Plan's overall objectives around preserving and improving the health and wellness of the local population.

Response 2-12

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR. There is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required. This comment relates to the policy approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 2-13

SECTION 5: CONCLUSION

The EIR requirement is a foundational element of CEQA.¹⁰¹ However, as demonstrated throughout this letter, the DEIR fails to sufficiently disclose potential significant impacts related to over-concentration of stand-alone fast food restaurants in the Tenth Council District area, displacement, open space, and multi-modal accessibility. These potential significant impacts evaluated alongside substantial evidence may conclude that there are direct and indirect consequences to the environment. In this regard, the DEIR represents an incomplete and unsubstantiated analysis of potential impacts inconsistent with CEQA guidelines:

"Direct and indirect significant effects of the project on the environment shall be clearly identified and described, giving due consideration to both the short-term and long-term effects. The discussion should include relevant specifics of the area, the resources involved, physical changes, alterations to ecological systems, and changes induced in population distribution, population concentration, the human use of the land (including commercial and residential development), health and safety problems caused by the physical changes, and other aspects of the resource base such as water, historical resources, scenic quality, and public services."¹⁰²

Furthermore, the DEIR's failure to employ "...enough relevant information and reasonable inferences [so] that a fair argument can be made to support a conclusion [using] facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, and expert opinion supported by facts"¹⁰³ results in a glaring omission of analysis of impacts that could "cause substantial adverse effects on human-beings, either directly or indirectly."¹⁰⁴ By not offering a sufficient and complete account of the effects from the plan's CD-10 exemption, transit-oriented development provisions, open space objectives, lack of adequate program alternatives, the DEIR fails to meet the CEQA standard of "consider[ing] the whole of an action, not simply its constituent parts, when determining whether it will have a significant environmental impact."¹⁰⁵

To inform other governmental agencies and the public generally of the environmental impact of the proposed plan¹⁰⁶ and to demonstrate to the public that it is being protected¹⁰⁷ a well-reasoned and substantial demonstration is needed to explain both why the assertions made around transit-oriented development and open space are valid without justifiable evidence and why the potential impacts emanating from these areas were not sufficiently studied in the DEIR. There is no clear, identifiable justification why impacts from the CD-10 exemption would not be studied. No statutory exemptions (Article 18, Sections 15260-15285) or Categorical Exemptions (Article 19, Sections 15300-15332) exist within CEQA to excuse the lead agency from studying potential impacts. Furthermore, no reason was provided in the Community Plan, Implementation Plan, Community Plan Implementation Overlay districts (CPIO), or administrative record to support the justification to exempt CD-10 from the fast food density regulations. In fact, Ordinance No. 181412, the enabling ordinance for the establishment of "CPIO" explicitly states that the Area Planning Commission may not permit an exemption from a CPIO regulation if the granting of exemption is "...detrimental to the public welfare..."¹⁰⁸ To inform other governmental agencies and the public generally of the environmental impact of the proposed plan¹⁰⁹ and to demonstrate to the public that it is being protected¹¹⁰ a well-reasoned and substantial demonstration is needed to explain both why the exemption is valid without justifiable evidence and why the potential impacts emanating from the exemption were not studied in the DEIR.

According to court opinions in *Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of UC* (1993)¹¹¹ and *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (1990)¹¹² CEQA requires that decisions be informed and balanced. It must not be subverted into an instrument for the oppression and delay of social, economic, or recreational development or advancement. To undermine a democratic process that has taken place over the course of 5 years with an unsubstantiated and unstudied exemption is an affront to a democratic planning process and threatens the implementation of all CPIO elements.

In addition, the lack of appropriate time to review the DEIR for a program that will dictate the West Adams community development for the next 2 decades undermines the intentions of the DEIR to facilitate inclusive and comprehensive community input. The California State Supreme Court recently stated that: "The EIR's function is to ensure that government officials who decide to build or approve a project do so with a full understanding of the environmental consequences and, equally important, that the public is assured those consequences have been taken into account. For the EIR to serve these goals it must present information in such a manner that the foreseeable impacts of pursuing the project can actually be understood and weighed, and the public must be given an adequate opportunity to comment on that presentation before the decision to go forward is made."¹¹³ State law requires that a minimum of 45 days be granted to the public through a formal comment period to review and respond to the contents of a DEIR. However, due to the extreme technicality of the West Adams DEIR and the more than 2,000 pages encompassing the DEIR and subsequent documents, Community Health Council submitted a letter of request for a 45-day extension of the public comment period on behalf of CHC and its community partners (see appendix). Although a 15-day extension (30 days less than the requested time period) was granted, this extension still proves inadequate as evidenced by the 90-day comment period and additional 30-day extension granted to the Hollywood community to review the Hollywood New Community Plan.

Therefore, we request that additional time be provided for the public to review the re-circulated DEIR in an effort to insure better compliance with CEQA standards and give impacted stakeholders adequate time to digest and respond to the new document's provisions.

Response 2-13

Refer to the individual responses provided above with regard to fast-food use restrictions, displacement, open space, and multi-modal accessibility. For the reasons described in these individual responses, as well as the Master Responses, the Draft EIR represents a reasonable CEQA analysis of potential impacts in light of the fact that the Draft EIR is a program-level document. The Draft EIR was available for public review for a 60 day period which is 15 days longer than is required by CEQA.

LETTER 3: COMMUNITY HEALTH COUNCILS AND UNDERSIGNED ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS

Comment 3-1

We, the undersigned individuals and organizations, appreciate being afforded the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park (West Adams) New Community Plan. The comments provided in this letter are written on behalf of each organization as stakeholders of the West Adams and Greater South Los Angeles communities.

The organizations signed onto this letter represent a dynamic network of coalitions composed of neighborhood leaders, advocates, providers, social services, educational and faith-based organizations serving communities throughout Los Angeles. These stakeholders recognize the impact of the built environment on the health of individuals and communities, and identify the community plan update as a powerful mechanism to encourage healthy and sustainable development throughout the community.

While we gratefully acknowledge the City of Los Angeles' intended objective to conduct an in-depth analysis of the environmental health implications of the proposed West Adams New Community Plan (NCP), the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) falls short of holistically meeting CEQA requirements[1]. This is evidenced by the profound oversight of the lead agency to acknowledge the myriad of environmental health impacts associated with the exemption of the Council District 10 (CD 10) area from specific fast food density limitations, incomplete assessments of the implications of the plan on displacement, and inaccurate assertions about the impacts of the plan on open space and active transportation. This letter briefly overviews these areas in which the DEIR fails to meet required standards as established by CEQA and its enforceable agencies [2].

Response 3-1

This comment contains introductory text and states that the Draft EIR fails to meet required CEQA standards. Since this comment does not identify specific issues with environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR, a response is not required. Refer to the responses provided below that address specific comments made in this letter.

Comment 3-2

Omission of Environmental Assessment on CD 10 Exemption

The DEIR's failure to assess any environmental impacts associated with the exemption of Council District 10 from specific fast food limitations contained within the West Adams NCP has contributed to the agency's oversight of potentially significant health and environmental effects on aesthetics, air quality and land-use consistency.

AESTHETICS - Based upon the aesthetic qualities of the West Adams community as defined by principles contained in the Los Angeles General Plan, Draft West Adams Community Plan, and West Adams Community Plan Scoping meeting comments- the continued over-concentration of auto-centric free standing fast food restaurants (perpetuated by the CD 10 exemption) is incompatible with the community's aesthetic values around pedestrian orientation [3].

Response 3-2

Refer to Response 2-2.

Comment 3-3

- AIR QUALITY - South Coast AQMD findings reveal that fast food restaurants generate significantly more vehicular trips than most other retail establishments of the same size [4]. This greater quantity of vehicular trips, which was not analyzed in the DEIR, can have significant impacts on the respiratory health of the West Adams community- particularly children, pregnant mothers and seniors [5]. For these reasons, we assert that the DEIR’s analysis of the West Adams NCP’s impacts on air quality is incomplete and must be both reanalyzed and recirculated with a disaggregated assessment of additional commercial development’s impacts on air quality.

Response 3-3

Refer to Response 2-2.

Comment 3-4

- LAND-USE CONSISTENCY - The LA City Planning Department asserts that South LA’s current “over concentration of Fast Food Establishments is found to be inconsistent with the respective Community Plans[6].” The CD-10 exemption from fast food limitations allows for the continued proliferation of fast food development in a significant portion of the West Adams community (see appendix). The unregulated growth of fast food establishment in the West Adams community will only worsen the high incidence of obesity, heart disease, diabetes and hypertension associated with unhealthy food options [7]. To alleviate inconsistencies with the existing General Plan Framework around promoting health and wellness and greater commercial diversity in the community, we suggest the elimination of the CD 10 exemption from the West Adams CPA.

Response 3-4

Refer to Response 2-2. The Proposed Project no longer includes a proposal for a fast food exemption in CD 10.

Comment 3-5

Incomplete Environmental Impacts Analysis on Displacement

The Los Angeles City Planning Department states in its RENEW Los Angeles report to the Planning Commission that “displacement is not a required outcome of Transit-Oriented Development. Policies that encourage, and sometimes require, the development of affordable housing can preserve the place of a neighborhood’s existing residents, even as new residents move in”. The DEIR determines that the West Adams NCP would result in less-than-significant impacts on displacement in the community. This conclusion is incomplete because it does not take into account the possible impacts that the plan’s lack of affordable housing provisions can have on gentrification and displacement. These impacts can result in potentially significant effects on population and housing as well as air quality.

- POPULATION & HOUSING - According to a recent study, “newly transit rich neighborhoods” can experience “unintended consequences in which core transit users—such as renters and low income households—are priced out in favor of higher-income [households]”[8]. Although the NCP does contain language that promotes affordable housing development, several of the Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zones (CPIOs) around transit-oriented districts do not include any mention of strategies to preserve and/or promote affordable housing. Furthermore, the land-use policies within the New Community Plan’s TODs omit many of the affordable housing policy recommendations that were derived from the Planning Department’s Project RENEW TOD Plan for South Los Angeles [9].

Response 3-5

The commenter has not provided substantial evidence to support claim that the Proposed Project will result in a significant impact on affordable housing and displacement. Refer to Master Response 4. In addition, the City has not adopted the RENEW policy recommendations. See Response 2-6.

Comment 3-6

- AIR QUALITY - The inability of the agency to adequately assess the impacts of the NCP on displacement has also resulted in an inaccurate assessment of the impacts of the plan on air quality as well. The DEIR bases its air quality assessment on the assumption that TOD will automatically result in a reduction in automobile usage. Research demonstrates that VMT is highly correlated to income, so analysis of vehicle-related emissions must take the income levels of future residents into account [10]. This may have significant implications on vehicular emissions, and must be taken into consideration in order to accurately determine the air quality impacts of the West Adams New Community Plan [11]. Residents within the West Adams New Community Plan area currently have disproportionately high levels of chronic disease such as asthma, diabetes and heart disease which can be exacerbated by mobile source air pollution [12].

Response 3-6

The commenter has not provided substantial evidence to support claim that the establishment of a TOD will result in a significant impact on air quality. Please refer to Master Responses 3 and 4. Footnotes 10, 11 and 12 refer to technical studies and/or professional reports that are general in nature and not directly connected to the analysis of this Proposed Project.

Comment 3-7

- MITIGATION RECOMMENDATIONS - We recognize that TOD can be an effective tool for economic development and health equity, however, to mitigate the potential negative impacts of the NCP's TOD provisions on displacement in the community, we recommend, pursuant to the RENEW Los Angeles Transit-Oriented Districts Plan, that the NCP allow for more policies that preserve the existing stock of income-restricted units near transit stations, and that more incentives are incorporated into the TOD overlay zones to encourage mixed-income housing development. Additional research indicates that a vast majority of units occupied by low-income households are in the private market; therefore, focusing exclusively on the construction and preservation of deed restricted affordable housing actually only addresses a small percentage of units. For this reason, we also recommend targeted outreach to tenants in units that are covered by the rent stabilization ordinance to ensure that the units remain in compliance with just cause eviction control laws. Moreover, we propose that the planning department consider additional policies that extend rent stabilization efforts beyond their limited scope, which currently only impacts units developed prior to 1978. Renters are not the only victims of gentrification and displacement, however. Small business owners and homeowners can also be negatively impacted by changing community dynamics that do not recognize the unique historic vulnerabilities of a specific area. As a result, we suggest that the New Community Plan's implementation section incorporate multi-lingual homeowner and small business counseling and education programs that promote the preservation of the existing community residents and that protect and extend opportunities for participation to historically marginalized business owners.

Response 3-7

Refer to Master Response 4.

Comment 3-8

Lack of Substantial Evidence and Mitigation for Open Space Impacts

The DEIR determines that the West Adams NCP will have significant impacts on open space due to projected increases in population and housing growth. Despite the ideological reliance of the NCP on open and green space as a principal tool for promoting healthy, vibrant, and green neighborhoods, the DEIR is insufficient in disclosing the full extent of the plan's actual impacts on open space and omits a thoughtful discussion of feasible mitigation measures.

- **PUBLIC SERVICES** - The DEIR's analysis of the NCP's open space provisions is significantly inaccurate because it utilizes park and recreation facility standards that are more than thirty years old [13] and generally considered deficient[14]. Furthermore, the technical assessment of park access and quality is considerably flawed under the DEIR's current analysis. Specifically, the DEIR's inflated calculations of open space within the West Adams CPA are based on the presumption that a "majority of the population visiting the regional park would come from a 2-mile radius." This unsubstantiated claim is miscalculated because parks are not equally accessible to all users given the high variability of public safety concerns, car ownership, public transit access, and hillside grade impacts (especially for access to Kenneth Hahn State Recreation Area). Finally, the reported acreage of park and recreational facilities within ¼ mile of the CPA is inconsistent with other measures reported by California Department of Parks and Recreation (CADPR). For example, the DEIR lists Leimert Park as 2.66 acres large while CADPR lists it as only 1 acre.
- **MITIGATION RECOMMENDATIONS** - As a result of the DEIR's unsubstantiated underestimation of open space within the West Adams CPA, the document's mitigation measures must be reevaluated and revised. Currently, due to resource limitations, the DEIR omits a discussion of measures to mitigate the plan's open space impacts despite its findings that the impacts will be "significant". This inadequate response to the community's overwhelming disparities in open space access completely belies the intention and spirit of CEQA [15]. The City must discuss and develop viable and impactful mitigation measures in a process that is open and accessible to impacted community stakeholders. These measures should include, but not be limited to, innovative strategies around interim-use agreements for the area's underutilized surplus property for pocket parks and/or urban agriculture sites; the modification of parkway gardening guidelines to allow for food production; and the greater promotion of joint-use policies.

Response 3-8

Refer to Master Response 5 regarding impacts resulting from adoption of the Proposed Project related to parks and open space.

Comment 3-9

Over-Reliance on Auto-Centric Transportation Analysis

The West Adams Community Plan strives to support active transportation infrastructure by increasing the access to and quality of multi-modal facilities— including pedestrian and bike infrastructure. However, the DEIR relies on an outmoded metric to evaluate impacts on transportation and traffic in the CPA.

- **TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC** - The DEIR currently uses vehicle-level-of-service (LOS) to study transportation and traffic impacts in the CPA. However, because LOS only considers the impacts to vehicle traffic—vehicle miles travelled (VMT) or vehicle hours travelled (VHT)—plans and policies that favor increasing vehicle capacity will perform better than those that encourage biking and walking. By not evaluating the plan's effect on bicyclists and pedestrians, the DEIR fails to provide substantial

evidence of the “whole record”[16] regarding environmental impacts. Based upon CEQA standards, the City of Los Angeles has great leverage in selecting environmental review methodology in the presence of alternative arguments provided by reliable experts. The California Natural Resources Agency advises that LOS is not always the best way to analyze environmental impacts, and “in some cases the use of LOS can lead to traffic mitigation that may actually lead to greater environmental impacts.” [17] The Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide requires the City to evaluate environmental impacts using “the best information and evaluation methods available.” Therefore, the DEIR should restudy the transportation and traffic impacts to support multi-modal level of service as supported by case law, expert opinion, and state and local policy imperatives [18].

Response 3-9

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR. There is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required. Refer to Master Response 2 regarding the traffic impact analysis included in the Draft EIR. The traffic impact analysis follows City of Los Angeles guidelines for assessment of transportation impacts relating to New Community Plans (Community Plan Updates). A multi-modal level of service methodology has not yet been adopted by the City as part of its guidelines. Therefore, the traffic impact analysis included in the Draft EIR need not be revised to employ a multi-modal LOS methodology.

Comment 3-10

Conclusion

For the aforementioned deficiencies, CHC respectfully asks for the City of Los Angeles to recirculate a DEIR that includes a thorough, adequate, and substantiated analysis of the proposed plan’s CD-10 fast food exemption, gentrification impacts, effects on open space access, and implications for multi-modal accessibility. In response to our comments, we respectfully ask for reasoned analysis in good faith [19],[20]. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, we request that the City provide ample time for the public to review the recirculated DEIR in an effort to insure better compliance with CEQA standards and that impacted stakeholders are afforded with the adequate time to digest and respond to the new document’s provisions.

Response 3-10

See Response 2-2. Based on the number of comment letters received and the substantive discussion provided therein and responses to those comments, it has been determined that recirculation of the Draft EIR would not be necessary. The Draft EIR was available for public review for a 60 day period which is 15 days longer than is required by CEQA.

LETTER 4: NEIGHBORS UNITED FAIRCREST HEIGHTS COMMUNITY

Comment 4-1

Neighbors United is a neighborhood association representing over 700 households in the Faircrest Heights Community. It is bordered by Pico Boulevard on the north, Fairfax Avenue on the east Guthrie Street (or the Kaiser Permanente Hospital wall) on the south, and Crescent Heights Boulevard on the west. This community consists primarily of single family residential homes built during the 1930's and 1940's. Some of the original owners still live here. Our newer residents have moved to this neighborhood because of its stability, beauty, convenient location and sense of community.

Our community is divided at 18th Street between the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert and Wilshire General Plan areas. We are further divided by zip code—Fairfax Avenue is the boundary for 90019; one block from 18th Street to Sawyer Avenue is 90035; and Sawyer Avenue south to Venice Boulevard is 90034. We are at the western boundary of LAPD's Wilshire Division—La Cienega Boulevard. LAPD's West L.A. Division covers the west side of La Cienega Boulevard. This portion of Faircrest Heights is like a postage stamp on a rather large parcel.

After reading the New Community Plan Draft EIR, our neighbors have serious concerns about losing our quality of life to tall commercial buildings, increased traffic and over-building for the area.

Response 4-1

This comment contains introductory text and expresses concerns related to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project. As this comment does not identify specific issues with the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR, a response is not required. Refer to the responses provided below that address specific comments made in this letter.

Comment 4-2

In particular, we are concerned that the proposed zoning changes will allow for much greater density in our small enclave. Changing the R-1 designation to Low II Residential or Low III Residential would lead to the destruction of our single family homes in favor of much larger multi-family units.

The CPIO Overlay Districts and Subdistrict drive home this point by allowing for minor adjustments to standards and permitting discretionary approval for projects that exceed the adopted standards for the area. Figure 3-5 illustrates such a concern at Fairfax Avenue and Venice Boulevard where height and density could threaten our ability to traverse the City.

Response 4-2

Draft EIR Figure 3-5 illustrates the Faircrest Heights community as being located in an area where nomenclature and consistency changes in General Plan designations and zoning would occur. As explained on Draft EIR page 3-13, nomenclature changes are changes in name only. Densities, heights, and land uses will not change in these areas as a result of the Proposed Project. R1 zoning will remain in place. Other zone change adjustments will simply create consistency between existing land uses and the General Plan. Certain existing land use designations, including Low Residential, have been modified to create consistency with the General Plan Framework land use designations. Draft EIR Tables 3-3 and 3-4 on page 3-15 show that Low Residential would be modified to Low II Residential or Low III Residential which are single-family residential land use designations. Density would vary from 4 to 9 units per acre depending on the land use designation and zoning for the parcel. Accordingly, proposed land use changes in the Faircrest Heights community would not allow for the construction of residential uses at densities greater than what is currently permitted and existing.

As shown in Draft EIR Figure 3-5, the north side of Venice Boulevard east and west of Fairfax Avenue is identified as being within a CPIO subarea. More specifically, this portion of Venice Boulevard is located within the Commercial Corridors CPIO Subarea. The height district of the Commercial Corridors CPIO is being lowered from the Current Plan’s unlimited height to the Proposed Project’s 1VL height district with a maximum height of 45 feet. Accordingly, changes to permitted densities, heights, and land uses would occur with implementation of the Proposed Project.

The commenter is correct that these proposed land use changes could impact how residents traverse the City. This is discussed in Draft EIR Section 4.15. The Draft EIR on page 4.15-28 acknowledges that significant and unavoidable impacts related to the circulation system and the congestion management program would occur as a result of the Proposed Project. However, as shown in **Table 2-5**, the 2008 (Existing) LOS at the La Cienega/Venice Boulevards intersection area generally does not change any more under the Proposed Project than would otherwise be anticipated under the existing Community Plan in 2030. Furthermore, **Table 2-2**, below, of Master Baseline Response 2 also indicates that traffic counts taken at this location for later years 2010 and 2012 have decreased and that overall change has been minor.

TABLE 2-5: LA CIENEGA / VENICE BLVD. ROADWAY SEGMENT LEVELS OF SERVICE (LOS)				
Roadway Segment	Direction	LOS - PM Peak Hour		
		2008 (Existing)	2030 (Proposed Project)	2030 (Current Plan)
Fairfax Ave. (Venice Blvd. to 18 th St.)	NB	C	D	D
	SB	C	D*	C*
Venice Blvd. (La Cienega Blvd. to Cadillac Ave.)	EB	C	C	C
	WB	C	D	D
La Cienega Blvd. (Cadillac Ave. to 18 th St.)	NB	F	F	F
	SB	D	D	D
La Cienega Blvd. (Venice Blvd. to Cadillac Ave.)	NB	C	D	D
	SB	F	F	F

*The LOS for Fairfax Ave. heading southbound from 18th St to Venice Blvd has a projected evening peak hour of 670 vehicles with the current plan and 720 with the plan update for the year 2030.
SOURCE: Fehr & Peers, *New Community Plan Program West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan Area Draft Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Program*, February 2012.

Comment 4-3

Adding to our concerns is the fact that our community is in a liquefaction zone. We are mere blocks away from the site of the collapse of the Santa Monica Freeway during the Northridge earthquake. Could greater density and height have an impact on potential damage and threats to life during future seismic activity?

Response 4-3

Areas susceptible to liquefaction in the West Adams CPA are identified in Draft EIR Figure 4.6-2. As shown, liquefaction areas cover a large portion of the West Adams CPA. Increased building densities and heights would result in the exposure of more individuals and structures to risks associated with seismic activity. However, as explained on Draft EIR page 4.6-12, prior to construction of new structures in liquefaction-prone areas, a site-specific geotechnical evaluation is required that would specifically address and include measures to minimize risks associated with liquefaction. New development would be required to comply with recommendations identified in the geotechnical evaluation, as well as the City of Los Angeles Building and Grading Codes and any specific requirements established by the Department of Public Works and/or the City Engineer. Compliance with these recommendations would ensure that impacts related to seismic activity, and more specifically liquefaction, would be less than significant.

Comment 4-4

Traffic patterns surrounding our community are at maximum capacity. Fairfax Avenue, Venice and La Cienega Boulevards are a complete gridlock at nearly any time of the day. Increasing heights and density in this area would make it virtually impossible for residents to leave the community to go to work, run errands or otherwise traverse the city. In addition, this traffic density is already posing a serious threat to emergency vehicles attempting to get through traffic to homes or to Kaiser Permanente or other nearby hospitals along designated emergency routes as described in Draft EIR Figure 4.15-2.

Response 4-4

The commenter is correct that increases in the allowable height and density of development could impact how residents traverse the City. This is discussed in Draft EIR Section 4.15. The Draft EIR acknowledges on page 4.15-28 that significant and unavoidable impacts related to the circulation system and the congestion management program would occur as a result of the Proposed Project. However, the Proposed Project clarifies the development parameters of zones by establishing maximum height limits (where they currently do not exist) in addition to maximum FARs, which are generally consistent with current maximum FARs, as well as further tailoring the residential land use designations and their corresponding zones. Additionally, most of the proposed “up-zones” occur near transit, which would facilitate additional trips to be accommodated through public transit versus private automobile.

Emergency access is addressed in the Draft EIR on page 4.15-27 and further addressed in Final EIR Section 3.2 regarding supplemental analysis. The Draft EIR determined that design of future developments in accordance with City emergency access standards would foreseeably minimize potential emergency access impacts. Additionally, the proposed TIMP identifies highway infrastructure improvements and maintains street system classifications that would favor facilitation of emergency access. TIMP Section 5.5 (Draft EIR Appendix G), states that because as-built conditions would generally remain thereby maintaining the predominate early twentieth century development pattern along most corridors, fewer curb-cuts and other traffic control variants would be introduced that impede emergency access. Accordingly, impacts related to emergency access were determined to be less than significant.

Comment 4-5

Noise is a significant factor in this community due to our proximity to the Santa Monica Freeway and because of heavy traffic along Venice and La Cienega Boulevards and Fairfax Avenue, which is used as a secondary highway. Mitigation of noise levels would be another concern to our community.

Response 4-5

A mobile noise analysis was completed for 16 street segments in the West Adams CPA. As shown in Draft EIR Table 4.12-8, the Proposed Project would not significantly increase existing noise levels. In addition, Mitigation Measure N3 would require site-specific noise studies for new industrial land uses located near residences. As a result of recent case law, Mitigation Measure N4 is no longer necessary. The Draft EIR assessed potential impacts related to new development. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the Draft EIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the Draft EIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15088;15204(e)).

Comment 4-6

We strongly support changes to any plan that limits the number of Conditional Use Permits for the sale of Alcohol, and for the establishment of Marijuana clinics in our overall community. Also, we strongly support any changes to limit the number of automotive businesses in a general area.

Of environmental significance to us is the need for more trees and green space in our general area. We would seek to protect the trees in the community and encourage any new businesses or construction projects to include trees and landscaping to enhance the air quality and visual aspects of our community.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments. We would like to receive any updates and decisions that are part of this project.

Response 4-6

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the Draft EIR. This comment is directly related to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and not to the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. This comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

LETTER 5: LOS ANGELES CONSERVANCY

Comment 5-1

On behalf of the Los Angeles Conservancy, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert New Community Plan (the Community Plan). The Los Angeles Conservancy is the largest local preservation organization in the United States, with over 6,500 members throughout the Los Angeles area. Established in 1978, the Conservancy works to preserve and revitalize the significant architectural and cultural heritage of Los Angeles County through advocacy and education.

We commend the City for a thoughtful and innovative plan that fosters growth while respecting and protecting historically sensitive properties and existing neighborhood character. The plan area contains some of Los Angeles' most outstanding examples of urban design in Leimert Park and Village Green, as well as early twentieth-century and postwar residential neighborhoods, commercial streetcar corridors, and the built heritage of African-American and Japanese-American communities. The integration of preservation tools such as rehabilitation, adaptive reuse, architectural compatibility, and neighborhood conservation throughout the Community Plan demonstrates a nuanced approach that values a community's sense of place and its layers of history alongside new development.

Response 5-1

This comment contains introductory text. The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR. Refer to responses provided below that address specific comments made in this letter.

Comment 5-2

While the Conservancy applauds the intent of the Community Plan, we submit the following comments to further ensure its effectiveness and avoid impacts to historic resources.

- I. Downzone areas outside of the implementation overlays to protect historic resource and encourage development in the intended areas

The Conservancy appreciates the inclusion of five Community Plan Implementation Overlay Districts (CPIOs) as well as amendments to the Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan to implement the Community Plan's policies. The CPIOs generally outline zoning and other development standards that together with the proposed review processes and meaningful incentives encourage reuse and rehabilitation of historic buildings as well as compatible infill. Unfortunately, the areas outside of the CPIOs fail to benefit from such protections or incentives and remain at risk of development pressure incompatible with the Community Plan.

The Community Plan attempts to address this gap through zoning adjustments, such as a height district change for Crenshaw Village and proposed Planning Districts, though with unspecified guidelines. Until more substantial protections are in place, we urge the City to review the areas outside the CPIOs, and downzone as necessary, to ensure zoning and height district designations are consistent with the existing neighborhoods. The multifamily residential zones may be most vulnerable, particularly if they currently contain single-family residential, duplex units or low-scale apartment complexes that contribute to a cohesive neighborhood character. Such areas include the two-story apartments along Leimert Blvd and in Leimert Park, the neighborhoods adjacent to CPIO boundaries, and other large-scale garden apartment communities near Village Green. Appropriate zoning further encourage development at the CPIO areas and away from stable neighborhoods.

Response 5-2

As this is not a comment regarding the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR, but rather a request to revise the Proposed Project, a response is not required. However, this comment will be forwarded to decisions makers for their consideration when contemplating the adoption of the Proposed Project.

Referring to the DCP's City Planning Commission Staff Recommendation Report dated April 11, 2013 regarding Issue #3, conservation and preservation of historic "character" neighborhoods through the study of new Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs) and/or other neighborhood conservation related overlays such as CPIO the District was identified as the preferred course for the Proposed Project's policy and future implementation programs. To this end, several Low Medium Residential areas were recommended for approval through the CPC's subsequent February 11, 2016 action and include neighborhood conservation "down-zones", General Plan amendment "down-plans", and a Character Residential CPIO District subarea designation consistent with Council Motion CF 15-0071. Refer to Response 6-2 and FEIR Section 3.3 Changes to the Proposed Project, for further description of the neighborhood conservation implementation programs as part of the Proposed Project.

Comment 5-3

II. Amend mitigation measures in the Draft EIR to avoid significant impacts

As the mitigation measures in the Draft EIR acknowledges, industrial properties in the plan area have yet to be surveyed for eligibility as historic resources. While the proposed review process for industrial sites in mitigation measure CR3 is appropriate, we suggest that the Office of Historic Resources should concur with the recommendation of the qualified architectural historian and not merely accept the reports for documentation. In addition, the language in mitigation measure CR4 should be amended to include subsequent updates to SurveyLA, as additional resources may be identified in future surveys or research.

Response 5-3

The City has completed subsequent phases of the SurveyLA Historic Resources Survey Report: West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan Area that include analysis of industrial and manufacturing land uses. Therefore, Mitigation Measure **CR3** is no longer needed, and Mitigation Measure **CR4** has been renumbered and revised as follows:

CR34 ~~As a condition of approval for any~~ Before approval of a Discretionary Project or "Active Change Area Project", as defined in Section 3.4 of the Project Description, the City shall: involving properties identified in the SurveyLA Historic Resources Survey Report: "West Adams – Baldwin Hills - Leimert Community Plan Area" as eligible for listing, the City of Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources (OHR) shall find that the project is consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation or that upon further review or study, the property is not eligible for designation as a historic resource.

- ~~Identify potential impacts to historical resources. The project applicant shall review the SurveyLA Historic Resources Survey Report: West Adams Baldwin Hills Leimert Community Plan Area, dated August 2011 (and subsequent phases of the report that will evaluate industrial/manufacturing land uses), to determine whether the project site has been previously surveyed and whether historical resources were identified.~~
- ~~Ensure that designated historic buildings, are appropriately renovated and maintained, and that the preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction or adaptive reuse of a known historical resource shall meet the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Secretary's Standards). Any proposal to preserve, rehabilitate, restore, reconstruct, or adaptively reuse a known historical resource in accordance with the Secretary's Standards shall~~

~~be deemed to not be a significant impact under CEQA and, in such cases, no additional mitigation measures will be required if the project does not require discretionary action.~~

- ~~• Ensure that incentive areas where Floor Area Ratio (FAR) increases may be proposed are in compliance with the Secretary's Standards, and require that all projects within these areas that may potentially impact historic resources meet the Secretary's Standards. The project would also be subject to any other historic resources review process triggered by any other historic designation. This requirement would be reviewed for compliance by Office of Historic Resources staff.~~
- ~~• Require, where feasible, noise buffers/walls and/or visual buffers/landscaping or some other material to be constructed by the prime construction contractor to preserve the contextual setting of significant built resources.~~

Comment 5-4

III. Ensure the approach and policies toward historic and cultural resources are consistent among community plans.

The Conservancy previously recommended establishing a set of baseline policies toward historic and cultural resources in all community plans to ensure a consistent approach across plan areas. The West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Plan is a good model, and we urge that its goals, policies, and incentives be adopted for subsequent community plans. This is especially important for the areas immediately adjacent, as the Commercial Corridors CPIO applies to streets that extend beyond the plan's borders. Extending the provisions of this plan to similar portions of Robertson, Pico, Washington, Venice, Jefferson, and Adams boulevards outside of the plan area will ensure a seamless transition among plan areas and maintain a cohesive planning approach.

Response 5-4

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR. Instead, this comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 5-5

IV. Clarify CPIO definitions and applicability to historic resources

The seven CPIO District subareas and the Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan amendments include definitions for "Character Defining Elements," "Rehabilitation," and "Restoration." If these terms apply specifically to historic resources, we recommend that they align with the definitions associated with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* (the Standards) as found at the National Park Service website www.nps.gov/hps/tps/standguide. This, or the most recent print publication from the National Park Service, should be the reference document for the Standards in the Community Plan and in the CPIOs, as the Standards may be redefined from time to time. In addition, the definition for "Designated Historic Resource" should remove the clause "as of the (*the effective date of this ordinance*)," as new resources will be identified and designated beyond the effective date of the ordinance and should be subject to the same processes.

Response 5-5

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the Draft EIR. Instead, this comment is a request to revise the Proposed Project and does not relate to the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. While a response is not required, this comment has been addressed through updates to the

recommended CPIO and will be forwarded to decisions makers for their consideration when contemplating the adoption of the Proposed Project.

Comment 5-6

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR for the West Adams-Baldwin Hills Leimert New Community Plan. Please feel free to contact me at 213-430-4203 or afine@laconservancy.org should you have any questions.

Response 5-6

This comment contains a thank you and applicable contact information. No further response is required. This comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

LETTER 6: UNITED NEIGHBORHOODS OF THE HISTORIC ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, WEST ADAMS AND JEFFERSON PARK COMMUNITIES NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

Comment 6-1

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park New Community Plan, a revision and update of the existing Plan. This letter comprises several components.

First: this letter presents a list of issues, concerns and questions identified by the United Neighborhoods of the Historic Arlington Heights, West Adams and Jefferson Park Communities Neighborhood Council (UNNC). This list was voted upon and approved by the UNNC Governing Board at its regularly scheduled meeting on Thursday, November 1, 2012.

Second: this letter also presents detailed commentary prepared by Laura Meyers (UNNC Planning & Zoning Chair, title for information only), Norman Gilmore (UNNC Secretary, title for information only), and Jim Lancaster, a UNNC stakeholder. The UNNC Executive Committee has not yet had an opportunity to schedule a meeting to review and approve the detailed commentary below. It is possible that the UNNC Executive Committee may in the near future approve this letter in whole, in part or not at all; if it does act it will forward another letter to you confirming its actions.

Response 6-1

This comment contains introductory text and summarizes the intent of the comment letter. As this comment does not include specific comments directed at the Draft EIR, no response is required. Refer to responses provided below that address specific comments made in this letter.

Comment 6-2

UNNC ACTION

The following section comprises the voted upon and approved list of UNNC concerns, issues and questions:

UNNC has begun (but not completed) the process of evaluating the proposed New Plan and its associated Draft Environmental Impact Report. UNNC is concerned that the New Plan and DEIR are inconsistent with certain citywide policies already in place, among them:

- The mandate to “conserve” stable, character residential neighborhoods (Framework Element)
- The mandate to handle additional housing unit capacity primarily (or entirely) on the City’s commercial corridors and in its Regional Centers (Downtown, Hollywood, Century City, Warner Center)
- The concept of “Fair Share” for Affordable Housing to be spread among all 35 Community Plans and not concentrated in South Los Angeles

The implied requirement to align the actual, technical Plan with the policy statements.

Response 6-2

The Proposed Project is not inconsistent with Citywide policies referred to by the commenter. The Proposed Project strengthens consistency between zoning and land use, and generally maintains current zoning in residential areas while providing policies and implementation programs that would further conserve the character of stable residential neighborhoods. Additionally, the Proposed Project provides policies and implements programs that create increased housing capacity at nodes, and TOD areas, and does not mandate the provisions of affordable housing units in the West Adams CPA.

In particular, the Proposed Project does not generally include “up-zones” in stable residential neighborhoods that could adversely impact the character of residential neighborhoods, but rather carries forward zoning actions consistent with the CPC’s recommendation to approve the Proposed Project by initiating “down-zone” and General Plan amendment “down-plan” changes in several residential areas such as “West Jefferson Park”, and by proposing a Character Residential CPIO subarea designation for the Arlington Heights neighborhood.

Nomenclature and consistency changes to General Plan designations and zoning are also proposed for some residential neighborhoods. However, as explained on page 3-13 of the Draft EIR, nomenclature changes are changes in name only; densities, heights, and land uses will not change in these areas as a result of the Proposed Project. Other zone changes will simply create consistency between existing land uses and the General Plan.

Increased housing capacity resulting from adoption of the Proposed Project would occur exclusively within proposed CPIO District and the Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan Amendment areas, located along major commercial corridors and nodes and within a half mile radius of transit stations, consistent with City of Los Angeles General Plan policies, as well as SCAG policies. Adoption of the Proposed Project would not increase the housing capacity in excess of that provided through the current adopted 1998 Community Plan in areas outside of the Corridor, Node and TOD CPIO subareas and the Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan Amendment area, and will decrease capacity in several areas through adoption of the CPC Recommended Plan, as modified.

No housing projects are proposed as part of the Proposed Project, and the Proposed Project does not include any mandate to provide affordable housing in future development, although the provision of mixed-income housing is encouraged and incentives are provided for affordable housing near transit. Accordingly, adoption of the Proposed Project would not result in an unfair proportion of the City’s affordable housing within the West Adams CPA. Additionally, “fair share” of affordable housing is not a CEQA consideration.

Comment 6-3

So, UNNC has identified about a dozen broad questions and concerns (so far):

1). The Housing Capacity number (20,000 additional housing units) identified in the draft Plan does not appear realistic, appropriate or representing a fair share of the City’s total housing capacity mandate – without risking changing the character of our residential neighborhoods and going against goals stated in the Plan. (*By way of comparison, the Hollywood Community Plan adds 15,000 units; the combined Sylmar and Granada Hills Plans subtract 10,000 units.*)

2). How did the Plan authors get the number 20,000? Is this number based on the use of transit and/or affordable housing density bonuses?

Response 6-3

Because the Proposed Project does not generally recommend increased development capacity changes for residential areas, the Proposed Project’s housing capacity of 86,118 dwelling units can be characterized as maintaining the existing Community Plan (Current Plan) housing character of its residential neighborhoods. Additional capacity above the Current Plan’s projected 76,478 dwelling units is associated with implementation of City policies which call for new growth to be directed towards regional and commercial centers, along major corridors, and in proximity to transit, as recommended through the Proposed Project. Referring to Master Baseline Response 1, FEIR Section 3.1 General Topics and FEIR Appendix M Methodology, the Proposed Project’s statement of potential future population and housing capacity is consistent with SCAG’s 2030 population and housing projections in that it accommodates the SCAG projections for the City, as adjusted by the DCP for each CPA and Planning Subregion. The Proposed

Project's housing capacity is intended to appropriately reflect the potential growth in housing that may be anticipated through implementation of the Community Plan's goals and policies, including targeting growth at the ten light rail transit stations that will serve the CPA in the near future and addressing existing City policies that call for increasing capacity around transit in order to move the City toward achieving its goals of reducing greenhouse gases citywide, as mandated by State law.

Under the Proposed Project, growth occurring in the West Adams CPA would account for approximately eight percent and 11 percent of projected Citywide housing and population growth, respectively, between 2008 and 2030. Although growth projected and planned for in the West Adams CPA is greater than the amount of the growth that is expected in some of the other CPAs during that time period, in consideration of the transit rich nature of the CPA, DCP finds this consistent with the Framework Element and the City's growth policies.

The majority of the proposed 4,811 dwelling unit increase in housing capacity under the Proposed Project compared to the existing Community Plan would occur within the proposed CPIO subareas and the Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan Amendment areas located along major commercial corridors and nodes and within a half mile radius of transit stations where Active Changes are proposed. Accordingly, the character of residential neighborhoods would not be influenced by the proposed increase in housing capacity of the Proposed Project, but rather could occur as a result of current zoning that has been in place at least since the adoption of the 1998 Community Plan. With the residential General Plan amendment, zone and height district changes approved through the CPC's February 11, 2016 action, the population would be reduced an additional 1,861 dwelling units and 4,729 people upon adoption of the Proposed Project in a manner that addresses the issues raised through this comment.

Comment 6-4

3). If there are these increases (perhaps dramatic housing unit capacity increases) why are there not some corresponding decreases in zoning designations within character residential neighborhoods?

Response 6-4

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. As such, no response is required and this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration. Referring to Final EIR Section 3.3 Changes to the Proposed Project, consideration should acknowledge that with the City Planning Commission's (CPC) Motion recommending approval of the Proposed Project, several residential neighborhoods include "down-zone" and General Plan amendment "down-plan" changes that generally reduce height, development density and intensity at several commercial nodes and within low medium residential areas, or create further consistency by zoning, General Plan land use designation and existing use of property. Should the City Council adopt the CPC recommended changes, the Proposed Project's capacity would be reduced to 84,257 dwelling units and a population of 214,012.

Comment 6-5

4). What is the reasoning behind the transit-oriented "nodes" along Arlington Avenue? (*UNNC previously raised an objection to this, at a scoping meeting.*)

Response 6-5

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR. Instead, this comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. As such, no response is required and this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration. Consideration should acknowledge that with the City Planning

Commission's Motion recommending approval of the Proposed Project, the Node at Arlington Ave. was reduced to include only parcels at the Southwest corner of the intersection with Washington Blvd.

Comment 6-6

5). Historic Preservation issues:

- * Arlington Heights HPOZ recommendation in the Survey L.A. appendix
- * Why is Survey L.A. an appendix? There are other issues related to this.

Response 6-6

The Proposed Project recommends that the City consider the Arlington Heights neighborhood for future designation as a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ). In addition, in response to community input, the findings of the SurveyLA Historic Resources Survey Report for the West Adams CPA (SurveyLA Report) (Draft EIR Appendix D) has been revised to identify the Arlington Heights neighborhood as eligible for designation as a HPOZ. The revised findings of the SurveyLA Report with regard to the Arlington Heights neighborhoods is included within FEIR Section 3.3, Changes to the Proposed Project. The complete revised SurveyLA Report can be found on the City's SurveyLA website.⁴ Furthermore, in accordance with Council Motion (CF:15-0071), initiated by Council District 10, a Character Residential CPIO Subarea designation for the Arlington Heights neighborhood was recommended for approval by the CPC on February 11, 2016 (Refer to FEIR Appendix H).

SurveyLA is a technical report and is not written or analyzed in a manner consistent with the CEQA guidelines. However, the SurveyLA Historic Resources Survey Report for the West Adams CPA was used in the preparation of the Cultural Resources section and included as an appendix. Refer to Response 15-4 below regarding SurveyLA's and the Proposed Plan's treatment of the historic resources and more specifically, the Arlington Heights neighborhood.

Comment 6-7

6). Parks – there are currently 414 acres of parks and open space, but of that 285 acres (70%) is Kenneth Hahn Park in the Baldwin Hills. There are 11 pocket parks, 2 neighborhood parks and 5 community parks in the entire Community Plan area.

- * The Plan does not seem to identify any other potential parks, and the Draft EIR does not address this lack of parks and recreational opportunities by offering any mitigations.

Response 6-7

Refer to Master Response 5 regarding the significant and unavoidable impacts related to parks and open space identified in the Draft EIR and the absence of mitigation measures.

Comment 6-8

7). Pedestrian/Walkability – the Mobility section (section 4) skipped Jefferson, Washington and Pico boulevards.

Response 6-8

This comment relates to the policy approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. As such, no response is required. However, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

⁴[http://www.preservation.lacity.org/survey-la-field-survey-findings-and-reports#West Adams - Baldwin Hills – Leimert.](http://www.preservation.lacity.org/survey-la-field-survey-findings-and-reports#West%20Adams%20-%20Baldwin%20Hills%20-%20Leimert)

Comment 6-9

8). Bicycle Policy – How is the Community Plan going to implement citywide bicycle policies?

Response 6-9

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. As such, no response is required and this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 6-10

9). Washington Boulevard Specific Plan: UNNC voted (2004-2005) to propose the adoption of a Specific Plan for Washington Boulevard, from Normandie to Crenshaw. Although staff assured us over the years that its “elements” would be a part of the Community Plan revisions, that does not appear to entirely be the case. *(At the November 1 meeting, the UNNC Governing Board ratified its previous support for a Specific Plan on Washington Boulevard, as previously written and approved.)*

Response 6-10

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. As such, no response is required and this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Consideration should acknowledge that Washington Boulevard is identified as a Key Neighborhood District within the policy document of the Proposed Project, page 3-53, and the preferred future of the neighborhood is described. On this same page, the Community Plan text states that the entire Washington Boulevard corridor spanning from Normandie to Fairfax Avenues should be considered for future establishment as a Specific Plan. Although a Specific Plan is not currently being proposed, DCP referenced the two draft Specific Plans developed by the United Neighborhoods and Mid-City Neighborhood Councils for Washington Boulevard when drafting the Commercial Corridors and Major Nodes CPIO Subarea regulations, as well as their design guidelines for Washington Boulevard.

Comment 6-11

10). Libraries – How was the number of people served evaluated?

Response 6-11

The public library service information was provided by the Los Angeles Public Library (LAPL), Library Facilities Division, as cited in Draft EIR Table 4.14-15. Please contact the LAPL for further information on their process to determine the population served.

Comment 6-12

11) We would like a clarification of the word “projected” versus the word “potential.”

Response 6-12

“Projected” may be defined as a forecast of future conditions (population, dwelling units, employment, etc.) based primarily on the trajectory of present trends and indicators, while “potential” may be defined as having or showing the “capacity” to develop into something in the future given a finite set of factors (acreage, development intensity FAR, height, etc.). The term “projected” is most typically used in this document when referring to future conditions in the context of SCAG forecasts, while the term “potential” is typically used

when referring to development capacity based on factors applied to the various land use designations of the Proposed Project. See FEIR Appendix M Methodology for additional discussion.

Comment 6-13

DEIR EVALUATION/COMMENTS

Land Use

1). It appears as if the residential neighborhoods in the northeast section of the New West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park Community Plan (UNNC's area, which includes Arlington Heights and Jefferson Park) have been barely evaluated. For a once-in-a-quarter-century Community Plan revision, there ought to have been more than a "windshield survey" of only "targeted change areas." How did staff determine what would be targeted change areas without first conducting a full-fledged survey of the entire Plan area? It is perhaps due to the failure to conduct a full survey that flaws have emerged.

For example, the pocket neighborhood best described today as "West Jefferson Park" (generally bounded by Mont Clair, Edgell, Jefferson and Crenshaw) is comprised primarily of small, one-story single-family Spanish and Classical bungalows (in form), and SFR and duplex (in use) units, with some two-story Spanish/Mediterranean duplex and fourplex buildings (all on single lots) on a few of the blocks. It has a later period of significance than the adjacent Jefferson Park HPOZ, but it appears historically intact. It is obvious from one quick drive through this neighborhood that the zoning should be R2 if there would be any slight effort at all to "conserve" a stable residential enclave. But staff did not even conduct a windshield survey here. It is clear that any "RD" intrusion of new construction of a multi-family building spanning multiple combined lots would completely change the character of this neighborhood.

Response 6-13

Targeted change areas, known as Active Change areas in the Draft EIR, would occur entirely within the proposed CPIO Subareas and the Crenshaw Specific Plan Amendment areas, identified in Draft EIR Figure 2-5. These areas are concentrated along major commercial corridors and intersection nodes, and around transit stations where future growth may be accommodated in a manner that improves economic vitality as well as physical conditions, consistent with the policies of the General Plan Framework and the vision of the Proposed Project. With the CPC's recommendation of the Proposed Project, Active Changes would take place in several residential neighborhoods such as "West" Jefferson Park. Furthermore, the Proposed Project would implement nomenclature and consistency changes to zoning and/or General Plan designations in certain areas, identified in Draft EIR Figure 3-5. As explained on Draft EIR page 3-13, nomenclature changes are changes in name only; permitted densities, heights, and land uses would not change. Other zone changes include clarification of the reduced development intensity (FAR) applied to properties zoned R1-1 (Single-Family Residential) pursuant to the adopted Baseline Mansionization Ordinance and zone changes that simply create consistency between existing use of the land and the General Plan. All land use changes were carefully identified based on extensive surveying of the CPA by DCP staff, utilizing previous City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles and SCAG regional planning documents as well as zoning information resources, and field reconnaissance where appropriate.

Proposed Project goals and objectives as further detailed through policy document goals LU2 and LU8 aim to preserve, conserve, and enhance the varied and distinct residential character, scale and integrity of existing single-family and multi-family neighborhoods, respectively. Implementation of Proposed Project plan text polices LU2-1 through LU2-5, LU7-3, and LU8-1 through LU8-4 would achieve these goals. The Proposed Project policy document also establishes design guidelines for both single-family and multi-family residential development. The single-family design guidelines are intended to promote retention and enhancement of the unique character of single-family neighborhoods in the CPA.

As “up-zone” or General Plan amendment “up-plan” Active Changes are generally not proposed for single-family and low-intensity neighborhoods, such as the neighborhood referred to by the commenter, and the Proposed Project instead includes down-zone, General Plan amendment “down-plan” and numerous regulatory standards, goals and policies aimed at preserving, conserving and enhancing residential neighborhoods, the Draft EIR determined that implementation of the Proposed Project would not drastically change the existing visual character of areas outside of the CPIO Subareas and Crenshaw Specific Plan Amendment areas. Other comments are aimed at the scope of the Project Description which will be forwarded to decision makers for consideration.

Comment 6-14

2). In accordance with local and state CEQA Guidelines, the New West Adams Community Plan would have a significant impact relative to land use if it was: A). In conflict with any applicable land use plan, [or] policy; or B). If the Plan is inconsistent with policies contained in other applicable plans. Although the DEIR authors state that there are no significant conflicts or impacts that require mitigation, we disagree.

Two primary land use policies adopted in the City of Los Angeles are not fully implemented in this Community Plan revision. The General Plan Framework, adopted in 1996, establishes as policy (3.3.1) citywide that “existing stable residential neighborhoods” (described elsewhere in the Framework as “stable character neighborhoods”) shall be conserved. The Housing Element, adopted in 2009, specifically adopted a policy that all new housing capacity (in the current RHNA cycle) in the City be directed to the commercial corridors, citywide. Although that may not be possible through the year 2030, that directive has not even been addressed in this Community Plan revision.

Yes, the new CPIOs provide standards for residential mixed-use development on the commercial corridors, but there is no evaluation of the number of increased housing units capacity that this will result in, no requirement that that is where new housing development shall be located, and no further calculation of the impact of potential density bonuses (transit and/or affordable housing bonuses) on that capacity number. To be clear, 100% of all housing developments on the City’s commercial corridors are eligible for a 20% density bonus based on proximity to transit (busses and trains). In the West Adams District of this Community Plan (northeast section of the Plan), all recent housing development proposals on the corridors have included affordable housing components (affordable housing may qualify a project for a 35% bonus, depending upon the scope of the project.) What are the housing unit numbers that may result from these activities (e.g., how many acres are now devoted to the CPIO areas and how many units are calculated for the new housing capacity?)

In any case, there is no effort within the draft Plan to transfer any of the zoning density (housing capacity) away from stable, character residential neighborhoods – notably such as Arlington Heights and/or West Jefferson Park – and onto those commercial corridors. The policy of conserving stable, character neighborhoods requires a disincentive to development. Therefore the Plan is inconsistent with these land use policies.

Response 6-14

Referring to Responses 6-3 through 6-6 above, the adoption of the Proposed Project would not conflict or be inconsistent with policies of the City’s General Plan Framework and Housing Element. As elaborated on in Response 6-3, the majority of the proposed 4,811 dwelling unit increase (see Draft EIR Table 3-1) in housing capacity (as compared to the existing Community Plan capacity) would occur within the proposed CPIO Subareas and the Crenshaw Specific Plan Amendment areas, located along major commercial corridors and nodes and within a half mile radius of transit stations where Active Changes are proposed. As detailed in Response 6-13, the Proposed Project does not propose “up-zone” Active Changes in stable residential neighborhoods and includes goals, policies, and design standards that serve to preserve, conserve, and

enhance residential neighborhoods. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not inconsistent with the land use policies referenced by the commenter.

Comment 6-15

3). Please review page 4.10-22: The chart on this page purports to evaluate and compare the CPIO for the Corridors to land use consistency – But the design standards had not been revealed/released prior to the DEIR comment deadline, so how could the comparison be made either by the DEIR authors or by commentators such as ourselves?

Response 6-15

The Draft EIR incorporates a detailed Project Description and Project Summary disclosing all aspects of the Proposed Project required by CEQA towards establishing the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Furthermore, Table 4.10-5 located on page 4.10-22 of the DEIR, includes a detailed summary of the land use development regulations of the proposed CPIO subareas.

Comment 6-16

4). It appears that the DEIR authors have been less than careful in their descriptions. Example: page 4.10-26 - - The Community Plan is to be compatible with a variety of land use policies and elements, including the General Plan Framework Element, which states that the City Policy is to “conserve stable” and “character” neighborhoods, not zoning. There is no policy to, quote, “maintain the existing character of these land uses.” We were also unaware that any Community Plan revision goal would be to NOT make changes and revisions. In contrast, one would think this is the once-in-25-years opportunity to make dramatic changes if that would benefit the community while upholding citywide policies.

On the same page, the DEIR authors reference a “Table 3-5,” which does not exist (most likely they meant to direct readers to Table 3-4, which compares existing and proposed land uses.)

Response 6-16

As described through FEIR Section 3.3 Changes to the Proposed Project, numerous “down-zone” and General Plan amendment “down-plan” changes were made to the Proposed Project as a result of the CPC’s February 11, 2016 action. Furthermore, the statement the commenter may be referring to relates to proposed nomenclature and consistency changes to zoning and/or General Plan designations in certain areas. Certain zone changes have been proposed to create consistency between existing as-built conditions and the General Plan Framework land use designations. In some instances proposed zone changes will serve to protect areas by bringing zoning and land use into consistency with as-built conditions. Refer to Response 5-2 for a more detailed discussion regarding the Proposed Project’s approach to “conservation of character neighborhoods”.

The commenter is correct that the reference to Draft EIR Table 3-5 on page 4.10-26 is incorrect. This correction has been made and is shown below and in Final EIR Chapter 3 Corrections and Additions.

Draft EIR page 4.10-26, third paragraph, first sentence:

Table 3-~~5~~4 in Chapter 3.0 Project Description, illustrates the change in acreages between the surveyed/existing conditions and the proposed West Adams New Community Plan by land use designation.

Comment 6-17

5). There are no actual specific calculations related to land use and housing capacity in the Land Use Chapter. The New West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park Community Plan converts “X” number of acres from Q-CM (the Q Qualified Condition currently in place forbids residential uses) to C1-CPIO zones that encourage mixed use residential/commercial. How many acres does this comprise? How many units then can one calculate for the housing unit capacity figures in the year 2030?

The Chapter does include tables showing percentages of single family and duplex uses within Low Medium I areas (73% of the total acres designated LM1) and Low Medium II areas (64% of the LM2 total acres), but does not convert these figures into housing capacity units. One edict is that a Community Plan not reduce population/housing unit capacity when some subareas are down-zoned but others are up-zoned. How would we or anyone else calculate this if the underlying mathematics is not documented?

It also would seem that if two-thirds (64%) of the Low Medium II acres are in fact populated by single family homes and duplexes, then the zoning is too dense for the present condition in those (unidentified) pocket neighborhoods. Staff should re-examine all of these neighborhoods and consider a GP to reduce pocket neighborhoods, as appropriate, to Low Medium I and the equivalent zone of R2. We have already identified West Jefferson Park as one of those neighborhoods to target for a GP and down-zoning.

Response 6-17

Refer to Draft EIR Section 4.13 Population, Housing, and Employment for a discussion of the proposed increase in housing, population, and employment capacity in the West Adams CPA. As shown in Draft EIR Table 4.13-8, under the Proposed Project, the West Adams CPA would have the capacity for approximately 86,118 dwelling units and 218,741 residents, accommodating an additional 19,703 housing units and 36,141 residents over existing 2008 conditions. 14,892 of the 19,703 housing units and 18,381 of the 36,141 residents are accommodated through the distribution of land uses adopted through the existing Community Plan. The remaining 4,811 dwelling units and 17,760 residents are accommodated through the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project’s increase in housing capacity and population capacity reflects a reasonable approximation based on a theoretical mid-point buildout of the Proposed Project’s land use densities. Because market factors dictate the level of development that occurs and experience shows that only a percentage of the properties within a CPA will be redeveloped within the horizon year period, even then, the sites that do redevelop are not always developed to maximum levels allowed by the zoning. The Proposed Project utilizes a mid-point build-out in accommodating an adjusted SCAG 2030 housing and population projection for the West Adams CPA (see FEIR Appendix M, Methodology) that is consistent with the City’s long range General Plan Framework goal to target density near transit and with the City’s reasonable expectations based on historical development in the City. The additional housing capacity created by the Proposed Project would be concentrated within the proposed CPIO Subareas and the Crenshaw Specific Plan Amendment areas, located primarily at commercial and hybrid industrial planned major intersection nodes and within a half mile radius of transit stations where Active Change are proposed, consistent with DCP’s policy objectives. Furthermore, as described through FEIR Section 3.3 Changes to the Proposed Project, numerous “down-zone” and General Plan amendment “down-plan” changes were made to the Proposed Project as a result of the CPC motion recommending approval. The policy document of the Proposed Project also contains several future implementation programs to analyze targeted residential neighborhoods for conservation measures.

Comment 6-18

6). In this same regard, the TOD proposed for Crenshaw and Jefferson/Exposition would potentially have severe negative impacts to the low-density adjacent neighborhoods (referring here to the current built form and current uses, not the proposed zoning) if it is not carefully managed and limited to the commercial corridors. If it is not limited, then high-density, transit-oriented housing will have a significant impact on the

adjacent “conservation” neighborhoods that should be protected under policies already adopted in the General Plan Framework.

Response 6-18

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR. As detailed in Response 6-13, the Proposed Project does not propose “up-zone” Active Changes in stable residential neighborhoods and includes goals, policies, and design standards that serve to preserve, conserve, and enhance residential neighborhoods. The potential for new development from the Proposed Project is limited to Active Change areas within the commercial and industrial corridor, node and TOD subareas of the Proposed CPIO District and the amended Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan. Active change areas located adjacent to residential neighborhoods were analyzed throughout the Draft EIR, especially in Sections 4.1, Aesthetics (page 4.1-30 and 31), and Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning (page 4.10-21 through 32). The Draft EIR determined that residential neighborhoods would not be negatively impacted as a result of the Proposed Project. To ensure that land use, height and density conflicts do not occur between future development in Active Change areas and adjacent residential uses (i.e. the “conservation” neighborhoods), the CPIO and Specific Plan Amendment ordinances include development standards that require transitional elements to be incorporated into building design and the Draft EIR identifies Mitigation Measure **AE1**. Adherence to proposed policies, design guidelines and development standards coupled with implementation of Mitigation Measure **AE1** when applicable would prevent conflict between existing and proposed uses and protect residential neighborhoods.

Comment 6-19

7). The Crenshaw Vision Plan was adopted by the City Council in 2009. It is not referenced at all in the DEIR as a land use policy, but of course it is one. (It had previously been adopted by the Community Redevelopment Agency Board.)

Response 6-19

The commenter is referring to the Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles’s Mid-City Corridors Vision and Implementation Plan. Many elements of this plan were incorporated into both the Proposed Project through the amended Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan. This comment relates to the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. As such, no response is required. However, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 6-20

Housing and Population

There are many inconsistencies in the numbers, and, in particular, they are not internally consistent. Moreover, the utilization of out-dated data appears to have led to faulty conclusions.

1). The DEIR presents a population increase of 19.7% from 2008 to 2030 (from 182,600 to 218,741, an increase of 36,141 individuals), purportedly based on SCAG projections. (More on this below.) It presents an average household size within the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park Community Plan boundaries of 2.92 (compared with a similar 2.83 citywide). But the DEIR and the New Community Plan assigns a unit increase (capacity) of 20,000 units, a 29% increase in the capacity within the New West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park Community Plan. That would yield, based on the population figures, an average household size in the new units of 1.8 individuals.

If we were to accept the projected population numbers as accurate, then the related increase of housing unit capacity would be 12,338, unless projected household size is also adjusted (which would seem inappropriate).

Response 6-20

As discussed on Draft EIR page 3-1, Master Baseline Response 1 and Appendix M Methodology, the State of California requires that cities plan for changes in population, housing demand and employment. If growth is anticipated, each City must accommodate a share of the region's projected growth. The SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which contemplates regional growth based on an analysis of past and future regional trends, is the basis of SCAG's projections of growth for the region and each City in the region, including Los Angeles.

To implement the policies of the City of Los Angeles' Framework Element, other City policies, and SCAG policies, all of which call for new growth to be directed towards regional and commercial centers, along major corridors, and in close proximity to transit, DCP adjusted the SCAG projections for each of the City of Los Angeles' CPAs, while retaining the total amount of growth projected for the City as a whole. Given the West Adams CPA's relatively central location in the City and proximity to five constructed and five planned transit stations, DCP adjusted SCAG housing and population projections for the West Adams CPA in order to reflect potential growth.

SCAG projected through its 2004 RTP that the population and housing in the West Adams CPA could grow to 201,220 residents and 79,074 dwelling units in 2030, assuming an average household size of 2.54 persons per household (pph). In accommodating the SCAG projection, DCP analyzed a Proposed Project population and housing capacity of 218,741 residents and 86,118 dwelling units for 2030.

Housing capacity of the West Adams CPA would be increased through a series of General Plan amendments and zone changes proposed within Active Change areas. Population capacity is directly correlated to housing capacity. As discussed above, the proposed housing capacity and average persons per household size of 2.54 pph is based from SCAG's 2004 RTP and is consistent with both SCAG 2030 projections and DCP's adjusted SCAG 2030 projections for the West Adams CPA. The average household size of 2.92 pph in the West Adams CPA, identified in Draft EIR Tables 4.13-2 and 4.13-3, reflects existing (2008) conditions and is not the factor used to calculate future housing units.

Comment 6-21

2). Apparently the City Planning Department opted to utilize Year 2000 Census figures (based on footnotes throughout the DEIR), rather than the Year 2010 Census figures, which have been available for quite some time. The problem is that the previous SCAG figures were based upon a regional (six-county) 2030 population projection that proved to be inaccurate when the Census figures were calculated. The actual six-county figure in 2010 was one million below previous projections, according to the former deputy director of SCAG. If Southern California wound up with one million fewer people than previously expected/projected, then the numbers we are looking at in this DEIR are also out of date and the projection of 218,741 becomes a much higher percentage increase.

Response 6-21

Since the NOP was published in 2008, the existing population and housing conditions described in the Draft EIR reflect 2008 conditions and not 2010 Census conditions. The Draft EIR, published in 2012, acknowledges on page 4.13-6 the release of the 2010 Census population statistics prior to the completion and release of the Draft EIR, but clarifies that the baseline year is 2008, consistent with the date of the NOP which the DCP as the Lead Agency has determined remains an appropriate baseline estimate (see Master

Baseline Response 1 and Final EIR Section 3.2 regarding supplemental 2010 analysis for Draft EIR Section 4.13).

The capacity of the Proposed Project is based on assumptions about the level of development that can reasonably be expected to occur during the life of the plan, given the NCP's land use designations and policies. Past building data demonstrates that not all sites will be built to the maximum densities permitted by the Proposed Project for a variety of reasons including economic conditions, market trends, financial lending practices, construction and land acquisition costs, physical site constraints and other General Plan policies or regulations (see FEIR Appendix M Methodology). Therefore, if population growth does not occur at the projected levels, reducing anticipated demand for housing, new housing will not be developed, and proposed housing capacity will not be reached. The provision of increased housing and population capacity under the Proposed Project does not explicitly mean that the area must be built out to those levels if demand is not there. It is simply a disclosure of potential development levels based on land uses under the Proposed Project. Additionally, regardless of existing population in the CPA, reasonably expected capacity under the Proposed Project would not change. Therefore, the finding of the Draft EIR that impacts related to population and housing would be less than significant would remain applicable because the determination of significance of impacts is based primarily on the end-state condition, or in this case, whether future conditions under the Proposed Project's 2030 capacity would exceed established thresholds of significance.

Comment 6-22

3). In addition, the DEIR makes it clear that SCAG's actual projection for the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan area was 201,220. It is permissible for the City Planning Department to determine that with the addition of TOD areas that it makes sense to adjust population estimates upward. But can the several TODs actually absorb 17,521 people? Have calculations been done that would indicate that the TODs alone would absorb circa 5,800 units? This seems to be an inordinately high number adjusted upwards just to account for the light rail (Expo and Crenshaw) TODs. Have these calculations actually been completed?

Response 6-22

Referring to Master Response 1 and FEIR Appendix M Methodology, in order to implement the policies of the Framework Element, other City policies, and SCAG RTP/SCS policies, all of which call for new growth to be directed towards regional and commercial centers, along major corridors, and in close proximity to transit, DCP adjusted the SCAG projections for each of the CPAs, while accommodating the total amount of growth projected for the City as a whole. Given the West Adams CPA's relatively central location in the City and proximity to five constructed and five planned transit stations, the Draft EIR for the Proposed Project analyzed a capacity that accommodates the adjusted SCAG housing and population projections for the West Adams CPA and adequately captures potential additional growth.

SCAG projected through its 2004 RTP that the population of the West Adams CPA will grow to 201,220 residents in 2030 creating demand for an estimated 79,074 dwelling units. The DCP accommodated this projection based primarily on the transit-oriented land use recommendations of the Proposed Project to reflect a proposed population and housing capacity for the West Adams CPA of 218,741 residents and 86,118 dwelling units in 2030.

The West Adams CPA is not currently built-out to capacity under the existing Community Plan. Capacity under the existing 1998 West Adams Community Plan is currently estimated to be 81,307 dwelling units. In 2008, there were an estimated 66,415 dwelling units. Accordingly, the West Adams CPA currently has capacity for an additional 14,892 dwelling units. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be increasing the housing capacity of the West Adams CPA by 4,811 dwelling units from 81,307 to 86,118. The additional housing capacity created by the Proposed Project, through a series of land use changes, would be concentrated in TOD areas, at nodes, within the Regional Center, and portions of the Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan area, where Active Changes are proposed. From a long-range planning perspective, the

capacity changes are consistent with DCP's policy objectives, including targeting growth at the ten light rail transit stations that will serve the West Adams CPA in the near future. Existing City policies also call for the need to implement land use policies that move the City toward achieving its goals of reducing greenhouse gases Citywide, as mandated by State law, and increasing capacity around transit will assist in achieving such goals.

Comment 6-23

4). Per above, if the SCAG calculations were adjusted downward to reflect the actual Year 2010 Census, then it is completely inappropriate to dismiss those projections, as the City appears to have done. We cannot tell from this document where/how the various numbers were derived.

Response 6-23

Refer to Master Response 1, FEIR Appendix M Methodology, and FEIR Section 3.2 regarding supplemental 2010 analysis for Draft EIR Section 4.13. The Draft EIR utilized a Base Year population and housing estimate that was 4 percent greater than the Census 2010 data and greater than SCAG's citywide projection from the 2004 RTP assigned to each CPA. Since the NOP was published in 2008, the existing population and housing conditions described in the Draft EIR reflect 2008 conditions and not 2010 Census conditions. The Draft EIR, published in 2012, acknowledges on page 4.13-6 the release of the 2010 Census population statistics prior to the completion and release of the Draft EIR, but clarifies that the Base Year for the Proposed Project is 2008. According to the 2010 Census there were 175,057 persons living in the West Adams CPA in 2010. The Base Year 2008 estimate was 182,600 and is used since it was the data available at the time of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Proposed Project, and the DCP as the Lead Agency has determined that its use does not change the analysis in this section.

Comment 6-24

5). In any case, the total housing unit capacity increase citywide is projected (from which Census?) at circa 250,000 units for the year 2030. The Department has assigned 20,000 of those units to the New West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park Community Plan area, and an additional 40,000 units to the adjacent New South Los Angeles Community Plan area --- 60,000 total -- while subtracting 10,000 units (at this writing) from Granada Hills and Sylmar. So the 60,000 units figure represents approximately a quarter of the total units citywide. Really? What happened to "fair share" of affordable housing (Housing Element policy) and the concentration of new housing in Regional Centers (Housing Element and Framework policies)? The DEIR does not identify this as a significant impact and proposes no mitigations.

Response 6-24

The Draft EIR concluded that in maintaining land use densities associated with the preservation of the CPA's existing stock of rent stabilized (RSO) housing, incentivizing growth near transit, the Proposed Project would not conflict with applicable City Housing Element and General Plan Framework policies such as those referred to by the commenter, and would therefore result in a less-than-significant impact related to land use plans and policies. No mitigation was identified in the Draft EIR or is required. To further support the Draft EIR's findings the following explanation has been provided.

Referring to FEIR Appendix M, Methodology, population and housing projections referred to in the Draft EIR were taken from SCAG's 2004 RTP and adjusted by the DCP for each of the City of Los Angeles' CPAs. Adjustments to SCAG's projections were made in order to implement the policies of the Framework Element, other City policies, and SCAG policies, all of which call for new growth to be directed towards regional and commercial centers, along major corridors, and in proximity to transit. Given the West Adams CPA's relatively central location in the City and proximity to 10 light rail transit stations, the Proposed

Project, in accommodating SCAG's housing and population projections analyzes a dwelling unit and housing capacity for the West Adams CPA that reflects potential growth at specified locations.

As elaborated on in Response 6-3, the majority of the proposed increase in housing capacity would occur within the proposed CPIO subareas and the Crenshaw Specific Plan Amendment areas, located at commercial nodes and within a half mile radius of transit stations where Active Changes are proposed, consistent with City policies calling for housing to be concentrated in community and regional centers. For instance, 13 percent or 2,549 of the Proposed Project's overall 19,704 dwelling unit capacity is identified for the Regional Center which includes the Baldwin Hills-Crenshaw Plaza and the Santa Barbara Plaza sites.

Assuming that growth occurs as projected by the DCP, the West Adams CPA would account for roughly five percent of the City's projected housing inventory and population in 2030, roughly consistent with both 2008 and 2010 conditions. Although growth projected and planned for in the West Adams CPA is greater than the amount of growth that would be experienced by other CPAs between 2008 and 2030, in consideration of the transit rich nature of the West Adams CPA, this is consistent with the City's growth policies. Accordingly, implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in an increased concentration of citywide population and housing compared to existing conditions, and the West Adams CPA would not assume an unfair percentage of projected growth. In addition, it is important to note that the broader South Los Angeles region already contains 20 percent of the City's population. Along with the transit rich nature of this geography, the accommodation of a quarter of the City's population in this broader region is appropriate and consistent with citywide policies and current conditions.

While the Proposed Project includes policies that encourage the provision of the affordable housing and incentivizes the inclusion of affordable housing in new development occurring within the TOD CPIO subareas through an affordable housing density bonus available Citywide, the Proposed Project does not include a mandate that a certain amount of housing must be affordable. As such, it is not appropriate to conclude that the West Adams CPA would assume an unfair proportion of affordable housing relative to the rest of the City.

Comment 6-25

6). This placement of units is also in direct contravention to the City's Cultural Heritage and Historic Preservation policies, given that the majority of the new units appear to be concentrated within neighborhoods and districts in these two Community Plan areas that are also identified as historic and/or character/special planning areas. You cannot prepare a Community Plan that governs zoning for the next 25 years that guarantees ongoing neighborhood disputes over proposed new housing projects plunked into the middle of both designated historical districts and stable/character residential neighborhoods that are to be conserved. Even with tools (not currently identified) and the transfer of density to corridors (not currently implemented in the New West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park Community Plan), these two Community Plan areas will not be able to absorb 25% of the City's population and housing capacity increase – and should not have to. The DEIR does not identify this as a significant impact and proposes no mitigations.

The addition of housing units capacity also appears to be unfairly not applied to Granada Hills and Sylmar. Even though these two communities are more rural, perhaps, there are commercial corridors within both of these Community Plan areas that should be targeted for housing and/or mixed use development. No part of the city should be dismissed from the "fair share" of affordable housing (no matter how politically unpalatable the concept may be). It is simply offensive to relegate the plurality of new housing – and by inference, the majority of affordable housing – to the South Los Angeles region. Beyond the distaste of the idea, the practical reality is that this would not help create the economic engine that could finally result in the reduction of blight along the commercial corridors in the region (businesses do not invest in communities with low-low average income, and with the demise of the Community Redevelopment Agency the likelihood of such investment is greatly diminished.) This region needs a mixed of market-rate and affordable housing, and the conservation of its beautiful and distinctive residential neighborhoods, in order to attract long-term

business/economic investment. There is no such discussion in the DEIR, and no solutions (mitigations) proposed.

Response 6-25

The Draft EIR analyzes the impacts of adopting and implementing the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project includes goals, policies, and design guidelines, amendments to General Plan designations and zoning, the establishment of a CPIO district, and subareas, as well as other implementing ordinances. The Proposed Project aims to accommodate the housing and employment needs of the community, while also preserving and conserving residential neighborhoods and historic resources.

The majority of new units would not be concentrated within neighborhoods and districts that are also identified as historic and/or character/special planning areas. The additional housing capacity created by the Proposed Project, through a series of land use changes, would occur within Active Change areas shown in Draft EIR Figure 3-5 and will be accommodated primarily in TOD areas, major corridors, at nodes, and within portions of the Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan area. Additionally, several “character” residential neighborhoods throughout the CPA, and in particular those within the northeastern portion of the CPA will undergo “down-zone” and General Plan amendment “down-plan” changes. Finally, refer to Response 6-24 above with regard to a fair share of affordable housing. The distribution of housing in Granada Hills and Sylmar is outside the purview of the Proposed Project and therefore, was not addressed in the Draft EIR.

Comment 6-26

7). The numbers (again) are inconsistent. On page 2-2, the DEIR indicates that the housing unit capacity increase is actually from 81,307 to 86,118 – 4,800 units. That appears to be a more feasible number that would allow the transfer of density from certain stable, character neighborhoods that should be conserved to the commercial corridors generally and the TODs specifically.

Response 6-26

The increase of housing units on Draft EIR page 2-2 refers to the proposed increase in housing units capacity under the Proposed Project compared to the existing Community Plan. These numbers are consistent throughout the Draft EIR. To address the commenter’s statement further, referring back to Response 6-4, should the City Council adopt the residential land use and zone changes recommended in accordance with the CPC’s February 2016 action, the overall capacity of the Proposed Project would be decreased by 1,861 dwelling units to 84,257 and 4,729 persons to a 214,012 population.

Comment 6-27

8). Earlier this year, UNNC had temporary access to the ESRI Community Analyst product, which easily enables the mapping of arbitrary geographic areas and the retrieval of extensive statistics about those areas, including US Census and housing data. (Sample reports generated for UNNC boundaries are attached by way of example). The city should use these accessible commercial sources of data like ESRI Community Analyst to cross-check data from other sources and to rapidly acquire updated and more accurate population and housing data.

Response 6-27

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR. Instead, this comment is directed to the DCP and not towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR, therefore, a response is not required. However, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 6-28

Public Services: Libraries, Parks and Schools

Once again, the projected population numbers seem inconsistent with elements in this Chapter.

1). Schools: If the population is proposed/projected as increasing by circa 36,000 individuals, why are the school-age children projections limited to 6,261? (Or, one in six residents.) Is there a basis for that calculation? The DEIR also indicates that the majority of the schools serving the residents of the New West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park Community Plan are “not overcrowded.” This would seem to fly in the face of previous LAUSD studies utilized to justify eminent domain throughout the West Adams District to build new schools. Moreover, at least in the northeast section of this Community Plan area, the children attend schools outside the arbitrary boundary of Arlington on the East (including Pio Pico school at Arlington and Pico, West Adams Preparatory High School at Washington and Vermont, which has become a principle resource for this community, along with Los Angeles High School.) Schools that “serve” a population may not be located within the Community Plan boundary.

In any case, the analysis is incomplete or inaccurate. It is not possible to increase the housing capacity by 20,000 units (or 36,000 people) without planning for additional school seats. There is no mitigation proposed in the DEIR for this significant impact.

Response 6-28

Adoption of the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts related to public schools. Draft EIR Table 4.14-12 identifies how the number of school-aged residents generated by implementation of Proposed Project was determined. Student generation rates used in the Draft EIR are consistent with those identified in the Los Angeles Unified School District’s (LAUSD) Commercial/Industrial Development Fee Justification Study (2008) and the LAUSD School Facilities Analysis (2009). The Draft EIR recognizes on page 4.14-21 that increases in student enrollment associated with the Proposed Project would exceed capacity of existing schools. However, because development associated with the Proposed Project would be subject to California Government Code Section 65995 and SB 50 which are deemed to provide full and complete mitigation of school facilities impacts described beginning on Draft EIR page 4.14-21, the Draft EIR concluded that the Proposed Project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to public schools with no mitigation.

Comment 6-29

2). Libraries: the DEIR specifically says that “no feasible mitigation measures were identified to reduce the significant impacts related to public libraries,” of which there are too few to serve the growing population. However, one would think there may be adaptive reuse possibilities of existing buildings (including the historical original Washington Irving Library) to make smaller, focused libraries, or the inclusion of small, neighborhood public libraries into other community facilities (including schools), or other creative potential solutions that ought to be explored, rather than assuming that the current financial crisis in public funding would still continue for the next quarter century, leading to an inability to build or staff public libraries.

Response 6-29

The Proposed Project includes four policies that support flexible library siting and securing additional library resources. The policy document of the Proposed Project includes Program P166 which identifies the Los Angeles Public Library as the Lead Agency to implement these policies through their LAPL Branch Facilities Plan.

Comment 6-30

3). Parks and Recreational Opportunities: the DEIR also says that “no feasible mitigation measures were identified to reduce the significant impacts related to public parks.” There are far too few acres devoted to parks and recreational uses in the New West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park Community Plan. It references “open space” requirements for the new construction of mixed use and other large housing developments on the corridors; however, we have learned with each new such actual development proposal that these open space uses tend to be on second- or third-story podiums, and thus the recreational uses/open space impacts the adjacent low density residential neighborhoods (noise impacts as well as lack of privacy.) This may be an unavoidable impact of mixed-use projects on commercial corridors, but there should at least be a discussion of it in the DEIR.

UNNC is working to identify potential added green space and possibly park space within the northeast portion of the New West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park Community Plan. But neither the Plan nor the DEIR explore such concepts as recently-proposed pocket “parking space” parks. Furthermore, the Planning Department team designing the public realm spaces near the Crenshaw – Jefferson/Exposition TOD is exploring creating park/green space on Crenshaw Boulevard; this initiative is not explored in the DEIR. All of this should be incorporated into the same environmental analysis.

Response 6-30

Refer to Master Response 5 regarding the significant and unavoidable impacts related to parks and open space identified in the Draft EIR and the absence of mitigation measures. The Draft EIR does not evaluate or discuss the initiatives described by the commenter as these initiatives are not included as part of the Proposed Project.

Comment 6-31

Historic Preservation

In general, the mitigations for the Historic Preservation component of the DEIR and the Plan itself seem well-conceived. However, there are some issues.

1). Section 4.5-8 sets out CHR Status Codes. However, those Status Codes are not utilized (or not demonstrably utilized) in the appended Survey LA document. In fact, it appears as if the Survey LA evaluators simply skipped over dozens (or hundreds) of structures in Arlington Heights in particular, not recording the evaluations (according to the methodology described in its introduction.) Without recording or making public these evaluations, it is not possible for us or staff to determine how accurate – or not – the evaluations were. There is no correlation in the published document.

Response 6-31

This comment is directed towards the content of the SurveyLA Report, which has been updated to not preclude future designation efforts within the Arlington Heights neighborhood (see Response 6-6). Since this comment is not related to the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR, a response is not required. This comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 6-32

2). On page 3-109 of the Plan itself, the Neighborhood Conservation Techniques do not appear to have been adopted/implemented anywhere within the boundaries of the New West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park Community Plan. The DEIR does not evaluate the lack of the adoption of these guidelines or regulations (we

do not know which they would be) and thus neither evaluates the impact of their absence nor does it offer any mitigations.

Response 6-32

The Neighborhood Conservation Techniques, referred to by the commenter, are a component of the Proposed Project and include Active Change areas such as the proposed Character Residential CPIO Subarea and the zone, height district and General Plan amendments proposed for several neighborhoods throughout the Community Plan Area. Upon adoption of the Proposed Project, these Neighborhood Conservation Techniques will be implemented. Where they also pertain to potential or proposed HPOZs, they are generally identified as future programs such as the Arlington Heights Neighborhood, which was initiated by Council District 10 in accordance with Council Motion (CF:15-0071) to become a Character Residential CPIO Subarea. Refer to FEIR Appendix H for a copy of the supporting documents.

Comment 6-33

3). Although it is true that the list of designated Historic Cultural Monuments is a moving target as the City adds additional HCMs to its list, Figure 4.5-1 is missing several notable designated HCMs, including the Starr Dairy Farmhouse (2801 Arlington, within the Plan boundaries) and the Lukens/Soriano (corner 27th and 5th Avenue), as well as two HCMs on 5th Avenue in Arlington Heights. None of these are recent additions. A more careful review is required.

Response 6-33

Upon review of the Historical-Cultural Monument (HCM) Report for the West Adams CPA located at the DCP's Office of Historic Resources website⁵, all designated HCMs in the West Adams CPA as of the publication date of the Draft EIR were identified in Draft EIR Table 4.5-3 and Figure 4.5-2. Draft EIR Figure 4.5-1, referred to by the commenter, identifies Historic Preservation Overlay zones in the West Adams CPA. Accordingly, HCMs would not be identified on this figure.

Comment 6-34

Biology

In the Biology chapter, there is extensive work on plants/animals that are presumed extinct in the area. Badgers and voles are "native" but we have never seen either. We see opossums, raccoons and skunks, but I do not know if these are native to adjacent districts, or entirely invasive. For the plant summary, no mention is made of the pioneering work of Theodore Payne, though perhaps that was an underlying source - something that makes me dubious about the findings. Then, under the recommendations, there is frequently the decision "No mitigation" without any apparent explanation how this decision not to mitigate impact upon something was derived. If there is a correlation, it requires an expertise unavailable to the lay reader.

Response 6-34

As described on Draft EIR page 4.4-17, the majority of the West Adams CPA is fully urbanized, containing primarily residential, commercial, and industrial development. Important plant and animal habitats exist primarily within the Kenneth Hahn State Recreation Area, situated in the southwest boundary of the West Adams CPA (Draft EIR Figure 4.4-1). Because future development occurring under the Proposed Project would be primarily infill of existing urban spaces, these projects are not expected to directly impact

⁵City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, Office of Historic Resources, Historical-Cultural Monument Report, Planning Community: West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert, last updated April 2012. Website: http://cityplanning.lacity.org/complan/HCM/dsp_hcm_result.cfm?community=West%20Adams%20-%20Baldwin%20Hills%20-%20Leimert%20Park.

candidate, sensitive, or special status plant and animal species or habitats listed in Draft EIR Table 4.4-2. As such, no mitigation is required to protect candidate, sensitive or specific status plant and animal species.

Comment 6-35

Traffic

In discussing Traffic conditions, there appears to be an underlying assumption that mass transit is efficient and underutilized; this may be a reason why 20,000 added units are seen as a true "potential" outcome.

The DEIR authors do not seem to recognize that busses get stuck in traffic, and trains stop for stoplights that are not coordinated to their approach. Busses and trains run with no regard to the actual schedule. In fact, traffic will not abate until mass transit is timely and efficient, but mass transit cannot become timely and efficient until traffic abates. Drivers pass through residential neighborhoods to bypass gridlock; the stated goal of minimizing residential pass-throughs with traffic barriers of one sort or another will only increase main and secondary artery congestion, and keep busses and trains behind schedule.

For instance, it takes a Jefferson Park resident 10 minutes to drive to USC. It takes 45 minutes if that resident walks casually with the dogs (stopping frequently). It takes 45 minutes each way by train, departing from Western and Exposition - two stops total - because of the time it takes to walk to and from the depot, and then wait for the schedule-disregarding train to arrive. Also, it takes that same resident a 1/2 hour to drive to or from work in Century City (8 miles), while mass transit would take at least 1 hour, not counting or walking to the train. It's a no brainer that a car is faster, easier and more dependable.

The statistics and charts note "traffic conditions" but not the underlying reasons or circumstances behind them. It's all theory - there does not appear to be any sense that ground conditions were analyzed with an eye to causation. Statistics will not tell you that every 4-way stop requires a negotiation of the right-of-way because too many drivers do not know the rules. It does not take into account that many low-paying jobs, like yard care, require a vehicle and cannot be performed using mass transit, and gardening, along with roving scrap collection or the numerous ice cream trucks in the neighborhood, are ways to stay self-employed when there is high unemployment or a large number of unskilled (or skilled but not certified in the U.S.) workers in an area.

Similarly, the street lighting recommendations appear to be based on classifications and not actual needs. The biggest threat appears to be light-pollution, not (a) ugly sodium-vapor lighting or (b) darkness.

Response 6-35

Portions of this comment are not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR, and would not require a response. Those portions of the comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration. With regard to commute times using the various modes of transportation, as discussed on paragraph 2 of page 4.15-27 of the DEIR, the TODs of the Proposed Project would allow for an increase in both jobs and housing. Locating jobs near housing can help reduce commutes, increase walking and biking rates, thereby creating a benefit for public health. The proposed West Adams TIMP also includes a number of public transit improvements to encourage and facilitate transit ridership.

Comment 6-36

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, there is so much missing data and/or outdated data that it is difficult to properly evaluate many aspects of the New West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park Community Plan. Our hands have also been tied by the relatively-short comment period on the DEIR when the documents associated with the Plan itself have not all been released, or were released after the UNNC Governing Board last met. We respectfully

request that UNNC and other stakeholders in the Plan area be permitted to continue to comment on the DEIR until, at least, the next series of presentations to the community by Planning Department staff are completed, and some review of issues that we and others have brought up have also been completed (which may cause a change to the DEIR.)

Response 6-36

Refer to the responses to individual comments above with regard to missing or outdated data. The comment period for the Proposed Project began September 13, 2012 and was due to close on October 29, 2012, the first business day after the 45th day of the required review period. However, the DCP extended the review period by an additional 15 days in response to requests by interested parties, which closed on November 13, 2012. The Proposed Project has been appropriately noticed and was circulated for a 60-day public review period, which was 15 days more than that required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15105.

LETTER 7: UNITED NEIGHBORHOODS OF THE HISTORIC ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, WEST ADAMS AND JEFFERSON PARK COMMUNITIES NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL STAKEHOLDER (LUIS SOUTH)

Comment 7-1

"It's important to include the projections for improving medical service facilities. Due to Obamacare there will be major changes to improve how services are designed and integrated into the community."

Response 7-1

Since this comment pertains to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR, a response is not required. However, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

LETTER 8: CRAIG LAWSON & CO. (ON BEHALF OF KAISER)

Comment 8-1

On behalf of our client, Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc. ("Kaiser"), we are writing to request that certain items found in the West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert New Community Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR") and the Draft Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan ("Draft Specific Plan") be considered for revision or deletion. Kaiser owns the property located south of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard that is bounded by the southerly portion of Marlton Avenue to the east, Santa Rosalia Drive to the south, and the southerly portion of Buckingham Road to the west ("Kaiser Project Site"). Kaiser proposes to develop a medical office building which is currently in the preliminary stages of design.

As a stakeholder of the West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert Community Plan area, Kaiser would like to make some comments regarding the Draft EIR and the Draft Specific Plan. Please see the comments on the following pages.

Response 8-1

The commenter's summary introductory comments are addressed in detail below. As this comment is not directed towards the environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR, a response is not required.

Comment 8-2

SECTION I: Draft EIR Comments

a) Figures 3-4 and 4.10-1 Existing Land Use Map

Figures 3-4 and 4.10-1 on pages 3-7 and 4.10-11 respectively depict the existing land use designation of each property within the West Adams – Baldwin Hills - Leimert Community Plan area. The "Regional Center Commercial" land use designation is incorrectly labeled as "Regional Center" and should be revised.

The proposed changes include the following:

The "Regional Center" land use designation should be corrected to "Regional Center Commercial."

Response 8-2

These corrections have been verified and made to Draft EIR Figures 3-4 and 4.10-1 and Draft EIR Table 3-2. Refer to FEIR Section 3.4 Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR to review the specific corrections.

Comment 8-3

b) Table 4.1-4 CPIO Subdistrict and Specific Plan Amendment Standards and

Guidelines Regarding Aesthetics

Table 4.1-4 beginning on page 4.1-18 illustrates CPIO Subdistrict and Specific Plan Amendment Standards and Guidelines Regarding Aesthetics. Under the Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan Amendments section found on page 4.1-18 in the Views and Vistas column, the words "Mixed Use" should be deleted. The Draft EIR includes tables which should be consistent with the Draft Specific Plan information. Maps 6, 7 and 8 included in the Draft Specific Plan reference the new 75 foot maximum building height allowed on the portions of Subareas A, B, C and F that are shaded in a dark red color. The new 75 foot maximum building height limit applies to all projects and not Mixed Use Projects exclusively. Furthermore, Section 10 Floor Area Ratio and Height includes a maximum 75 foot building height limit for Subareas A, B, C and F for projects that are not Mixed Use Projects.

The proposed changes include the following (deleted text is shown with a strikethrough line/bolded text):

48 foot Maximum Height (portions of subareas B, D, and F)
60 foot Maximum Height (portions of subareas A, B, C, and F)
75 foot Maximum Height (~~Mixed Use~~ Projects in portions of Subarea A, B, C and F)
Setback Transition to Residential Neighborhoods

Response 8-3

This correction has been verified and made to Draft EIR Table 4.1-4. Refer to FEIR Section 3.4 Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR to review the specific corrections.

Comment 8-4

c) Table 4.10-5 CPIO Subdistrict and Specific Plan Amendment Standards and Guidelines Regarding Land Use

Table 4.10-5 beginning on page 4.10-22 illustrates CPIO Subdistrict and Specific Plan Amendment Standards and Guidelines Regarding Land Use. Under the Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan Amendments section found on page 4.10-22 in the Land Use Compatibility column, the words "Mixed Use" should be deleted. The Draft EIR includes tables which should be consistent with the Draft Specific Plan information. Maps 6, 7 and 8 included in the Draft Specific Plan reference the new 75 foot maximum building height allowed on the portions of Subareas A, B, C and F that are shaded in a dark red color. The new 75 foot maximum building height limit applies to all projects and not Mixed Use Projects exclusively. Furthermore, Section 10 Floor Area Ratio and Height includes a maximum 75 foot building height limit for Subareas A, B, C and F for projects that are not Mixed Use Projects.

The proposed change includes the following (deleted text is shown with a strikethrough line/bolded text):

Ministerial sign-off procedure for signs, minor facade repair/storefront rehabilitation, paint and Leimert Park Village neighborhood serving uses.

1.5:1 Maximum FAR (Portions of all subareas)
2:1 Maximum FAR (Portions of all subareas, except E)
3:1 Maximum FAR (~~Mixed Use~~ Projects in portions of Subarea A, B, C, F)
Increased street frontage setbacks for projects with outdoor amenities (Subareas D, E)

Maximum FAR may be increased by up to 1.0 when allowed by height district, through introducing one square foot of floor area for each square foot of podium or surface parking area relocated to subterranean levels

48 foot Maximum Height (portions of subareas B, D, F)
60 foot Maximum Height (portions of subareas A, B, C, F)
75 foot Maximum Height (~~Mixed Use~~ Projects in portions of Subarea A, B, C, F)
Setback transition to Residential Neighborhoods

Discretionary projects involving an Eligible Historic Resource may require compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings as mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

Response 8-4

This correction has been verified and made to Draft EIR Table 4.10-5. Refer to FEIR Section 3.4 Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR to review the specific corrections.

Comment 8-5

d) Appendix B - Maximum Discretionary Height

The Appendix B Table shows the existing and proposed zoning for each subarea. The Conditions of Maximum Height column for Subarea 1270 on page 12 of the Appendix B Table includes a 10% possible discretionary building height increase instead of the 20% increase referenced in the Draft EIR Mitigation Measure AE1 achieved through an Exception. A 20% discretionary building height increase would allow up to 72 feet for the by-right 60 foot maximum height portion of Subarea 1270 and up to 90 feet for the by-right 75 foot maximum height portion of Subarea 1270. The Maximum Discretionary Height Column currently includes an 82.5 feet maximum height which should be revised to match the maximum 20% maximum discretionary height increase of 90 feet. The maximum discretionary height should be consistent with Mitigation Measure AE1.

The proposed change includes the following (added text is shown with underlined/bolded text):

Request changes to the Conditions of Maximum Height column to allow a 72 foot maximum discretionary building height which represents up to a 10% increase above the maximum 60 foot building height allowed by-right and to allow a 90 foot maximum discretionary building height which represents up to a 20% increase above the maximum 75 foot building height allowed by-right, both through an Exception entitlement procedure as follows:

Conditions of Maximum Height

60 ft., 66 ft. with adjustment, and 72 ft. with exception, 75 ft. MU, 82.5 ft. MU w/ adjustment, and 90 ft. with exception

The proposed change includes the following (deleted text is shown with a strikethrough line/bolded text & added text is shown with underlined/bolded text):

Request changes to the Maximum Discretionary Height column to allow a maximum discretionary height of 90 feet which represents a 20% increase above the maximum 75 foot maximum building height instead of the maximum 82.5 feet which is a 10% increase as follows:

Maximum Discretionary Height

~~82.5~~ 90

Response 8-5

CPIOs are guided by the enabling procedures found in LAMC Section 13.14, which provides for adjustments that do not exceed 20 percent. The Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan, which contains the subject subarea 1270, is guided by LAMC Section 11.5.7, Section E regarding Specific Plan Adjustments. This enabling ordinance provides for adjustments in height that do not exceed 10 percent. Height increases in excess of 10 percent may be granted through exception (LAMC Section 11.5.7, Section F).

Mitigation Measure **AE1** refers to the transitional height for new development located on commercial and industrial land that abuts the side and rear yards of residential properties. This means that height is required to transition pursuant to Mitigation Measure **AE1** and may deviate by up to a 20 percent pursuant to the adjustment procedures identified within the applicable sections of the LAMC regarding CPIOs, or Specific Plan. This provision does not pertain to the building's maximum permitted height. To provide further clarification, Mitigation Measure **AE1** has been revised as follows:

AE1 ~~As a condition of approval for any~~ Any approval of a Discretionary project or “Active Change Area Project”, ~~as defined in Section 3.4 of the Project Description, the City shall require with new~~ construction located on commercial or industrially planned land in CPIO ~~subdistricts~~ subareas ~~and/or~~ the Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan that directly abuts or is across an alley from residentially planned land ~~to~~must transition in the following manner:

- Where the rear or side property line is contiguous with that of a residential lot or separated by an alley property, the building structure shall be set back or “stepped back” one foot for every one foot in height as measured fifteen feet above grade at the shared/residential property line, or as specified through the individual CPIO subarea or Specific Plan ordinances when more restrictive.
- ~~Where the properties are separated by an alley, the structure shall be set back or “stepped back” one foot for every one foot in height as measured from grade at the residential property line.~~
- New construction located opposite the front yard setback of residentially planned land along local streets shall not exceed 30 feet in height for the first 50 feet of lot depth as measured from the commercial or industrial property line opposite the residential lot.
- Adjustments and Exceptions (permitted): The fifteen foot “step back” height limitation at the residential property line may be increased by not more than 20 percent or as specified through the CPIO or Specific Plan regulations when more restrictive through adjustment, otherwise, through the exception procedures pursuant to the Los Angeles Municipal Code.

See Chapter 3.0 Corrections and Additions.

Comment 8-6

e) Appendix B - Conditions of Maximum Height

The Appendix B Table shows the existing and proposed zoning for each subarea. The Conditions of Maximum Height column of Subarea 1270 on page 12 of the Appendix B Table includes a mixed use notation (“MU”) following the 75 ft. and 82.5 ft. height limit. The Draft EIR includes tables which should be consistent with the Draft Specific Plan information. Maps 6, 7 and 8 included in the Draft Specific Plan reference the new 75 foot maximum building height allowed on the portions of Subareas A, B, C and F that are shaded in a dark red color. The new 75 foot maximum building height limit applies to all projects and not Mixed Use Projects exclusively. Furthermore, Section 10 Floor Area Ratio and Height includes a maximum 75 foot building height limit for Subareas A, B, C and F for projects that are not Mixed Use Projects.

The proposed change includes the following (deleted text is shown with a strikethrough line/bolded text & added text is shown with underlined/bolded text):

Request that City Planning Staff strike out the “MU” notation as follows:

Conditions of Maximum Height

60 ft., 66 ft. with adjustment, and 72 ft. with exception, 75 ft. MY, 82.5 ft. MY ~~w/~~ adjustment, and 90 ft. with exception

Response 8-6

In response to this comment, the Proposed Project has been updated to reflect 75 foot height limit for all projects. See Response 8-5 regarding “exceptions” to CPIOs and Specific Plans.

Comment 8-7

f) Appendix G - Parking Policies

Within Appendix G, The New Community Plan Program West Adams – Baldwin Hills - Leimert Community Plan Area Draft Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Program (TIMP) includes Section 5.9 Parking Policies (page 35) which are intended to help encourage transit use and mixed-use/transit-oriented development. The second parking policy reads as follows:

- Establish maximum parking requirement for individual projects. For example, consider existing LAMC parking requirements to be the maximum number of parking spaces allowed for projects.

The proposed change includes the following:

Request the elimination of the aforementioned parking policy from Appendix G. If, however, the City chooses to include a parking maximum, we suggest that the New Community Plan Update include an exemption to this parking maximum for medical uses.

Response 8-7

The TIMP identifies optional measures that could help to reduce traffic impacts, but are not required mitigation measures, and therefore are not enforceable. While the mitigation measure is not required and not enforceable, a technical correction to clarify that maximum parking requirements may be established for “targeted uses” has been made to the TIMP. Refer to FEIR Section 3.4 Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR to review the specific corrections.

Comment 8-8

g) General Plan Footnote No.1

Although not included in the Draft EIR, the current General Plan Land Use Map of the West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert Community Plan requires updating to be consistent with the West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert New Community Plan. General Plan Footnote No.1, listed next to the Commercial land use designation, states: "Height District 1" which allows for a maximum FAR of 1.5 to 1 on a commercially zoned lot. The notation of Footnote No. 1 should be deleted.

The proposed change includes the following:

The Footnote No.1 notation next to the Commercial land use designation on the General Plan Land Use Map of the West Adams - Baldwin Hills – Leimert Community Plan should be deleted as it is not consistent with the proposed zone change and height district changes to the Community Plan.

Response 8-8

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this request has been addressed as part of the Proposed Project, and this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 8-9

SECTION II: Draft Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan Comments

a) Section 11.H Campus Signage

The campus signage section beginning on page 27 of the Draft Specific Plan provides the signage regulations for corporate or institutional campus Projects 50,000 square feet or greater and located within the Regional Center Commercial designated portions of subarea C of the Draft Specific Plan. However, it is unclear if the 50,000 square-foot threshold is referring to floor area or lot area. The Draft Specific Plan text should be revised to clearly note that the 50,000 square-foot figure references the project's floor area and not the lot area. Additional clarifying language is proposed as follows:

The proposed changes include the following (deleted text is shown with a strikethrough line/bolded text & added text is shown with underlined/bolded text):

H. Campus Signage

Corporate or institutional campus projects 50,000 square feet or greater of floor area, ~~and~~ located within the Regional Center Commercial designated portions of subarea C, shall not be subject to the sign standards enumerated in subsections 11.A through 11.G above. Instead, such major campus Projects shall comply with the sign regulations of Section 14 of the LAMC.

Additionally, in order to ensure that signage on institutional or corporate campus signage Projects adequately reinforces. The unique identity of the Specific Plan Area as well as the corporate or institutional identity of the campus, ~~the following shall apply:~~ signage on institutional or corporate campus Projects shall be subject to the following approvals:

- 1) A sign program fully delineating the size, number, location, color, material finish and copy of all exterior signage (e.g. including identity, retail, parking, etc.) shall be submitted and reviewed by the Design Review Board in accordance with Section 14 of the LAMC prior to the Director of Planning issuing an approval.
- 2) The DRB shall recommend approval of, and the Director of Planning shall approve, all ~~projects whose~~ sign programs that comply ~~complies~~ with Design Standards 14f - h of the Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan Design Guidelines and Standards Manual.

Response 8-9

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing amendments to the Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan Campus Signage regulations as part of the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 8-10

b) Section 14.B.3 Design Review Organization

(pages 29 & 30 Draft Specific Plan)

Section 14 of the Draft Specific Plan provides Design Review regulations for review and approval of Projects by the Director of Planning, pursuant to LAMC Section 16.50 within Subareas C, D, E and F and the portions of Subarea B which are either south of Vernon Avenue or are located on the west side of Crenshaw Boulevard between Coliseum Street and 39th Street. Section 14.B.3: Organization makes

reference to the Community Redevelopment Agency and the Community Redevelopment Agency Project Area Committee.

The text states that a Design Review Application will be deemed complete only upon initial review by the Community Redevelopment Agency ("CRA") within 30 days of filing the application, in addition to the requirements by the Director of Planning. Since the text referencing the CRA's Crenshaw Project Action Committee (PAC) was deleted from the previous section (Section 14.B.2), the reference to the CRA and the CRA Crenshaw PAC should also be deleted as the CRA/LA, A Designated Local Authority (Successor to the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles, "CRA-DLA"), currently does not have sufficient staff to review signage applications to deem them complete on such a short time frame. It is also important to note that while the Crenshaw Redevelopment Project Area is still active, the proposed text to be deleted does not refer to the Plan itself, but refers to the CRA Crenshaw PAC.

The proposed changes include the following (deleted text is shown with a strikethrough line/bolded text & added text is shown with underlined/bolded text):

Organization. When a Project that is subject to design review ~~is under the jurisdiction of both a Community Redevelopment Agency Project Area Committee and the Design Review Board~~, the Design Review Application shall be deemed complete only upon an initial review by the Director of Planning, ~~the Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency~~ within 30 days of the date of filing the Application, ~~in addition to the requirements for a completed application by the Director of Planning.~~

Response 8-10

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, the proposed amendments to the Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan Design Review Board organization regulations are part of the Proposed Project, and this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration. Refer to FEIR Appendix H Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan Amendments for the exact text changes.

Comment 8-11

Thank you for your time and consideration in reviewing these comments. Please provide confirmation of the proposed changes included in this letter that you plan to incorporate into the Draft EIR and Draft Specific Plan. I would also like to request notification of any further changes that affect the zoning, land use designation, etc. of the Kaiser Project Site.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Response 8-11

This comment contains a thank you and request for confirmation of which changes will be incorporated and for future notification. No further response is required. This comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

LETTER 9: D. VARNADO

Comment 9-1

- Page 15 says that the 2010 Bike plan for the City of Los Angeles has not been adopted. The plan has been adopted according to the City's website: <http://www.bicyclerla.org/>

Response 9-1

The commenter is referring to page 4.15-15 of Section 4.15, Transportation and Traffic of the Draft EIR, which has been revised as follows to reflect the adoption of the 2010 City of Los Angeles Bicycle Plan:

UPDATE 2010 - City of Los Angeles 2010 Bicycle Plan. The City of Los Angeles adopted the 2010 Bicycle Plan on March 1, 2011. The Bicycle Plan as a component of the 1999 Transportation Element is fully incorporated into the adopted Mobility Plan 2035 as part of the City's General Plan. The purpose of the Bicycle Plan is to increase, improve, and enhance bicycling in the City as a safe, healthy, and enjoyable means of transportation and recreation. It establishes policies and programs to increase the number and type of bicyclists in the City and to make every street in the City a safe place to ride a bicycle.

The City is implementing the bicycle plan in a series of Five Year Implementation Strategies, monitored, advised, and assisted by the Bicycle Advisory Council and the Bicycle Plan Implementation Team. The First Five-Year Implementation Strategy, started in 2011, prioritizes the first 253 miles of new bikeways for implementation. As the City updates each of its 35 Community Plans, it can include localized recommendations that address community-specific conditions and are consistent with and complementary to the 2010 Bicycle Plan. As each Community Plan is updated, future bicycle lanes in that planning area would be analyzed for potential environmental impacts.

The Bicycle Plan has been updated to reflect public input received since the 2010 Bicycle Plan was adopted on March 1, 2011. The 2010 Bicycle Plan, was incorporated into the MP 2035 and would not be a standalone chapter devoted to a single mode but instead would reflect the City's commitment to a holistic and balanced complete street approach that acknowledges the role of multiple modes (pedestrians, bicycles, transit, and vehicles). The Technical Design Handbook was incorporated into the MP 2035's Complete Streets Manual, including sections on design needs, bicycle paths, bicycle lanes, bicycle routes and neighborhood friendly streets, network gaps, signalized intersections, bicycle parking, bikeway signage, non-standard treatments, and street sections.

Comment 9-2

- Please insert language describing the outreach process used to get feedback on the scenarios and the extent to which the scenarios were modified in response to the outreach.

Response 9-2

As shown on the Proposed Project's website (<https://sites.google.com/site/westadamsnpc/meetings-outreach>), a Public Workshop was held on September 6, 2008. Over 60 neighborhood focus and small group meetings were held prior to that Public Workshop and a public scoping meeting was held on February 27, 2008. During the adoption phase, in addition to meetings with eight Neighborhood Councils prior to the CPC action, the City also conducted an Open House/Public Hearing on January 15, 2013. For further detail on Public Outreach, please consult the Staff Recommendation Report presented to City Planning Commission on April 11, 2013.

Comment 9-3

Rather than “consider developing and adopting a pedestrian master plan,” language should be added to the Community Plan stressing the need for such a plan (citywide) and paying attention to sidewalk needs in TOD and in non-TOD corridors. The city has a tremendous backlog of sidewalk repair and maintenance needs. It would be counterproductive to ignore these needs while investing billions of dollars in transit and transit oriented development.

Response 9-3

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 9-4

The assessment of mid-block pedestrian safety should be included or coordinated with the development of a pedestrian master plan, including any measures that address and reduce conflicts between pedestrians and motorized transportation.

Response 9-4

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 9-5

- The TIMP, especially as related to parking and zone changes, should consider and support the needs of local small businesses and should minimize detrimental impacts on the same.

Response 9-5

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 9-6

- For the commercial corridors, include objectives that require the consideration of local goods movement, delivery truck traffic, and loading docks and zones. New/proposed/future developments should be required to incorporate these elements in order to be granted permits.

Response 9-6

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 9-7

4-15-20

The TDF model was modified from the 2005 model and calibrated to 2008 traffic conditions. The 2005 model underestimated 2008 conditions with an error range of -3 percent to - 9 percent. How does the underestimating of the traffic relate to the Great Recession which began in 2008? Was the model calibrated

with actual 2008 data (e.g., unemployment) on the effects of the downturn? The 2008 model should be based on the most accurate and up-to-date data in order to be reliable in projecting 2030 conditions.

Response 9-7

Refer to Master Response 2 with regard to how the calibration of the West Adams Travel Model to 2005 traffic conditions influenced forecasts of future traffic conditions. Based on the Caltrans trip assignment guidelines for models to be deemed acceptable for forecasting future year traffic, the traffic consultant in agreement with LADOT and the DCP determined that the use of the West Adams CPA Travel Model, calibrated to 2005, was considered to be valid for use in the TIMP and Draft EIR to represent existing (Year 2008) traffic conditions. As the NOP was published in 2008, and traffic conditions were found to have essentially remained the same between 2005 and later years, it is acceptable that the Draft EIR uses 2008 conditions to represent baseline conditions for purposes of determining significant impacts.

Comment 9-8

- In the section marked Estimation of Trip Reduction, please show data on the trips by bus, rail and non-motorized transportation.

Response 9-8

The 4Ds methodology estimates vehicle trip reduction. These estimates are not quantified by individual modes of travel. The TIMP and its policies focus on the active transportation modes aimed at reducing vehicular travel. See Response 9-10 as to the City's traffic methodology. The facilities being provided to serve the active transportation modes are sufficient to accommodate the anticipated demand for the community plan area. Refer also to Master Response 3 regarding the traffic impact analysis methodology.

Comment 9-9

Page 8

- Paratransit services are not considered in the Community Plan. Please identify the rationale for not documenting paratransit services.

Response 9-9

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)).

Comment 9-10

- Table 2.2 page 33 – These numbers are for motorized vehicles only. Please discuss bus, rail and non-motorized transportation indicators. And please put the metrics in context. How does the system operate system-wide as well as in the Plan Area?

Response 9-10

The traffic impact analysis follows City of Los Angeles guidelines for assessment of transportation impacts relating to New Community Plans. A multi-modal level of service methodology has not yet been adopted by the City as part of its guidelines. Therefore, the transportation analysis does not currently employ a multi-

modal level of service analysis methodology to analyze street segments for significant traffic impacts. For this reason, non-motorized transportation was not evaluated in the TIMP. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)).

Comment 9-11

- Please develop a map which shows the current certified neighborhood council boundaries overlaid over any geographic, TIMP and other area of interest. The NCs were enabled through city charter and should be recognized officially as a part of the framework of planning.

Response 9-11

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 9-12

- 5.3.2 – Outreach to Chambers of Commerce and business groups along the corridor is essential especially regarding strategies that involve parking and travel lane removal.

Response 9-12

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 9-13

- The Community Plan and TIMP can serve as a document to engage and inform affected communities. Please insert a table with selected strategies appropriate for reducing cut-through traffic and unwanted parking in affected neighborhoods. Before TODs are established, steps should be taken to prevent cut through traffic and unwanted parking impacts.

Response 9-13

The TIMP outlines the framework for creating effective neighborhood traffic management plans based on coordinating with the affected parties including planners, engineers, neighborhood residents and Council representatives. Following a detailed outreach process with the aforementioned parties, issues can be identified, sources of funding determined, and the effectiveness of certain measures discussed in order to address the goals and objectives of an affected neighborhood. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)).

Comment 9-14

- Traffic conditions on collector streets should not be denigrated through the implementation of the TIMP, e.g., removal of lanes on major streets. Impacts are likely to be felt in adjacent neighborhoods.

Response 9-14

As disclosed in Draft EIR Section 4.15, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable traffic impacts. No feasible mitigation measures were identified to reduce the significant impact related to the circulation system to a less than significant level, because none of the proposed TIMP scenarios would maintain the same (or fewer) number of segments at LOS E or F when compared to existing (Year 2008) conditions. However, it should be noted that the goals of the Proposed Project are to encourage the use of active transportation modes. It should also be noted that the Proposed Project does not call for the removal of lanes but to keep street widths consistent with what exists as of baseline conditions.

The TIMP also contains policies relating to the management of traffic in residential neighborhoods. Various elements aimed at ensuring traffic intrusion to residential streets is minimized are contained within this policy. The TIMP allows the use of traffic control measures to regulate, warn, and guide motorists and pedestrians, along with implementation of traffic management plans based on neighborhood priorities and values. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)).

Comment 9-15

- Please ensure that the Specific Plans for Crenshaw and Washington Boulevards have been integrated into the New West Adams Community Plan.

Response 9-15

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 9-16

- Please ensure that any new land use designations and geographic analysis areas in the 2012 Community Plan can be compared to the land use designations and geographic areas of the 1998 Community Plan. Table of equivalencies and maps (as appropriate) should be created to facilitate the comparisons.

Response 9-16

These maps and tables can be found on the DCP's West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert New Community Plan websites: <http://cityplanning.lacity.org/> and <https://sites.google.com/site/westadamsncp/home>, in the Staff Recommendation Report page. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)).

Comment 9-17

- Table 4.1 – In the notes and clarifications, please show the proposed bicycle, parking and other physical changes/ improvements on this table so that the reader can see how they are coordinated, the tradeoffs and any un-intended consequences.

Response 9-17

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Street Reclassifications Table 4.1 of the TIMP (DEIR Appendix G). The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 9-18

- Some of the ROWs and roadbeds are being increased with the objectives to prioritize enhancement of the pedestrian realm. Please be more explicit. How does increasing the row and roadbed enhance the pedestrian realm? Also, there is no mention of Historic Preservation Overlay Zones in the objectives. The Plan should explicitly address and avoid impacts on HPOZs. It should ensure that the Community Plan’s components are consistent with the HPOZ goals and objectives.

Response 9-18

As discussed in the Proposed Project, the proposed modifications to the ROW to enhance the pedestrian realm would be consistent with the area’s early to mid-twentieth century development pattern which remains intact today throughout much of the community. Historic corridors initially developed at the turn of the century such as Washington, Jefferson and Adams Boulevard possess a great deal of pedestrian-oriented architecture with structures built close to the sidewalk, often creating the experience of a continuous “streetwall” of commercial activity for the pedestrian. It should be noted that modifications to streets generally involve maintaining the roadbed and avoiding dedications that would disrupt continuous “streetwalls”.

With regard to HPOZs, the Proposed Project’s policies address both the maintenance of existing HPOZs and the identification of future HPOZs, the Proposed Project does include several programs related to the preservation of historic neighborhoods including Programs P149, P152 and P216. Additionally, mitigation measures CR3 and CR4 were identified in the Draft EIR to protect and preserve historic resources in the West Adams CPA. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)).

Comment 9-19

4.13 Population, housing and employment

- Figure 4.10-2. Residential Distribution. Please include a map that shows current (2008) population, employment and housing and a map that shows projected changes to 2030.

Response 9-19

While additional mapping will graphically depict how population, housing and employment were dispersed throughout the CPA in 2008, the requested map is not necessary to support the conclusions made in the Draft

EIR related to population, housing, and employment impacts. However, refer to Appendix H for the General Plan Land Use Map which identifies where residential development would be permitted. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)).

Comment 9-20

- Please develop a composite map identifying the 55 acres of vacant and undeveloped land, the commercial corridors, and the TOD areas where growth and development are planned. This will help readers visualize the impact of a 29.6 percent growth in housing, a 19.7 percent increase in population and a 18.6 percent increase in jobs between 2008 and 2030, all of which are higher than in the City overall.

Response 9-20

While additional mapping will graphically depict how population, housing and employment were dispersed throughout the CPA in 2008, the requested map is not necessary to support the conclusions made in the Draft EIR related to population, housing, and employment impacts. However, refer to Draft EIR Figure 3-5 which identifies where Active Changes would occur under the Proposed Project. It is within these Active Change areas where additional capacity would be accommodated. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)).

Comment 9-21

- Please overlay the TIMP on this composite map. Please describe the performance of the system in the context of the new growth, and the impacts on neighborhoods, including cut-through traffic.

Response 9-21

This particular mapping request is partially reflected through the figures of Chapter 4 Mobility of the policy document of the Proposed Project. Future traffic conditions under the Proposed Project and the associated impacts are described in Draft EIR Section 4.15. As referenced on Draft EIR page 1-1, CEQA Section 15151 states, “An evaluation of the environmental effects of a Proposed Project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonable feasible.” The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)).

Comment 9-22

- The retail and service sector employment will see major growth between 2008 and 2030. How can the Community Plan, zoning, land use and General Plan amendments be used as tools to encourage job growth in a broader cross-section of the economy. Please discuss issues related to accomplishing this objective.

Response 9-22

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 9-23

- Please create a map showing the distribution of affordable housing that is at risk and its relationship to existing transit and TOD locations.

Response 9-23

Numerous study maps and analyses such as the mapping noted above, has been generated as part of the plan development and adoption phases of the Proposed Project. However, inclusion of the requested map is not necessary to support the conclusions made in the Draft EIR related to population, housing, and employment impacts. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)).

Comment 9-24

- Of the affordable housing units needed in the city overall by 2030, the Plan should identify the number and percent that the West Adams Community Plan area is expected to absorb and relative totals and percentages for the other community plan areas in the City. Please discuss the rationale for the distribution.

Response 9-24

Refer to Master Response 4. Although no specific mandated amount of affordable units are required by Community Plan Area, page 1-78 of the City's adopted (2014-2021) Housing Element identifies a Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation of 82,002 units for the City of Los Angeles. Of these allocations, 20, 426 are for very low-income, 12,435 are for low-income, 13,728 are for moderate-income and 35,412 are for above moderate-income levels. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)).

Comment 9-25

- Page 12 – The West Adams Area already has higher densities than the city and county overall. With the increase in population designated for the Plan area, the jobs per house figure of .67 declines to .62 by 2030, resulting in fewer jobs per house overall--more people, but fewer jobs to go around. Already the persons per household figure is 2.92 in the West Adams Area. Does the City project that the workers per house will decrease? Please discuss.

Response 9-25

In the event that the West Adams CPA is built-out to the reasonably expected capacity under the Proposed Project, the commenter is correct that the jobs to housing ratio would decrease compared to existing conditions. However, as described on page 4.13-14 of the Draft EIR, the number of jobs in the West Adams CPA is anticipated to increase by 18.6 percent compared to the 12.3 percent in the City, as a whole, and would not be expected to lead to the displacement of substantial numbers of existing jobs. Additionally, in keeping with planning policies and the Proposed Project TODs, the City is focusing growth and development towards more transit-oriented areas of the City, which is also in keeping with SCAG's Sustainable Communities Strategy policies of orienting housing near jobs and transit centers. Sources of these additional job-oriented developments would result from changes to land use, zoning, and height districts in order to incentivize greater commercial and industrial land use intensities at key node and TOD locations. The Proposed Project further seeks to retain viable existing industrial uses primarily within larger parcels, increasing the amount of commercial zoned land along the area's major east/west commercial corridors. For these reasons the Draft EIR determined that the Proposed Project would not contribute to a substantial jobs/housing imbalance and impacts related to employment growth would be less-than-significant. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)).

Comment 9-26

- Projected population growth (and other changes) along the corridors must not be detrimental to the corridor or adjacent neighborhoods. It is highly desirable and essential that the character of existing stable neighborhoods be conserved and that neighborhood character be preserved.

Response 9-26

Refer to Response 6-18 regarding how conflict between future development in Active Change areas and existing adjacent residential uses will be avoided. Furthermore, the policy document of the Proposed Project includes goals, policies, and design standards that serve to preserve, conserve, and enhance residential neighborhoods. The Draft EIR determined that negative impacts to residential neighborhoods would be reduced as a result of the CPIO and specific plan transitional height regulations applied to the commercial and industrial Active Change areas of the Proposed Project. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 9-27

- The Community Plan should be cognizant of the historic preservation overlay zones in Plan areas and should respect the tenets of these zones and associated specific plans.

Response 9-27

Refer to Response 15-4 regarding the Proposed Project's treatment of historic resources and districts. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 9-28

TIMP - Appendix G Table 4.1 Street Reclassifications - Page 164

- **Washington Blvd. – Arlington to Crenshaw Blvd.** The West Adams Community should be coordinated with plans for economic development on Washington Boulevard. The street should become a thriving pedestrian and bike -oriented destination with attractive neighborhood stores, shops, restaurants, and amenities. Please discuss how land use/zoning code changes in combination with the Washington Boulevard Specific Plan and the Community Plan can support successful economic development in the corridor.

Response 9-28

This comment relates to approaches taken in the development of the proposed TIMP as a component of the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration. Refer to FEIR Section 3.4 Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR for revisions to TIMP Appendix G. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)).

Comment 9-29

Page 173 - Adams Blvd.

Why does the segment of Adams stop at 13th Avenue rather than continuing to the Bronson, the next block to the west? The residential neighborhood in question is the Avenues of West Adams; it includes Bronson Avenue.

Response 9-29

The commenter is referring to a segment of Adams Blvd. identified in Table 4.1 of the TIMP Report (Appendix G of the DEIR). This particular segment of Adams Blvd. from Arlington Avenue. stops at 13th Avenue because it relates to adjacent residentially zoned properties. Referring to those street reclassifications within the Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan, the segment continues west from 13th Ave. to Sommerset Ave. as it relates to properties within the Specific plan. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 9-30

- There is a Senior Citizen complex located on Bronson and 25th Street. Pedestrian safety is a concern in the Bronson/25th Street curve in front of the Senior Citizen Housing.

Response 9-30

This comment is a pedestrian safety concern at a specific location and relates to approaches taken in the development of the proposed TIMP as a component of the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration. Furthermore, the policy document of the Proposed Project has several pedestrian safety goals including: P8, P23, P25, P58, P59, P64, P174, P190 through P197, P210, P214, and P215. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the

DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 9-31

- Suggest that objectives specifically address safety and operational improvements, especially at Bronson and 25th Street, and at 6th and 10th Avenues. (Red light running is very common at 6th Avenue. Drivers are uncertain as to the legal vehicle movements at the 6th Avenue dogleg intersection. They frequently make right turns despite the “No right turn on red on 7th at Adams.” Bus/car collisions occur at this intersection because of illegal turns.)

Response 9-31

This comment relates to the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. As such, no response is required. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 9-32

- Mid-block safety is a major concern in this residential area even with the crosswalk at 4th Avenue and West Adams. There is a bus stop at this location (4th Avenue). Several schools with hundreds of students are located on West Adams immediately to the east and west of Arlington. Turning movements from the Avenues onto West Adams is dangerous. Drivers on West Adams drive too fast. Drivers frequently ignore the time of day turn restrictions at Arlington and West Adams.

Response 9-32

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 9-33

Enhancing the pedestrian realm should explicitly address school zones, senior complexes, intersections and midblock safety.

Response 9-33

Refer to Response 9-30 regarding pedestrian safety programs included within the policy document of the Proposed Project. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088;15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 9-34

- The Plan should discourage through-traffic on neighborhood streets, and the use of neighborhood streets to avoid signalized intersections and/or as an alternative to West Adams Blvd.

Response 9-34

As a technical report, the TIMP (DEIR Appendix G) was utilized in the development of the Proposed Project and the Draft EIR. Page 29 of the TIMP identifies future, (currently unfunded) plans and strategies for residential neighborhood traffic management. As part of the proposed TIMP, an outreach/public participation program could be established to identify problems and develop and implement neighborhood traffic management plans. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

LETTER 10: JOYCE DILLARD

Comment 10-1

Alternative 1—No Project Alternative and Alternative 2—Proposed Project without Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) should not be listed as the Consolidated Plan is now tied to Transportation around TODs. If alternatives were chosen, you would eliminate any federal funding through most of the Consolidated Plan. This is false representation here.

Response 10-1

While Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are analyzed the Proposed Project is considered the preferred alternative for numerous reasons directly related to the fulfillment of the goals, objectives, policies and programs of the Proposed Project, such as the future transit-oriented funding opportunities. Refer to Response 1-12 regarding the alternatives analysis included in the Draft EIR.

Comment 10-2

Understated are the problems in Methane Zones. You state:

When structures are built on or near landfills or naturally occurring natural gas fields, methane gas can penetrate the buildings' interiors and expose occupants to significant levels of methane. Methane Zones and Methane Buffer Zones in the West Adams CPA are shown in Figure 4.8-2. As shown, the largest concentration of methane is located in the northeast portion of the West Adams CPA, primarily north of the I-10 Freeway and east of La Brea Avenue. Another concentration of methane occurs in the Baldwin Hills area in the west/central portion of the West Adams CPA. There are also several smaller pockets of methane dispersed throughout the central portion of the West Adams CPA.

This problem is more than landfill. It is unregulated fracking and out gassing. You have no testing of out gassing nor do you question fracking fluid and its impacts. Fault zones need to be laid over methane zones. Infrastructure needs to be analyzed for its age and condition. Any underground pipeline system needs to be analyzed for its safety. PHMSA has released information on Pipeline Safety Systems. May we refer you to Docket No. PHMSA-2011-0023-0001 Pipeline Safety: Safety of Gas Transmission Pipelines.

Response 10-2

The commenter has not provided substantial evidence to support claim that the Proposed Project will result in a significant impact on methane zones or the use of fracking and out gassing. Future development located within a defined Methane Hazard Zone would be subjected to the City of Los Angeles Methane Ordinance which requires compliance with the Methane Mitigation Standards in Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 91.7102, as described on pages 4.8-4 and 4.8-7 of the Draft EIR. Compliance with these mitigation standards would be ensured through direction and approval by the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety and Los Angeles City Fire Department.

Comment 10-3

Consequently Air Quality and Water Quality are affected. Will the area comply with the Air Quality State Implementation Plan for the South Coast Basin. What is the impact on TMDL Total Daily Maximum Loads and the pollutants into the Receiving Waters? How are Soils analyzed to show benefit by use of LID Low Impact Development.

Response 10-3

The commenter has not provided substantial evidence to support claim that the Proposed Project will result in a significant impact on air quality and water quality related to the Air Quality State Implementation Plan or the Total Daily Maximum Loads. Please refer to Draft EIR Section 4.3 Air Quality and Section 4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality for a detailed analysis of how implementation of the Proposed Project will impact air and water quality. The Draft EIR concluded that impacts related to air and water quality would be less than significant as all future development would be subject to applicable local, State, and federal regulations, standards, and requirements, enforced through the City’s plan approval and permit process. Additionally, as a condition of approval, “Active Change Area Projects” would be required to implement mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR to ensure that potentially significant air quality impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. The Proposed Project is consistent with the goals of the SCAQMD’s Air Quality Management Plan as the Proposed Project includes goals, policies, and programs which are intended to minimize vehicle miles traveled which would minimize air pollutant emissions.

Comment 10-4

What is the Watershed Management approach to other than stormwater. Will Beneficial Uses be affected in the Coastal Los Angeles Basin Plan.

Response 10-4

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR, but instead asks general questions related to storm water. Please refer to Draft EIR Section 4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality for a detailed analysis of how implementation of the Proposed Project would affect water quality. The Draft EIR concluded that implementation of the Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality as all future development in the West Adams CPA would be subject to applicable local, State, and federal regulations and requirements, enforced through the City’s plan approval and permit process, and the City takes a watershed-based approach to stormwater management designed to reduce flood hazards and manage stormwater pollution. Accordingly, implementation of the Proposed Project would not negatively affect beneficial uses designated by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board in their Basin Plan nor would it violate any water quality standards or discharge requirements.

Comment 10-5

Your population figures do not reflect USC expansion plans including increase in student population and the related impacts of density.

Response 10-5

Referring to FEIR Section 3.4 Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR, an updated discussion of Cumulative Impacts (Draft EIR Section 6.5) which includes a list of cumulative projects (Table 6.5-1) has been introduced. The USC Specific Plan, adopted in 2012, has been included into this list of cumulative projects. Since the USC Specific Plan is located outside the boundaries of the West Adams CPA, its increase in student population would not have been analyzed as part of the Proposed Project. Cumulative impacts associated with the student population and density of the USC Specific Plan would have been considered at the Planning Subregion level based on existing and potential development capacity.

LETTER 11: PLAINS EXPLORATION & PRODUCTION COMPANY

Comment 11-1

PXP has reviewed the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert New Community Plan (Plan) and the associated DEIR and respectfully submit the enclosed comments for the Department's consideration. With respect to our Inglewood Oil Field (IOF), PXP encourages the City to pay close attention to ensuring that the proposed Community Plan Update is consistent with the County of Los Angeles Baldwin Hills Community Standards District (CSD), and the associated Settlement Agreement which govern operations at the IOF. Additionally, the Plan boundaries include PXP's Las Cienegas production facility located at 3304 W. Washington Boulevard. PXP does not believe that the revised land use designation proposed in the draft plan for this facility is appropriate. As noted in our formal comments, we request that an appropriate land use designation and policies be applied to this property to ensure the future economic benefit of the land and existing and future operational feasibility.

Response 11-1

This comment contains introductory text and a request that the Proposed Project be consistent with the County of Los Angeles Baldwin Hills Community Standards District (CSD), and the associated Settlement Agreement which govern operations at the Inglewood Oil Field (IOF) and that the appropriate land use designation and policies be applied to properties where PXP facilities exist. This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 11-2

PXP operates the IOF, the majority of which is located in the Baldwin Hills unincorporated area of Los Angeles County (a small portion of the field is within the jurisdiction of the City of Culver City). The IOF has played an integral role in the history of oil production in the Los Angeles Basin and continues to be a steady source of domestic oil and natural gas. The IOF is the 2nd most productive oil field in the entire Los Angeles Basin.

With technological advancements in the oil and gas industry, PXP's professional engineers estimate that as much as 50% of the field's oil resources remain in place in producing zones and can be readily accessed through drilling and production activities. These resources will continue to ensure the IOF supplies Southern California's refineries with oil for decades to come, offsetting their need to import supplies from Venezuela and the Middle East.

As you know, the IOF is subject to the requirements of the county's CSD and associated Settlement Agreement, which together provide the most comprehensive, local regulations ever implemented for an oil field in California. The guidelines put forth in the CSD and Settlement Agreement are unique to the IOF and regulate nearly every aspect of the oil field's daily operations through 2028. The County of Los Angeles completed a comprehensive Environmental Impact Report on the CSD and then worked diligently with the community, other stakeholders and PXP to ensure its successful implementation. PXP has successfully operated under the terms of the CSD since its adoption in 2008 without incurring a single violation of the ordinance.

Through its adoption and eventual settlement of the litigation surrounding the ordinance, the CSD recognized and validated PXP's existing and future operational and development needs. The CSD established a rigid framework that regulates, yet allows new oil field development to occur. Given the extraordinary amount of effort that went in to establishing this long term regulatory framework, we believe it is essential and in the City's best interests to ensure the Community Plan Update is consistent with the CSD and Settlement

Agreement. As noted in our formal comments, we would also urge the City's Plan to recognize the significant number of studies that have been conducted as a requirement of the CSD and the ongoing monitoring that the ordinance requires on an annual basis.

Response 11-2

This comment, which relates to the history and background of the issue and the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project, is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 11-3

Finally, the draft Plan makes multiple references to future use of the IOF as a park. As noted in our formal comments, PXP believes any such reference or formal statements as to whether or not the oil field will be turned into a park are premature. There are a number of different families with ownership interests that comprise the IOF. Discussions about the future use of the land for anything other than oil production has a direct bearing on the property rights of these landowners and we urge the City to ensure that this fact is recognized in the Plan.

Response 11-3

The commenter asks that the Proposed Project make clear that the IOF will continue to operate as an oil production facility in the future. This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. While the concept of additional parkland in the Baldwin Hills is incorporated into the Proposed Project policy document, acquisition of land in the IOF is not identified in achieving this goal. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 11-4

PXP is also the operator for the Las Cienegas facility within the jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles and the boundaries of this Plan. The Plan re-designates this property from "commercial manufacturing" to "neighborhood commercial." Re-designating the land as "neighborhood commercial" is inconsistent with the existing use and operations and could negatively impact future operations if imposed. Accordingly, we request that this property retain its current designation or be re-designated with a more appropriate "industrial" designation.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of our comments. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Response 11-4

Based on review of Draft EIR Appendix B, the commenter is correct in stating that the Proposed Project proposes to change the General Plan land use designation of the Las Cienegas facility property, located at 3304 W. Washington Boulevard, from commercial manufacturing to neighborhood commercial. However, the proposed change will not impact the current petroleum related activities on-site because the existing Oil

Production Overlay "O" will remain in place pursuant to LAMC Section 13.01. In this regard, oil production and operations are first permitted within the Heavy Industrial M3 zone. There is no distinction between the Neighborhood Commercial C2 zone and Hybrid Industrial CM zone regarding this particular use.

Secondly, the commenter requests that the current designation be retained or a more appropriate industrial designation be proposed. These activities are permitted "by-right" first within the M3-Heavy Industrial Zone, which is not a zone which the existing Current Plan or the Proposed Project incorporates. Given the subject site's proximity to adjacent low-intensity residential uses as well as a newly constructed elementary school, the Proposed Project does not seek to rezone or change the General Plan land use of this originally commercial zoned block face to M3 Heavy Industrial. The existing "O" overlay designation should be sufficient to address any future needs regarding "oil" related activities on-site.

Finally, this comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 11-5

DEIR COMMENTS

1. Figure 4.4-1 and 4.4-2: The IOF is not within the City's jurisdiction; hence, the Biological Resource Area designation of the IOF is inappropriate and should be removed.

Response 11-6

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR. Draft EIR Figures 4.4-1 and 4.4-2 clearly define the boundaries of the West Adams CPA. The Biological Resource Area designation indicates that these areas contain open space and habitat for biological resources. This designation is not exclusive to the City of Los Angeles. For this reason, it is not inappropriate to identify Biological Resource Areas immediately adjacent to the CPA, although outside of the City of Los Angeles jurisdiction, for the purpose of illustrating where biological resources have been known to occur and could potentially affect the CPA. The inclusion of the IOF on these figures has no bearing on the IOF property as this is representative of existing conditions. Accordingly, these figures will not be removed or revised.

Comment 11-6

2. Figure 4.6-2: The IOF is not within the City's jurisdiction; hence, the inclusion of liquefaction areas on the IOF is inappropriate and should be removed.
3. Figure 4.6-3: The IOF is not within the City's jurisdiction; hence, the landslide zone designations on the IOF are inappropriate and should be removed.

Response 11-6

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR. Draft EIR Figures 4.6-2 and 4.6-3 clearly define the boundaries of the CPA. These figures were created using California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology seismic hazards GIS data that is applicable to the entire State of California, and not exclusively the City of Los Angeles. For this reason, it is not inappropriate to identify liquefaction areas and landslide zones immediately adjacent to the CPA, although outside of the City of Los Angeles jurisdiction, for the purpose of illustrating where seismic hazards have been known to occur and could potentially affect the CPA. The inclusion of the IOF on these figures

has no bearing on the IOF property as this is representative of existing condition. Accordingly, these figures will not be removed or revised.

Comment 11-7

4. Figure 4.8-2: The IOF is not within the City's jurisdiction; hence, the methane zone designations on the IOF are inappropriate and should be removed.
5. Page 4.8-20: The IOF is not within the City's jurisdiction; hence, the reference to Baldwin Hills in the text under "Methane Gas" should be deleted.

Response 11-7

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR. Draft EIR Figure 4.8-2 clearly defines the boundaries of the CPA. This figure was created using Los Angeles County GIS data that identifies methane zones and is applicable to the entire County, and not exclusively to the City of Los Angeles. For this reason, it is not inappropriate to identify methane zones immediately adjacent to the CPA, although outside of the City of Los Angeles jurisdiction, for the purpose of illustrating where methane zones occur and could potentially affect the CPA. The inclusion of the IOF on these figures has no bearing on the IOF property as this is representative of existing conditions. Accordingly, these figures will not be removed or revised.

The commenter refers to the following statement made on page 4.8-20 of the Draft EIR, "Another concentration of methane occurs in the Baldwin Hills area in the west/central portion of the West Adams CPA." This is an accurate statement based on Draft EIR Figure 4.8-2. For this reason, this statement will be retained in the Draft EIR.

Comment 11-8

6. Page 4.11-3: This text should be updated so it is consistent with the CSD and associated Settlement Agreement.

Response 11-8

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR. The EIR prepared for the CSD for portions of the IOF is referenced and the potential future development scenario analyzed in that EIR is described on Draft EIR page 4.11-3 under the heading State and Regional Mineral Resources in the Existing Setting portion of Section 4.11. This description is not untrue nor is it inconsistent with the terms of the Settlement Agreement referred to and provided by the commenter. For this reason, no revisions will be made to Draft EIR page 4.11-3 as requested. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 11-9

7. Figure 4.14-3: Move the #3 box out of the boundaries of the IOF and into Kenneth Hahn State Recreation Area. The IOF is not a part of the park nor is it scheduled to be.

Response 11-9

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR. As clearly indicated in Draft EIR Figure 4.14-3, the #3 box referred to by the commenter identifies the general location

of the Kenneth Hahn Recreation Area. The inclusion of this figure in the Draft EIR is meant to illustrate the general location of existing parks, recreation centers, and libraries in and adjacent to the CPA for the purpose of establishing existing conditions related to parks and recreation. This figure has no bearing on existing or future use of the IOF. Accordingly, these figures will not be removed or revised. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 11-10

8. Page 4.14-26, Table 4.14-13: The Kenneth Hahn State Recreation Area is listed as only 285.9 acres. In 1965, the Baldwin Hills Regional Park Plan was adopted, which identifies a future Baldwin Hills Regional Park of 230 acres. Note that the Kenneth Hahn State Recreation Area has already exceeded its planned size of 230 acres. Today it makes up approximately 380 acres including the ball and soccer fields area which are located at 5401 S. Fairfax Ave. Excluding the ball and soccer fields, the State Recreation Area currently encompasses 308 acres. Please update this table and associated analysis accordingly.

Response 11-10

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR. Based on review of the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) website, the Kenneth Hahn State Recreation Area is 338 acres.⁶ Refer to Final EIR Chapter 3.0, Corrections and Additions, for revisions made to the Draft EIR to reflect the acreage of the Kenneth Hahn State Recreation Area as recognized by the Los Angeles County DPR.

Comment 11-12

PLAN COMMENTS

9. Page 2-9: The Mia Lehrer drawing is inappropriate for inclusion into the Plan as it depicts the IOF as a park. The IOF is not a park, is not designated to be a park, and there are no plans in the foreseeable future to convert it into a park. A significant portion of the land within the boundaries of the IOF is privately owned by a number of different families. The various land owners have publicly and consistently stated their intention to protect their legal private property rights against any forced effort to convert their land in to a park. Given the private property rights at stake with this topic, we recommend that the drawing be removed from the Plan.

Response 11-12

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the Draft EIR. Instead, this comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the Draft EIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the Draft EIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15088;15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

⁶County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation, Development Division, written correspondence with Lee Barocas on February 27, 2013.

Comment 11-13

10. Figure 3-1: The Proposed General Plan Land Use Map designates PXP's Las Cienegas facility located at 3304 W. Washington Blvd. as "public facilities." Figure 5-5 further designates this site as "neighborhood commercial." In accordance with Figure 3-4 of the DEIR, the existing land use designation of this property is "commercial manufacturing." Re-designating the land as "neighborhood commercial" is inconsistent with the nature of the operation, and could negatively impact future operations if an incompatible designation is imposed by the City. Accordingly, we request that this property retain its current designation, or be designated into a more appropriate "industrial" land use designation.

Response 11-13

This comment has been made partially in error, no portion of the La Cienegas Facility is located on land proposed to be designated Public Facility. Refer to Response 11-4 above regarding the proposed change to the General Plan land use designation of the PXP Las Cienegas facility property, from commercial manufacturing to neighborhood commercial. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 11-14

11. Page 3-113: We urge the City to incorporate text to the Plan that identifies how successful the CSD has been in limiting impacts from operations at the IOF on the surrounding neighborhood. The L.A. County Department of Regional Planning can be a resource in this regard.

Response 11-15

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 11-16

12. Policy LU 74-1: The draft plan contains language advocating that additional studies be done for the IOF operations. The language ignores the fact that multiple studies have been conducted, and are done on an annual basis, as a result of the CSD and subsequent settlement agreement. We recommend the language be deleted or at a minimum refer explicitly to the corresponding provisions in the CSD and settlement agreement to avoid any redundancy or regulatory confusion.

Response 11-16

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis

and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 11-17

13. LU 74-2: The draft policy does not take into account the terms of the CSD Settlement Agreement PXP, L.A. County and a number of community stakeholder groups entered in to on July 15, 2011. A copy of the settlement agreement is attached for the City's reference. The Settlement Agreement includes measures that further restrict the number of wells that may be drilled per year (thereby satisfying sub policy A), augments DOGGR requirements on well plugs (wells abandoned at the IOF utilize a 150' well plug above and beyond the DOGGR required 25-foot surface plug), requires that a study be done of the electrical distribution facilities within the IOF boundaries (which satisfies sub-policy D), and accelerated implementation of the Landscape Plans (satisfying sub-policy E). Furthermore, the CSD itself requires compliance with a site specific Habitat Restoration and Revegetation plan (providing compliance with sub-policy F). Finally, it should be noted that the CSD contains provisions that require the county to conduct a review of existing oil field operations when production falls below a designated threshold. The CSD also establishes a "Multiple Agency Coordination Committee" (MACC) which provides a forum for all the various regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over the IOF to coordinate regulatory activities and share observations. Since the CSD covers these provisions, language in the City's draft plan is redundant and could potentially create conflicting standards. We recommend the language in the draft plan that relates to "end date for drilling" and establishment of additional coordinating committees be deleted or, at a minimum, refer explicitly to the corresponding provisions in the CSD.

Response 11-17

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

LETTER 12: SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT (SCAQMD)

Comment 12-1

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. The following comment is intended to provide guidance to the lead agency and should be incorporated into the Final Environmental Impact Report (Draft or Final EIR) as appropriate.

The AQMD appreciates that the lead agency reviewed the California Air Resources Board's (CARB's) Air Quality Land Use Handbook: A Community Perspective (Handbook), and that the lead agency has utilized some of the guidance offered by the CARB Handbook on siting incompatible land uses and "sensitive land uses" (e.g., residences, parks, schools and medical facilities) to mitigate the project's significant air quality impacts. Specifically, the lead agency incorporated mitigation measure (MM) AQ-2 to minimize potentially significant health risk impacts to new sensitive land uses placed within 500 feet of the I-10 Freeway. However, the AQMD staff is concerned that MM AQ-2 does not provide sufficient measures to avoid potentially significant air quality impacts resulting from industrial land uses in the plan area. Specifically, MM AQ-2 does not address potentially significant air quality impacts that may result from the placement of sensitive receptors next to industrial land uses that could emit elevated levels of TAC's. Therefore, the AQMD staff recommends that the lead agency provide additional mitigation that precludes the establishment of sensitive land uses within the CARB recommended buffers to avoid significant air quality impacts. Further, the lead agency should consider additional mitigation measures to minimize the project's significant construction-related air quality impacts and greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts pursuant to Section 15126.4 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. Details regarding these comments are attached to this letter.

Response 12-1

In light of the 2015 decision by the California Supreme Court in *CBIA v. BAAQMD*, these types of impacts related to impacts on the project or users/residents of the project from the existing environment are not CEQA impacts, absent finding the project is exacerbating the existing environmental condition. The City is not aware of any evidence that would demonstrate that the project siting the SCAQMD would exacerbate environmental conditions such that they would impact users and residents. As such, these issues are land use issues not CEQA issues. The City recently amended the LAMC to require ASHRAE Standard 52.2 MERV 13 air filtration systems in new buildings located within 1,000 feet of a freeway. The MERV filtration is a legal regulatory requirement. Additionally, many of the industrial land uses identified in the Handbook exist intermittently, if at all, within the West Adams CPA. Even fewer of these industrial land uses are located adjacent to areas where "active" changes will be made. The land use compatibility of future development as it relates to toxic air contaminants will be assessed on a case-by-case basis as a land use matter, absent evidence that future development is exacerbating an existing environmental condition.

Comment 12-2

Siting Criteria and Future Project Planning

1. The AQMD staff recognizes the Proposed Project potentially provides regional air quality benefits by increasing residential densities near employment and transportation centers. However, the Proposed Project is a mixed use overlay zone that also includes zone changes for select areas that will result in the placement of residential uses in close proximity to industrial zones: This future juxtaposition may expose local residents to potentially significant sources of emissions.

The AQMD staff appreciates that the lead agency has reviewed the CARB Air Quality and Land Use Handbook¹ and that the lead agency has utilized the guidance offered by the handbook on siting incompatible land uses and "sensitive land uses" near high traffic freeways (e.g., the I-10 Freeway) to develop MM AQ-2. However, the AQMD staff is concerned that MM AQ-2 does not provide sufficient measures to avoid potential significant air quality impacts from toxic air contaminants (TAC's) resulting

from industrial land uses such as local chrome platers. Specifically, MM AQ-2 does not address potentially significant air quality impacts that may result from the placement of sensitive receptors next to industrial land uses that could emit elevated levels of TAC's. Therefore, the AQMD staff recommends that the lead agency provide additional mitigation that precludes the establishment of sensitive land uses within all applicable CARB recommended buffers to avoid additional significant air quality impacts.

Response 12-2

Refer to Response 12-1. Additionally, the West Adams CPIO District includes environmental standards that would reduce TAC exposure, such as requiring air intakes to be located as far from the freeways as possible.

Comment 12-3

Further, the AQMD staff recommends that the lead agency provide additional discussion in the Final EIR that addresses potential proximity issues such as odor impacts to future sensitive land uses from industrial activity in the plan area. The AQMD staff recognizes that the lead agency has determined that the project will not emit significant odors as discussed on page 4.3-18 of the Draft EIR; however, the AQMD staff recommends that the lead agency expand this discussion to include potential inward impacts to future sensitive land uses from industrial activity in the plan area.

Response 12-3

According to the SCAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, land uses and industrial operations that are associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies and fiberglass molding. The West Adams CPA, and specifically the Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan change areas where "Active Changes" will be made, do not include many of these land uses. There are industrial land uses with chemical processes that may generate odors. However, at this point analyzing a community plan update it is speculative to determine where or if those impacts will occur. The compatibility of proposed development with adjacent odor-generating land uses will be assessed by City staff on a case-by-case level.

Comment 12-4

Construction Equipment Mitigation Measures

2. Given that the lead agency's regional construction and operational air quality analysis demonstrates that the criteria pollutant emissions exceed the AQMD's daily significance thresholds for NO_x, VOC, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, the AQMD recommends that the lead agency consider adding the following mitigation measure to further reduce air quality impacts from the project, if feasible:
 - Require the use of 2010 and newer diesel haul trucks (e.g., material delivery trucks and soil import/export) and if the lead agency determines that 2010 model year or newer diesel trucks cannot be obtained the lead agency shall use trucks that meet EPA 2007 model year NO_x emissions requirements.
 - Provide temporary traffic controls such as a flag person, during all phases of construction to maintain smooth traffic flow.
 - Provide dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on- and off-site.
 - Reroute construction trucks away from congested streets or sensitive receptor areas.
 - Appoint a construction relations officer to act as a community liaison concerning on-site construction activity including resolution of issues related to PM₁₀ generation.
 - Improve traffic flow by signal synchronization, and ensure that all vehicles and equipment will be properly tuned and maintained according to manufacturers' specifications.

Response 12-4

In response to this comment, Mitigation Measure **AQ1** has been revised to include the SCAQMD recommendations as follows:

AQ1 ~~As a condition of approval for any~~ Any approval of a Discretionary project or “Active Change Area Project”, as defined in Section 3.4 of the Project Description, ~~the City shall ensure that require~~ all contractors ~~to include~~ the following best management practices in contract specifications:

- Use properly tuned and maintained equipment.
- Contractors shall enforce the idling limit of five minutes as set forth in the California Code of Regulations.
- Use diesel-fueled construction equipment to be retrofitted with after treatment products (e.g. engine catalyts) to the extent they are readily available and feasible.
- Use heavy duty diesel-fueled equipment that uses low NO_x diesel fuel to the extent it is readily available and feasible.
- Use construction equipment that uses low polluting fuels (i.e. compressed natural gas, liquid petroleum gas, and unleaded gasoline) to the extent available and feasible.
- Maintain construction equipment in good operating condition to minimize air pollutants.
- ~~All diesel-powered construction equipment shall meet US Environmental Protection Agency Tier 2 or higher emissions standards according to the following schedule:~~
 - ~~— **January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2014:** All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower shall meet Tier 3 off-road emissions standards. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) devices certified by California Air Resource Board (CARB). Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations.~~
 - **Post-January 1, 2015:** All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower shall meet the Tier 4 emission standards, where available. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with Best Available Control Technologies ~~BACT~~ devices certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations.
- Construction contractors shall use electricity from power poles rather than temporary gasoline or diesel power generators, as feasible.
- Use building materials, paints, sealants, mechanical equipment, and other materials that yield low air pollutants and are nontoxic.
- Construction contractors shall utilize super-compliant architectural coatings as defined by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (VOC standard of less than ten grams per liter).
- Construction contractors shall utilize materials that do not require painting, as feasible.
- Construction contractors shall use pre-painted construction materials, as feasible.
- Construction contractors shall provide temporary traffic controls such as a flag person, during all phases of construction to maintain smooth traffic flow.
- Construction contractors shall provide dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on- and off-site. as feasible.
- Construction contractors shall reroute construction trucks away from congested streets or sensitive receptor areas. as feasible.
- Construction contractors shall appoint a construction relations officer to act as a community liaison concerning on-site construction activity including resolution of issues related to PM₁₀ generation.

Comment 12-5

3. The Draft EIR demonstrates that the Proposed Project will exceed the lead agency’s GHG significance threshold; therefore, the AQMD staff recommends that the lead agency provide the following additional mitigation measures pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4.

Response 12-5

The SCAQMD recommends additional mitigation measures to reduce project-specific GHG emission. The City’s GreenLA program is designed to reduce City-wide GHG emissions by 35 percent from 1990 levels by 2030. To achieve this goal, the City published an implementation document titled “ClimateLA”. ClimateLA presents the existing GHG inventory for the City, includes enforceable GHG reduction requirements, provides mechanisms to monitor and evaluate progress, and includes mechanisms that allow the plan to be revised in order to meet targets. To achieve GHG reductions, the City has developed strategies that focus on energy, water use, transportation, land use, waste, open space and greening, and economic factors. To reduce emissions from energy usage, ClimateLA proposes the following goals: increase the amount of renewable energy provided by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power; present a comprehensive set of green building policies to guide and support private sector development; reduce energy consumed by City facilities and utilize solar heating where applicable; and help citizens to use less energy. With regard to waste, ClimateLA sets the goal of reducing or recycling 70 percent of trash by 2015. With regard to open space and greening, ClimateLA includes the following goals: create 35 new parks; revitalize the Los Angeles River to create open space opportunities; plant one million trees throughout the City; identify opportunities to “daylight” streams; identify promising locations for stormwater infiltration to recharge groundwater aquifers; and collaborate with schools to create more parks in neighborhoods.

The City adopted an ordinance to establish a green building program in April 2008. The ordinance establishes green building requirements for projects involving 50 or more dwelling units. The Green Building Program was established to reduce the use of natural resources, create healthier living environments and minimize the negative impacts of development on local, regional, and global ecosystems. The program addresses the following five areas:

- Site: location, site planning, landscaping, storm water management, construction and demolition recycling
- Water Efficiency: efficient fixtures, wastewater reuse, and efficient irrigation
- Energy and Atmosphere: energy efficiency, and clean/renewable energy
- Materials and Resources: materials reuse, efficient building systems, and use of recycled and rapidly renewable materials
- Indoor Environmental Quality: improved indoor air quality, increased natural lighting, and thermal comfort/control

Future development within the West Adams CPA will comply with the City’s ClimateLA document and the Green Building Program that include many of the strategies to reduce GHG emissions identified through this letter. Refer to Chapter 3 Corrections and Additions of this Final EIR for revisions to the Mitigation Measure **GHG1** which incorporates Operational Mitigation Measures identified in this letter.

Comment 12-6

Additional Operational Mitigation Measures - Energy Efficiency

- Maximize use of solar energy including solar panels; installing the maximum possible number of solar energy arrays on the building roofs and/or on the Project site to generate solar energy for the facility.

- Require all lighting fixtures, including signage, to be state-of-the art and energy efficient, and require that new traffic signals have light-emitting diode (LED) bulbs and require that light fixtures be energy efficient compact fluorescent and/or LED light bulbs. Where feasible use solar powered lighting.
- Use light colored paving and roofing materials.
- Use passive heating, natural cooling, solar hot water systems, and reduced pavement.
- Limit the hours of operation of outdoor lighting.
- Utilizing only Energy Star heating, cooling, and lighting devices, and appliances.
- Install light colored “cool” roofs and cool pavements.
- Use electric appliances (e.g. stoves) and gardening equipment.

Response 12-6

Refer to Response 12-5.

Comment 12-7

Additional Operational Mitigation Measures - Transportation

- Provide electric car charging stations for tenants beyond the requirements of the Los Angeles Green Building Code Ordinance. Also, provide designated areas for parking of zero emission vehicles (ZEVs) for car-sharing programs.
- Provide incentives to encourage public transportation and carpooling at commercial locations.
- Implement a rideshare program for employees at commercial site.
- Construct bicycle facility improvements, such as bicycle trails linking the facility to designated bicycle commuting routes or on-site improvements such as bicycle paths, bicycle parking facilities, etc.
- Require the use of 2010 diesel trucks, or alternatively fueled, delivery trucks (e.g., food, retail and vendor supply delivery trucks) at commercial sites.
- Provide an alternative fueling station for delivery trucks (e.g., natural gas or electric).
- Create local “light vehicle” networks, such as neighborhood electric vehicle (NEV) systems.
- Require the use of electric or alternative fueled maintenance vehicles at commercial facilities and multifamily residences.

Response 12-7

Refer to Response 12-5.

Comment 12-8

Additional Operational Mitigation Measures - Other

- Provide outlets for electric and propane barbecues in multi-family residential and recreational areas.
- Require use of electric lawn mowers and leaf blowers.
- Require use of electric or alternatively fueled sweepers with HEPA filters.
- Require use of water-based or low VOC cleaning products at commercial sites.

Response 12-8

Refer to Response 12-5.

LETTER 13: SCOTT A. GINSBURG

Comment 13-1

As provided for in the proposed West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan, I would like to comment on the proposed amendments to the Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan. Specifically, as it pertains to the area between Coliseum Street and 39th Street on Crenshaw Boulevard in Los Angeles, CA. This area is designated as Community Commercial. The area is improved as commercial and is a mix of uses. The area directly east of the property is designated as “Low Medium II” Multi-family density.

The proposed zoning for the properties identified as 1310 and 1320 on the map in the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert New Community Plan Draft EIR, Appendix B should be revised. The area is located within walking distance of the existing Exposition Light-Rail station at Crenshaw Blvd & Exposition Blvd and will be located within walking distance of the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor station at Crenshaw Blvd and Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. This means that the property will be within walking distance of two light-rail stations and two light-rail lines providing direct access to Downtown Los Angeles, LAX, Santa Monica, USC and beyond. It is currently the home to many jobs and community serving businesses. The area will also be home to many new businesses as the transit corridors are completed. The proposed zoning is not consistent with a property on a major commercial corridor that benefits from so many direct transit lines.

I would like for you to consider the following revisions to the Proposed Project:

1. The existing zoning is [Q] C2-1 and [Q]P-1 providing for densities of 1.5:1 and 3:1. The proposed zoning provides for a 45’ height limit and 1.5:1 FAR on the entire area effectively “down zoning” the properties. I request that a zoning designation providing for a 48’ height limit and 1.5:1, 2:1 FAR (Mixed Use) or greater be considered for the properties designated as 1310 and 1320.
2. Properties designated at 1310 and 1320 are included in Sub-Area B but are within walking distance of Metro stops in Sub-Area B and Sub-Area A. I would like to see the property included in the Transit Oriented Development Area for either Sub-Area.

Please consider the comments and proposed revisions to the plan. If necessary, I can provide additional comment or meet in person to discuss the importance of considering these revisions.

Response 13-1

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required. (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15088;15204(e)) Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

LETTER 14: WALTER MARKS

Comment 14-1

I am a commercial property owner within the CPIO district and have read the October 12, 2012 draft document. I believe most all of the provisions set forth in the CPIO are well crafted and thorough. I believe this overlay plan is precisely what it needed for current and future property owners and businesses to use as their compass in the years to come for a transit district around the existing Expo Light Rail station.

As the owner of the Helms Bakery Building, I offer my suggestions as modifications to the document, and not in order of priority.

1. Subarea C, frontage along the north side of Venice Boulevard, I suggest that the C Subarea extend 90 feet into the current residential Subarea. I believe the development of commercial lots with 100 feet of depth are difficult, if not impossible, to enhance simply due to the shallow lot depth. There are 5 blocks along the north side of Venice Boulevard that make up the C Subarea. We own 2 of them. In one block we already own the 'next' 90 feet, two residential lots, and with an approved CUP its use is for commercial parking for the Bakery. We are in the process of ownership of the same 90 feet on another block.

When complete, we would represent 40% of the C Subarea.

- a. Since one of the goals of the draft document is to build predictability with the overlay, streamlining the otherwise lengthy CUP and other type zoning administration process, this larger C Subarea achieves the objective.
 - b. A 'right sized' future mixed use or commercial development in 190' of depth will create the proper scale and proportion for the neighborhood, without being inappropriate in mass to the adjacent residential.
 - c. Parking will remain a constant neighborhood concern, focused on ingress and egress avoiding impacts on the residential community. This adjustment in lot size will ensure better traffic flow and circulation away from the residential area and thus make a better commercial project.
2. Subarea B, designated for the Helms Bakery, has the seemingly fair proposed FAR number, 2:1. However, I suggest Subarea B should have the permitted height of 55-75ft and Section 7.1.2 (Tower Building Height) adjustment matching Subarea A. There remains a possibility that a tower like structure could be constructed in the future while maintaining the historic presence and facade of the Bakery. The limiting factor of the stated FAR will ensure the proper scale and setback from the street edge.
 3. The language in Section 7.3.3 (Pedestrian Oriented Ground Floor) should include text mandating the all ground floor uses must be retail in nature. Currently stated as, "commercial uses ", would include office uses. All too often, I have seen office placed on the ground floor resulting in a detriment for the rhythm of the street. It's like having a few missing teeth in a smile.
 - a. Please add text stating only retail uses shall be permitted on the ground floor of any new development and consider language to phase in future turnover from existing office use to retail use in all existing structures, say 5 years.
 4. I believe the proposed area of the Subarea C should include the frontage on both sides of Venice Boulevard, east of Hutchison to Cattaraugus Avenue. I understand these two extra blocks of Venice Boulevard, east of the proposed CPIO, may be a bit further from the TOD, but there is a cadence and natural segmenting with Venice. Cattaraugus Avenue, with a traffic signal, completes a natural length or phase of Venice Boulevard and this extension would feel right with the aesthetic flow for future development.

5. The transfer of area rights (7.2.1 (c)) is forward thinking device for this CPIO. However, the potential properties in this one district are limited in number. Though not something that can be mandated in this document, if language was included to suggest future adjoining Community Plans, namely Palms-Mar Vista and West Los Angeles, would be encouraged to promote and permit the sharing of transfer of area rights between adjoining Community Plans within a 1/4 mile of the TOD.

Response 14-1

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

The goals and policies of the Proposed Project strive to maintain the integrity of the West Adams CPA's residential neighborhoods while promoting the creation of feasible development sites (See Policy LU16-2 of the Plan Text, Appendix H). To this end, while the Proposed Project's policies encourage consolidation and deepening of lots in order to create more feasible development parcels, implementation of development standards within the Proposed Project's TODs and Commercial Corridor subareas do not encroach into established residential neighborhoods, but rather include development standards such as transitional height that conserve residential neighborhoods, also consistent with the Proposed Project's policies. The CPIO regulations applied to Subareas C and E of the Venice/National TOD are consistent with these policies, as generally applied to all other TOD areas.

LETTER 15: WEST ADAMS HERITAGE ASSOCIATION

Comment 15-1

The West Adams Heritage Association (WAHA) is comprised of over 350 households in the West Adams District, which is partially contained within this Community Plan boundary. We routinely comment on land use applications and environmental documents on behalf of the Association members. We offer the following comments on the DEIR referenced above, focused most specifically on its Historic Preservation Chapter and the related sections in the proposed New Community Plan for the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert planning area.

First of all, we agree with many of the assessments contained in a letter submitted by the local neighborhood council, United Neighborhoods of the Historic Arlington Heights, West Adams and Jefferson Park Communities Neighborhood Council (UNNC). WAHA is a stakeholder organization to UNNC. In particular, we agree with UNNC's evaluations related to population and housing data, and we join UNNC in protesting the sheer volume of additional housing unit capacity being promoted for this Community Plan area. Adding 20,000 housing units capacity will lead to endless debate, and protests over proposed developments when they impact historical and period character neighborhoods – which essentially make up the entire West Adams District portion of this Community Plan area.

WAHA is pleased with the majority of the Historic Preservation elements contained in the Plan itself and the DEIR. Thank you for including significant mitigations for designated and identified historic resources.

Response 15-1

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR. Instead, this comment contains introductory text and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, elements of this comment will be addressed in the responses that follow and the comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 15-2

We would make a quick note, on page 3-110 of the Plan, LU72-1 “Partner with Preservation Organizations,” that presumably you meant to reference West Adams Heritage Association rather than (or in addition to) “West Adams Avenues,” a local neighborhood group.

Response 15-2

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR. Instead, this comment is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR, and although a response is not required, this change has been incorporated into the Policy Document of the Proposed Project and the comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 15-3

On the same page, LU72-2, “Promote Incentive Programs,” WAHA would urge you to consider adding the phrase “Identify and” Promote Incentive Programs. One of the key issues in historic preservation is providing benefits to the owners of historical properties; at every step the City should be cognizant that we all need to identify and/or create new incentives to benefit these owners.

Response 15-3

The commenter makes no specific comment on the environmental conclusions of the DEIR. Instead, this comment is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR, and although a response is not required, this change has been incorporated into the Policy Document of the Proposed Project and the comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 15-4

Regarding Survey LA, WAHA is generally pleased at the extent of the historic resources surveyed and the positive evaluations/identifications of literally hundreds of previously (officially) unidentified historic resources within the West Adams District. Of course, we had previously identified many of these, through our tours and our members' efforts, but Survey LA has revealed surprises throughout our community. Thank you.

Our primary concern, however, after reviewing the Plan, the DEIR, and the Survey LA document that is appended to the DEIR, is a disconnect (versus a nexus) between the Survey LA recommendations for Arlington Heights and the Plan's recommendations for the same specific community (bounded by Pico on the north, Arlington on the east, the 10 Freeway on the south and Crenshaw on the north.) This is the historical Arlington Heights Township, established in 1887 (its original boundaries extended to Adams Boulevard before the freeway was constructed.) It is a discrete neighborhood.

The Survey LA evaluators have identified ten individual historic districts comprised of 593 total residential (and a few commercial) buildings within Arlington Heights, out of a total of 1,065 evaluated buildings (in other words, well over half the buildings in Arlington Heights are contained within the boundaries of historic districts; of those, 450 have been identified as "Contributors," although what a Contributor is in this instance has not been defined within this document.). In addition, some 37 individual structures have also been identified as being individually eligible for designation within Arlington Heights' boundaries. And, there are an additional handful of actual designated buildings within the same boundaries. There may be a few more (such as the Bekins/Public Storage Building on the corner of Pico and Crenshaw) that are identified as historical in the Community Redevelopment Agency's Mid City Corridors Project Area in Arlington Heights – which was surveyed for historical structures but which appears not to have been included within Survey LA.

So it would seem on its face that the neighborhood as a whole should be identified as an HPOZ, and indeed the New Community Plan has identified it thusly (page 3-108.) Unfortunately, Survey LA has stated that Arlington Heights should be a "Planning Area" rather than an HPOZ. WAHA respectfully disagrees with this assessment as:

- * Not being borne out in facts (no numbers have been presented; the calculations above were done by us.)
- * Based on incorrect evaluations (on 4th Avenue alone, between Washington and Pico, which was not identified as one of the ten pocket historic districts, WAHA has identified 63 Contributors and Contributors-Altered utilizing HPOZ criteria, exclusive of properties identified in Survey LA as individual resources. WAHA's members include Qualified Historians with professional expertise.)
- * Assertive remarks (e.g. this recommendation) are not based on factual (revealed) documentation; in fact, the methodology description indicates that the "missing" structures were not even "recorded."
- * If they were recorded, the data has not been presented and we respectfully request copies of each of the evaluation sheets in order to determine whether or not the evaluations are based on HPOZ criteria (versus somewhat stricter California Register criteria, which reject most alterations).

In general, the assessment of Arlington Heights does not appear to take into consideration Contributor-Altered structures as required by standard HPOZ criteria. Arlington Heights should not be singled out for different treatment than every other HPOZ within the Historic West Adams District. These criteria – without having an extensive discussion within the arena of a DEIR comment letter – include a review of reversibility; historical context on an individual case-by-case basis; and specifically whether or not the individual building's original fenestrations (window openings), window and door trim, fascia boards, eaves and roof lines, and porch elements (among other elements) are still present and sufficiently intact to convey "integrity."

Unfortunately, the Survey LA evaluators may have used "window change-outs" (based on the comment on page 728) as a singular reason to exclude certain residential structures from inclusion as Contributors. With all due respect, that is a misapplication of criteria. In an HPOZ, these properties (if that is the only change)

would fall into the category of Contributor-Altered, and hence would indeed contribute to the locally-designated district (albeit perhaps not a California Register or National Register District.)

Specifically, Survey LA states that Arlington Heights has “few visual intrusions” and that “Arlington Heights is a significant concentration of residential development related to the location of historic streetcar routes.” This statement, positive as it is, was made in the absence of an evaluation of Washington Boulevard, which unfortunately was not conducted due to the CM zoning on the corridor. Had Survey LA actually also evaluated Washington Boulevard, the team would have realized that the portion of Washington Boulevard that stretches from Arlington to 7th Avenue was one of the City’s premier shopping districts in the 1920s through World War II, spurred by the development of the streetcar. This added layer of history would help elevate Arlington Heights to a recommendation from Survey LA to be an HPOZ.

In any case, WAHA believes that a sufficient number of historic residences are retained in Arlington Heights to properly identify this neighborhood as a whole as an HPOZ. We ask that the recommendation be changed.

If it is not, then the DEIR does not provide mitigations to the significant impacts that may result from over-density development in a community that has no zoning protections. What is the point of having more than half of a neighborhood’s residential structures within the boundaries of identified historic districts while not providing any overlay protections (height, setbacks, massing, roof lines, restrictions on stucco and window changes, sheer size of infill structures, and so on)? As presented, the New Community Plan shows Low Medium II for Arlington Heights and the RD1.5 and RD2 zones primarily, which permit the consolidation of lots and very large new structures potentially intruding into a neighborhood which thus far – according to Survey LA – does not currently have many such intrusions. RD zoning also permits lesser front yard setbacks than would be required in an HPOZ, which defines “prevailing setback” on a street-by-street basis.

There is certainly adequate basis in our review that calls in question the entire analysis of Survey LA as it relates to Arlington Heights. When experts disagree, CEQA demands that the decision makers err on the side of significance. We request that you do so.

Response 15-4

The Policy Document of the Proposed Project recognizes its historical significance and potential for future preservation and/ or conservation. In an effort to protect historically significant districts and structures, the Policy Document of the Proposed Project includes Policy LU70-1 which calls for the continued progress in historic district designation, as well as the maintenance and rehabilitation of structures of historic significance in the Arlington Heights neighborhood. To promote retention and enhancement of the unique character of the single-family neighborhoods in the CPA, including the Arlington Heights neighborhood, the Proposed Project includes both single- and multi-family residential design guidelines. These guidelines, beginning on page 3-3 of the Policy Document, relate to neighborhood compatibility, site design, streets and setbacks, size and scale, design and detail, and a number of other topics. Compliance with proposed design guidelines, identified through Policy LU2-2, would serve to protect historically significant neighborhoods, regardless of their historical status as dictated by SurveyLA.

Furthermore, under the Proposed Project, changes to zoning that reduce the allowable height and density are proposed for several “character” residential neighborhoods throughout the CPA. Although Active Changes to the Arlington Heights neighborhood are limited to a height district change from 1 to 1XL (from unlimited height to 30 feet) for a portion of the neighborhood, additional neighborhood conservation protections are proposed for the area consistent with the CPC’s February 11, 2016 action (See FEIR Appendix H and responses to Comment Letter 6). This modification to the Proposed Project will result in the adoption of a Character Residential CPIO Subarea for the Arlington Heights neighborhood that will address many of the concerns regarding lot consolidation, bulk and height of new construction enumerated through this comment.

LETTER 16: COMMUNITY HEALTH COUNCILS

Comment 16-1

Community Health Councils (CHC) gratefully recognizes that the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park New Community Plan (NCP) is a product of the hard work of a team of outstanding planners at the City and input from hundreds of residents. While the new plan includes many provisions that will enhance the quality of life for South LA residents, it falls short in addressing the overconcentration of fast food restaurants, prioritizing the development of new park space, enforcing efforts to make the community more pedestrian, transit and bike-friendly, and establishing safeguards to protect the character of our communities. As a result, CHC strongly recommends the adoption of land-use policies that address the aforementioned concerns and better ensure that the NCP effectively achieves its stated vision of making the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park community *"a model of health and sustainability through careful enhancement of the natural and built environment."*

For more than a decade, Community Health Council (CHC) has been at the forefront of work to eliminate health disparities by expanding healthcare coverage, increasing access to quality healthcare, physical activity and improving healthy food options in under-resourced communities. CHC engages, supports, and gives voice to marginalized, low-income and under-served populations through coalition building and community mobilization. Our dynamic network of coalitions is composed of neighborhood leaders, consumer advocates, healthcare providers, social services, educational and faith-based organizations serving communities in South Los Angeles. These stakeholders recognize the impact of the built environment on the health of individuals and communities, and identify the community plan update as a powerful mechanism to encourage healthy and sustainable development throughout the community.

While we gratefully recognize the City of Los Angeles' commendable work in updating the area's significantly outdated Community Plan, the following improvements must be made to truly mitigate disparities in the health, economic viability, safety and general welfare of the community:

Response 16-1

This comment contains introductory and summary text and relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 16-2

HEALTHY FOOD ACCESS

More than 71% of restaurants in South LA are fast food in comparison to 40% in West Los Angeles and 47.7% of LA County restaurants. The LA Department of City Planning has determined that South LA's disproportionate fast food restaurant over-concentration "has the effect of reducing the opportunities for new grocery stores and full service restaurants in a dense, urbanized neighborhood where land is limited." In 2008, the City responded to community concerns by adopting an Interim Control Ordinance (ICO) that placed a moratorium on the development of new "free -standing" fast food restaurants within ½ mile of an existing fast food restaurant. The temporary ICO was incorporated into a General Plan Amendment in 2010 that was intended to preserve the limited land available for development in South LA for healthier alternatives. Since the 2008 Interim Control Ordinance on fast food development, 6 new grocery stores have developed in the area while only 1 new stand-alone fast food restaurant has developed.

Despite the success of the policy, the West Adams New Community Plan excludes the CD 10 portion of the Plan Area and allows for the continued proliferation of fast food restaurants. This exempted region not only encompasses well over half of the West Adams Community Plan's geographic area, but it also contains some of the highest density areas within the community plan region. In fact, 2008 population estimates reveal that

the CD 10 portion of the West Adams Community Plan area contains approximately 143,750 people. This includes close to 80% of the community plan area's total population which would become more vulnerable to the negative health, aesthetic, and air quality impacts associated with continued fast food restaurant development;. Therefore, it is clear that the CD 10 exemption will significantly undermine the positive impacts of current regulations on curbing fast food restaurant development in the region. The exemption once again subjects a significant portion of the area's limited land to the potential development of auto-centrally designed fast food restaurants.

Based upon the aesthetic qualities of the West Adams community as defined by principles contained in the Los Angeles General Plan, Draft West Adams Community Plan, and West Adams Community Plan 2008 Scoping meeting comments- the continued over-concentration of auto-centric free standing fast food restaurants (perpetuated by the CD 10 exemption) is incompatible with the community's aesthetic values around pedestrian orientation and smart growth-oriented design. Furthermore, South Coast AQMD findings reveal that fast food restaurants generate significantly more vehicular trips than most other retail establishments of the same size. This greater quantity of vehicular trips can have significant impacts on the respiratory health of the West Adams community- particularly children, pregnant mothers and seniors.

Findings from CHC's soon-to-be published South LA Fast Food Health Impact Assessment (HIA) reveal specific details about the incompatibility of most stand-alone fast food restaurants with efforts to promote more pedestrian orientation. Results from the Fast Food HIA's survey of all fast food restaurants with in the 90008 zip code reveal that drive-thru windows are only present at free-standing fast food restaurants. Drive-thru windows are only utilized by automobiles and are subsequently considered to have "excessive automobile orientation" by urban planning standards. Additional findings from the South LA Fast Food HIA restaurant survey reveal that all drive-thru lane exits and/or entrances intersect with pedestrian sidewalks throughout the surveyed area.

A 2006 report from the Los Angeles City Department of Transportation states that 13 of every 100,000 deaths in South LA result from pedestrian collisions" This is over twice the amount of deaths due to pedestrian collisions in West LA, which amount to almost 6 per 100,000. Furthermore, these estimates may be conservative due to the recent resurgence in bicycle usage and other active forms of transit in both South LA and throughout the City. Numerous factors could contribute to the higher rates of pedestrian collisions in South LA including South LA's higher concentration of alcohol outlets, high population density, car biased design, and limited infrastructure for multi-modal transit. However, myriad studies reveal that auto-centric designs and a lack of pedestrian-oriented infrastructure contribute to increased pedestrian injury risk in communities.

Other transit research concludes that marked crosswalks in uncontrolled intersections, for example those without traffic lights or signs, have been associated with higher rates of pedestrian injuries as well. Fast Food HIA survey results reveal that over 44% of the drive-thru windows at fast food restaurants intersect with a marked pedestrian crossing. However, none of the drive-thru windows analyzed contained signs indicating a potential pedestrian crossing. Therefore, these pedestrian pathways may be more vulnerable to pedestrian injuries and should thus be deemed as "pedestrian unfriendly". Based upon the aforementioned evidence, the typically auto-centric typology of stand-alone fast food restaurants could have negative implications on the pedestrian-friendly design of the community and ultimately the aesthetic characteristics of the area.

The LA Department of City Planning also asserts that South LA's current "over concentration of Fast Food Establishments is found to be inconsistent with the respective Community Plans". Glendale/Burbank Light Rail." The CD-10 exemption from fast food limitations allows for the continued proliferation of fast food development in a significant portion of the West Adams community.

Recommendations: To alleviate inconsistencies with the existing General Plan Framework around promoting health and wellness and greater commercial diversity in the community, we suggest the elimination of the CD 10 exemption from the West Adams New Community Plan. Specifically, eliminate

geographic exemptions for the Council District 10 area of the West Adams Community Plan Area from fast food density regulations as provided in:

- Commercial Corridor and Nodes CPIO Table 6.1, row 9; and
- The Crenshaw Specific Plan "Limited Uses" section c subsection ii (a).

Furthermore, ¼ mile density boundaries within the Community Plan Implementation Overlay's Transit Oriented Districts (including Farmdale/LaBrea, Jefferson/LaCienega and Venice/National CPIO Districts) should be extended to a ½ mile to ensure greater consistency throughout the plan and with existing fast food density regulations as provided in the 2010 General Plan Amendment.

Response 16-2

Refer to Response 2-2. The Proposed Project no longer includes a proposal for a fast food exemption in CD 10 as discussed in Comment 2-1. Therefore, the commenter's arguments related to impacts and analysis required by the policy proposal are no longer relevant.

Comment 16-3

RESIDENTIAL, CULTURAL AND COMMERCIAL CHARACTER

The West Adams New Community Plan incorporates Transit-Oriented Development (TOD). Although this form of development is beneficial for promoting healthy, active transportation that can benefit a community, without the proper safeguards it can also result in the displacement of historical populations. According to a recent study, -newly transit rich neighborhoods "often experience-unintended consequences in which core transit users-such as renters and low income households-are priced out in favor of higher-income [households]." Both small business owners and homeowners can fall victim to displacement. More safeguards that protect the community from residential and commercial displacement should be integrated within the plan.

Recommendations: Preserve the existing cultural character of the West Adams, Leimert Park, Baldwin Hills and Hyde Park communities by establishing safeguards against both residential and commercial displacement. In addition to proposing inclusionary housing requirements (P158) and small business loans (P246), the plan should propose other targeted policy programs addressing displacement, including:

- Establishment of a housing linkage fee (e.g. Central City West Specific Plan, Los Angeles Housing Element policy 1.1.S) for the New Community Plan area (equal to or greater than any future citywide linkage fee).
- Requirement that any new development will not result in the net loss of affordable housing units (based on current HCD standards for Los Angeles County) within the New Community Plan area.
- Requirement that current tenants, housing co-operatives and affordable housing developers are given first right-of-refusal on the sale of any multi-family housing properties in the New Community Plan area (e.g. Tennant Opportunity to Purchase Act- Washington, DC, Los Angeles Housing Element policy 1.2.5).
- Making a portion of the proposed zoning envelope conditional upon the provision of a percentage of affordable units (based on current HCD standards for Los Angeles County) in perpetuity (e.g. Cornfield Arroyo Seco Specific Plan).

Response 16-3

This comment is directed towards the policies of the Proposed Project and is not a comment regarding the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or

conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration. Refer also to Master Response 4 regarding the displacement and affordable housing.

Comment 16-4

TRANSPORTATION ACCESS

The communities in South Los Angeles such as those within the West Adams/Baldwin Hills/Leimert Park CPA are experiencing a resurgence of public investment in light rail yet continue to suffer from decades of neglect and divestment to support other active modes of transit. A well designed network of light rail, bus and bicycle facilities, and pedestrian amenities provides better access to essential services, supports those dependent on public transportation, and increases the frequency of physical activity and economic vitality of local businesses. Walkable and bikeable neighborhoods encourage residents to shop at locally owned business and create a more vibrant livable community.

The West Adams New Community Plan establishes a number of policies and programs in the Mobility Chapter of the plan that support increased access to all modes of transportation for community residents. However, a disconnect exists between the strategies outlined in the Community Plan and the policies contained in the plan's implementation mechanisms.

Although the establishment of Integrated Mobility Hubs is recommended at several TOD areas within the West Adams CPA, there is no reference as to how these Mobility Hubs will be created. Additionally, new development projects will be required to provide pedestrian amenity areas as part of their project review within the individual CPIO sub-districts as well as the amended Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan. However, in the CPIO, pedestrian amenities areas are only referenced when it comes to the amount of required setback and does not require specific pedestrian amenities. To ensure improved connectivity to vital public services for the community's most vulnerable populations, stronger and more enforceable mobility-related policies should be included in the plan.

Recommendations: Ensure that the policies and programs addressing bicycle facilities, pedestrian amenities, complete streets, mobility hubs, access to transit and pedestrian/bicycle safety set forth in the Mobility Chapter of the New Community Plan are adequately implemented through: (1) greater coordination amongst the policies' responsible agencies (as identified in the Plan's Implementation Program Table); (2) more enforceable mobility policies in the Plan's Implementation Program Table provisions; and (3) more enforceable policies in the plan's CPIO provisions. These goals can be enforced through the adoption of the following strategies:

- Incorporate language that calls forth goals, deadlines and the creation of a LADOT, Metro, DCP coordination committee that will institute the Mobility Hubs (see Program number 41: *Integrated Mobility Hubs* (Mobility Chapter, Policy Section reference M5-2 page 4-16).
- Ensure that maps detailing bicycle priority streets (see Mobility Chapter Figure 4-4 pg. 4-15), and pedestrian priority streets (Mobility Chapter Figure 4-3 pg. 4-11) are publically vetted and adopted along with the community plan.
- Incorporate specific pedestrian amenity area requirements within the CPIOs (see Program number 64: *Private Investment for Off-site Facilities/Amenities* (Mobility Chapter, Policy Section reference M1-4 page 4-9 and Program 193: *Pedestrian Amenities CPIO Areas* (Mobility Chapter, Policy Section reference M3-3 page 4-10).

Response 16-4

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 16-5

OPEN-SPACE RESOURCES

Numerous studies have documented the inequity in open/recreational space in communities of color in Los Angeles. A 2009 Department of Recreation and Parks Needs Assessment concluded that the City lacks the appropriate levels of neighborhood and community parks that are close to homes and that *parks are not equitably distributed*. Strikingly, residents in the West Adams Plan Area have access to only 0.48 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents while city residents outside of the plan area have access to 5.62 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. Additionally, residents countywide have access to 75.2 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents; much of which either exists far outside of the West Adams Plan Area or is only available to Plan Area residents by vehicle or transit. Lack of access to open space and parks limits opportunities to be physically active and contributes to the current health crisis in South Los Angeles. Sadly, the current generation of children is the first that will not live longer than their parents due to obesity, diabetes, and preventable chronic disease.

Aside from the health benefits that open space provides, it provides essential environmental, social, and aesthetic benefits to communities. As evidenced by other areas in Los Angeles, open space enhances property values, increases local revenue, and can be a strong driver of local economic development.

Additionally, open space can serve as central walking, resting, and meeting places that can revive failing or threatened commercial areas. Finally, providing open space is one of the quickest and most effective ways to build a sense of community and improve quality of life.

Realizing these diverse opportunities, the New Community Plan does provide recommendations to provide policies and programs to address the stark disparities in open space access; however, the implementation of these programs and policies leaves many pressing issues unresolved. Furthermore as previously commented, the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the West Adams Community Plan determines that the new plan will have Significant negative impacts on access to open space due to projected increases in population and housing growth yet provides no mitigation recommendations. Despite these unsubstantiated findings, efforts must be made to address the West Adams community's inequitable access to parks and open space must be components of more comprehensive initiatives to improve connectivity between open space resources throughout the City including the creation of a Park and Tree Master Plan and strict incorporation of new open space into future development.

Recommendations: To alleviate significant park service shortages in the Community Plan Area and prioritize the allocation of new park space in areas of high need, the need for greening, creation of open space, and recreational opportunities the Plan's Implementation Program should integrate commitments pursuant to the Mayor's Memorandum of Understanding for the Space Shuttle Endeavor Move Project to create a Park Master Plan for the Plan Area by December 31, 2014 shall be included in the following implementation programs: P46 (CF8-1), P57 (CF12-2), P163 (CF6-1, CF6-2, CF9-5), P164 (CF10-1), P.183 (CF8-2, CF8-3, CF9-1, CF9-2, CF9-7, CF10-2, CF11-1, CF11-2, CF11-3, CF11-4, CF12-2, CF13-3), P218 (CF12-3). Additionally, CF15-2, a policy to inventory potential community garden sites should be added to Needs Assessment Strategies identified in P183.

In addition, the following recommendations will strengthen the plan's aim to provide increased quality open space consistent with the Open Space Element of the General Plan and Public Recreation Plan:

- *Policy LU18-3* recommends design standards for over-concentrated uses; however, these design standards do not differ from standards applied to accepted uses in the CPIO and Crenshaw Corridor Specific Plan. In granting requests to modify, expand, or continue the use of existing prohibited or limited uses, the minimum requirements for landscaping, pedestrian orientation, and open space must be raised to 1) encourage the development of acceptable uses in place of limited uses; 2) provide enhanced community design standards in exchange for limited use approval.
- *Policy LU29-2* encourages or requires all new building construction to incorporate green roofs and encourage conversions of existing roof space to green roofs. However, the policy's implementation through the Program Implementation Table (P36) and CPIO fails to identify criteria for cases in which green roofs are encouraged or required. As of now, the CPIO implementation of the policy only allows for increasing building height in cases where a green roof is installed. No language requiring green roofs is present in the current implementation scheme and must be clarified.
- *Policy LU30-1* responds to community concerns around blight, vacancy, and blight by allowing neighborhood serving uses to cluster and adaptively reuse existing structures within neighborhood. It is unclear how these structures and properties are to comply with open space and lot coverage requirements set forth in the CPIO and Crenshaw Specific Plan.

CHC recommends applying requirements consistent with proposed CPIO and Crenshaw Specific Plan provisions.

- *Policy LU31-1* aims to ensure that a mix of uses that serve the daily needs of adjacent areas occur within neighborhood commercial districts in order to encourage walkability. As of the date of this letter, Design Standards for the Crenshaw Specific Plan have not been released. As such, it is difficult to comment on community access to "daily needs," of which includes the access to quality open and green space and other opportunities for physical activity.
- *Policies M3-5, M4-S, and CF12-4* aim to increase physical activity opportunities for the community by the provision of more bike and pedestrian networks. However, the policies fail to address pedestrian accessibility and are implemented through programs and policies only related to bicycle facility improvements. Expand definition and implementation to effect pedestrian and open space through the modification and or addition to the following implementation programs: P123, P221, P222, P223, P224.
- *Policy CF8-1* aims to preserve, maintain, and enhance existing recreational facilities and park space. However, the Implementation Program (P46) does little to actively accomplish the spirit of the policy. The implementation of the policy should reflect effort to expand park space as the DEIR has noted that population growth will further strain existing facilities.
- Joint-use agreements can rapidly scale up open space service shortages in the West Adams Plan Area. Consistent with the goals and policies of the Plan, amend the following policies to reflect tangible opportunity for providing increased access to green space in the area:
 - *Policy CF10-1*: Aside from LAUSD and RAP facilities, encourage the development of joint-use agreements with other City of Los Angeles Departments including the General Services Department, Department of Water and Power, and the Department of Transportation as per Public Recreation Plan Policy.
 - *Goal M11-1*: Encourage interim-use agreements and joint-use agreements to form with city-owned parking lots to allow to increased opportunities for recreation and physical activity.
 - *Policy CF15-1*: Encourage joint-use agreements with currently vacant city-owned property for the development of community gardens.

- *Policy CF12-3* requires development at major opportunity sites to provide public open space per the Quimby Act. However, it is unclear what the plan refers to as a "major opportunity site" and if requirements for developments at these sites would be enhanced above current Quimby Act provisions.
- *Policy CF16-3* encourages urban greening through the implementation of Million Trees LA. However, programs, policies, and guidelines exist to further green the West Adams Plan Area including those in the LA County Design Manual for Living Streets and Downtown Design Guidelines. The plan should leverage existing best practices to implement urban greening policies.

No Implementation Programs are associated with the following policies: *CF9-4*, *CF9-8*, *CF12-5*. Assign policies to implementation program to fully realize the plan's intention of increasing accessibility to open space.

- *CPIO Recommendation: CPIO Recommendation:* To fully realize the purpose outlined in Section 3 of the CPIO to provide access to open space for the health and welfare of the community, the plan must define what constitutes publically accessible open space. Publicly accessible open space must be accessible to all community members regardless of ability and must be clearly indicated as public space. The definition also must establish criteria for minimum standards to promote not only access to open space, but green space as well per the Open Space Element. Finally, edible gardens in-line with the plan policies should be regarded as publically accessible open space.
- *Corridors & Nodes CPIO Sub-district-* Currently, there is no open space coverage requirement along corridors and nodes in the CPIO. Furthermore, no exemptions or incentives for public space are granted in lot coverage requirements. These omissions run counter to the CPIO's purpose outlined in Section 3, sub-sections 3.2, 3.3, 3.6, 3.7, 3.9 and by results gathered in the scoping phase of the New Community Plan. The Corridors & Nodes CPIO should address this inconsistency similar to provisions found in other CPIOs that 1) allow the lot coverage requirement to be further decreased to a maximum of 20% through adjustment by introducing one square foot of open space for each square foot decrease in lot coverage in excess of 10% and 2) requiring projects on a lot size equal or greater than 15,000 square feet to be developed to maintain at least 20% open space areas as publically accessible open space.
- *Jefferson/La Cienega CPIO Sub-district-* Policy B.2.1.F. in the Streetscape, Mobility, and Open Space Provision Chapter calls for open space to be generally located internal to sites and accessible from corridors via mid-block passages or paseos. Locating open space internal to sites may give the impression that the "publicly-accessible open space" is in fact, not publicly accessible. Furthermore, locating open space internal to sites runs counter to complete street design standards and pedestrian orientation. CHC recommends adding language to encourage discretionary review of the placement of required open space to better provide accessible open space to the community.
- *La Brea/Farmdale CPIO Sub-district-* Policy 7.3.1.0. allows for adjustment of lot coverage through the introduction of open space. However, this adjustment is only allowed in subarea "A" which is a small proportion of the greater Sub-district. Expanding the adjustment to other appropriate sub-areas allows the CPIO Sub-district to better realize the purpose identified in Section 3, sub-section 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 3.7.
 - *Policy B.1.1.A* aims to require project on a lot size equal or greater than 15,000 square feet should be developed to maintain at least 20% open space areas as publically accessible open space. To enable this requirement, remove the word, "should" and replace with "will" or "shall"
 - *Policy 8.1.1.F:* Consistent with recommendation provided for Jefferson/La Cienega CPIO Sub-district Policy 8.2.1.F, encourage discretionary guidance to be provided when evaluating open-space internal or external to sites.
- *Hyde Park CPIO Sub-district-* To make consistent with purposes outlined in Section 3, subsection 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7, the Hyde Park CPIO Sub-district shall integrate lot coverage and publically accessible open space requirements on developments in appropriate sub-areas.
- *Crenshaw Specific Plan-* At this time, no recommendations can be offered as the requisite design standards and use-limitations have not yet been released. As such, CHC calls on the Department to offer

another opportunity for public understanding and comment after an appropriate amount of time has passed after the re lease of the Design Guidelines and Standards Manual and List of Additional Uses Permitted in Leimert Park.

Response 16-5

Refer to Master Response 5 regarding impacts resulting from adoption of the Proposed Project related to parks and open space impacts. CPIO subareas that contain open space provisions, whether required or recommended, may be utilized when conditioning a discretionary project approval, such as through the Area Planning Commission’s review and approval of a CPIO Exception application. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 16-6

CONCLUSION

Health and economic equity are too important to be left to market forces. The public sector has a responsibility to ensure fair access to healthy foods, equitable housing/business opportunities, multi-modal accessibility, and physical activity resources in underserved communities. Policymakers must lay the groundwork to increase opportunities for improving these resources in our City's most vulnerable communities. We encourage the city to adopt policies that incorporate each of the aforementioned strategies into the future vision for development in the neighborhoods of the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park region, and ultimately the entire South Los Angeles community.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this letter, and/or our proposed policy recommendations please feel free to contact Policy Analysts Breanna Morrison or Mark Glasscock at 323.295.9372.

Thank you for your consideration and interest in this important matter.

Response 16-6

This comment concludes the letter and does not include any comments related to the Draft EIR. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

LETTER 17: UNITED NEIGHBORHOODS OF THE HISTORIC ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, WEST ADAMS AND JEFFERSON PARK COMMUNITIES NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL

Comment 17-1

The United Neighborhoods of the Historic Arlington Heights, West Adams and Jefferson Park Communities Neighborhood Council (UNNC) has voted to express its Concerns and present to you nearly a dozen initiatives regarding the proposed West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan. Although there are some very positive elements in the proposed Plan, as currently presented UNNC does not fully support it.

UNNC considered this matter at a regularly scheduled and publicly-noticed Governing Board meeting held on Thursday, January 3, 2013. UNNC's Planning and Zoning Committee, with many community stakeholders present, had met previously several times with Planning Department representatives, and UNNC Board representatives also participated in meetings with the Planning Department at least six years ago specifically to address the future of Washington Boulevard and UNNC's own initiatives to create a Specific Plan.

UNNC's Governing Board first had a discussion about some broad issues, in particular what appears to be a failure to "conserve character neighborhoods," and as well the conflicting population numbers utilized in the Draft EIR, in the proposed Community Plan, and the 2010 Census versus the 2000 Census and its projections in 2004 and 2008.

After the discussion immediately below, we will present UNNC's specific motions.

Response 17-1

This comment contains introductory text and summarizes the intent of the comment letter overall. As this comment does not identify specific issues with environmental analysis or conclusions in the Draft EIR, a response is not required. Refer to responses provided below that address specific comments made in this letter.

Comment 17-2

Regarding Population Figures: The West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan and the corresponding Draft EIR use population projections that we can't reconcile with SCAG provided information or 2010 Census results. The actual pace of growth in California was 2.6% from 2000 to 2010, which was slower than projected. However, the Department of City Planning is using 2008 numbers (projected from the Year 2000 Census) that do not reflect 2010 Census results that show the previous population forecast was too high by 277,000. As a result, it seems possible that capacity and/or density in excess of what is required by actual and forecast population projections is being incorporated in the plan.

A December 2008 Planning Department memo by then-Deputy Director John Dugan specified that the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan would be allocated 5% of the overall population growth assigned to the City of Los Angeles by SCAG. In addition, the current West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan draft forecasts a population increase of 19.8% by 2030. (n.b. Table 2-3 shows a 2008 population of 182,600 and a 2030 forecast of 218,741 for West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert.)

If one takes the 2030 forecast of 218,741 and subtracts the 2008 population of 182,600, the result is a forecast population increase of 36,141 for this Community Plan area. If one then takes the recommended John Dugan figure that 5% is the maximum fair share of city wide growth for this Community Plan area to absorb, that would imply a city wide population increase forecast of 722,820. (calculation: $36,141 / 0.05$). We would like assurances about whether allocation of city wide growth assigned to this Community Plan is in fact at 5% or under of current forecast growth as recommended by the John Dugan memo.

Response 17-2

Referring to Master Baseline Response 1, the existing population and housing conditions described in the Draft EIR reflect 2008 conditions and not 2010 Census conditions. The Draft EIR, published in 2012, acknowledges on page 4.13-6 the release of the 2010 Census population statistics prior to the completion and release of the Draft EIR, but clarifies that the data does not change the outcomes of the analysis which utilizes a Base Year 2008 estimate. As the NOP was published in 2008, it is acceptable under CEQA that the Draft EIR uses 2008 conditions to represent baseline conditions for purposes of determining significant impacts. There is no requirement that an EIR must use a year other than the year the NOP was published to represent baseline conditions, regardless of time passed. Refer to FEIR Section 3.2 Supplemental Analysis, regarding 2010 population and housing conditions, for further discussion.

SCAG projected through its 2004 RTP that the population of the West Adams CPA will grow to 201,220 residents in 2030 creating demand for an estimated 79,074 dwelling units. DCP adjusted this projection based primarily on the transit-oriented land use recommendations of the Proposed Project to reflect a future population estimate for the West Adams CPA of 218,741 residents in 2030, creating demand for an estimated 86,118 dwelling units. The housing and population capacity proposed under the NCP is intended to accommodate adjusted SCAG 2030 housing and population projections for the West Adams CPA. State Government Code (Section 65300-65303.4) does not require that Proposed Project capacity cannot exceed SCAG Projections. Refer to Appendix M Methodology, for further discussion.

Refer to Response 6-3 regarding housing growth that could be experienced in the West Adams CPA under the Proposed Project. Under the Proposed Project, growth occurring in the West Adams CPA would account for approximately 8 percent and 11 percent of projected citywide housing and population growth, respectively, between 2008 and 2030. In consideration of the transit rich nature of the CPA, higher projected growth for the West Adams CPA is consistent with the City's growth policies. Furthermore, the West Adams CPA would not assume an unfair percentage of projected growth since ongoing DCP analysis indicates that approximately 5 percent of the City's overall population will continue to reside in the CPA.

Comment 17-3

*** Regarding Character Neighborhoods:** One of the city's policies (Framework Element) is to conserve character neighborhoods. An equally important adopted policy (Housing Element) is that all new housing capacity is to be on our commercial corridors. In order to "conserve" character neighborhoods in the general West Adams District (this Community Plan area as well as the adjacent South Los Angeles Community Plan area), the Department of City Planning has said for MANY years that it would transfer density to the corridors (adopted Figueroa Corridor GPA; adopted Neighborhood Stabilization Ordinance; adopted Housing Element; etc.)

The West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan does add a lot of housing capacity on the corridors in the form of mixed use. However, it does not downzone existing character neighborhoods, particularly those that have zoning intensity higher than the actual use.

In the December 22, 2008 memo from John Dugan, with the subject "Final Community Plan population Projections for 2030," page two states that "Staff is encouraged to maintain existing capacity and to shift capacity when necessary (e.g., downzone a residential area, make up the capacity by allowing mixed use on a major corridor)."

The West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan goal is to add capacity for at least 19,703 dwellings. (n.b., Table 2-3 shows 66,415 units as built in 2008, with this plan accommodating growth to at least capacity of 86, 118 by 2030. The phrase "at least" is appropriate because the city reportedly uses a "mid-point method" and not maximum possible zoning capacity as the target, per the John Dugan memo establishing the criteria for this project.)

Response 17-3

Referring to the Appendix M, Methodology, a “mid-point” methodology is applied instead of the maximum possible due to several factors that render a 100 percent build-out scenario infeasible. Since one of the primary goals of the Proposed Project is commercial revitalization, and with an annual growth rate less than 2%, the Proposed Project recommends additional population capacity above the regional MPO projections in order to incentivize revitalization of strategic opportunity sites located in proximity to transit. Toward shifting excess capacity away from residential neighborhoods, conservation and preservation of historic “character” neighborhoods is recommended through the study of new HPOZs and/or other neighborhood conservation related overlays such as CPIOs which are a feature of the Proposed Project and activated through immediate and future implementation programs.

Comment 17-4

*** Further Comment on Residential Neighborhoods:** UNNC discussed the fact that the Department also did not evaluate most of the residential pocket neighborhoods. Reportedly this was because there was not enough budget to fully examine the current uses in the context of the current zoning and/or Community Plan designations. However, given that this Plan is to be the governing document for all land use decisions for the next two decades, it seems inappropriate to isolate residential neighborhoods, within UNNC's boundaries and indeed through the Community Plan, and not include them in the evaluations or recommendations – particularly since at least some of the current Plan designations and zoning designations appear to have been amended since the last public community-wide Plan Revision process in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Numerous of our UNNC stakeholders have commented that they were not aware of, and had not been notified about, any update process a decade later, in the early 2000s.

Furthermore, concerns were stated that the RD zoning, in and of itself, is problematic in certain character neighborhoods since it allows for the joining of lots/parcels, and thus massing of new structures that are often over-bulked in comparison to the neighborhood and its surrounding residential structures. This discussion was also previously had with Department staff.

Response 17-4

This comment relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.

Comment 17-5

UNNC RECOMMENDATIONS/MOTIONS

- 1). Transfer of density
 - A. Community Plans need to evaluate existing residential neighborhoods to identify those that are zoned for higher capacity than currently built, and residential neighborhoods that are zoned with excess capacity should be downzoned to a capacity that accurately reflects existing use and/or a zoning that conserves the character of the existing neighborhood.
 - B. Whereas the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan adds extensive mixed use to the Corridors and Transit Oriented Districts, sufficient new capacity has been added to meet growth projections after downzoning residential neighborhoods. UNNC notes that this is in accordance with advice given to staff in the December 22, 2008 memo from John Dugan, Deputy Director of City Planning.

- 2). The area bounded by Montclair on the north and Jefferson Blvd on the south; and Crenshaw on the west and Edgehill on the east (aka west Jefferson Park), should be substantially downzoned to R2 to match the predominant existing single-family and duplex use (and built form). Where higher density already exists, we recommend the lowest feasible density RD zone.
- 3). Whereas substantial portions of Arlington Heights have eligible historic resources, UNNC adopts the position that the Planning Department should address zoning in Arlington Heights by (i) creating numbered subareas; (ii) creating the subareas in units of half-blocks split on the rear property lines, when appropriate, so that both sides of the same street can have the same zoning; and (iii) evaluating each subarea for appropriate zoning (but not spot zoning). Appropriate zoning should be as low as possible based on current use and building form, with no more than 1/3rd of parcels out of line with the adjusted zoning.
- 4). Community Plans (i) should use the latest available Census results where Census results are used for estimating population and dwelling baselines and projections and (ii) should disclose in detailed footnotes or appendices how population and dwelling forecasts are derived, as well as how existing population and dwelling capacity numbers are derived, including data sources and calculation methodology. UNNC further adopts the position that the *West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan* should have no more than 5% of projected city wide growth allocated to that plan area, per the December 22, 2008 memo by John Dugan, Deputy Director of City Planning.
- 5). Community Plans should mitigate cut-through traffic resulting from ingress and egress of mixed use and commercial parking by requiring that traffic entering or exiting alleys or side streets adjacent to residential areas shall be guided by requiring such exits to have signage and traffic management features such as bump-outs that encourage traffic to flow to and from the nearest major boulevard, and thereby discourage traffic from cutting through residential neighborhoods. An appropriate goal should be added to Chapter 4.2 Mobility: Parking Management as well as a corresponding Implementation in the Commercial Corridors and Nodes CPIO.

DISCUSSION: Without such a requirement in the Plan itself, it may not be technically or legally possible to require such mitigations on new developments proposed for the commercial corridors, based on instructions the City Attorney has given to the Department of City Planning relative to such proposed mitigations on prior projects. UNNC wishes to avoid such problems in the future by simply making this initiative a part of the Community Plan.

- 6). Community Plans for the UNNC area should be reviewed to include zoning that stimulates creation of quality jobs in the appropriate commercial and industrial corridors, in order to create a better housing and job balance. DISCUSSION: It was brought to our attention by stakeholders that the Community Plan adds housing but doesn't seem to offer appropriate additional incentives that would create new employment locations commensurate with the projected population increase.
- 7). UNNC supports a second Public Hearing for West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Park Community Plan Update. UNNC wishes to emphasize that not all documents for the Community Plan Update were timely released for review.
- 8). The limitation against closely spaced Free Standing Fast Food restaurants should apply to Council District 10, by striking the exception for CD10 in the Commercial Corridor and Nodes CPIO Table 6:1, row 9 as shown here "~~All corridors and nodes except for those located in CD-10.~~"

DISCUSSION: According to studies, standalone fast food restaurants take away scarce land that can be used for higher and better purposes. For example, grocery store developers have said that a barrier to grocery store development in South LA is a lack of available land. A ban has been passed since 2007 on closely spaced standalone fast food restaurants in South LA. Seven new grocery stores have been developed since 2007, which while not a provable result of the ban, is a positive correlation. For reasons not made clear, the new West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan exempts Council District 10 from these regulations. UNNC voted to eliminate the exemption.

- 9). The Planning Department should ensure that the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan policies and programs addressing (i) bicycle facilities, (ii) pedestrian amenities, (iii) complete streets, (iv) mobility hubs, (v) access to transit; and (vi) pedestrian/bicycle safety that are set forth in the Mobility Chapter of the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan are more strongly enforced by (i) responsible agencies, (ii) the Plan's Implementation Program Table; and (iii) CPIOs. UNNC also recommends that Community Plans adopt sensible bicycle priority streets, pedestrian priority streets and pedestrian amenity plans.
- 10). Whereas there is a need to alleviate significant park service shortages in the Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert region, as well as the need for greening, creation of open space, and recreational opportunities, UNNC recommends that the Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan prioritize the allocation of new open space in areas of high need by incorporating within the Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan the commitment under the Mayor's Memorandum of Understanding for the Space Shuttle Endeavour Move Project to create a Park Master Plan for the Plan Area by December 31, 2014.

DISCUSSION: Open space and people-to-park ratios in South L.A. are much lower than elsewhere in the county, at 0.48 acres per 1,000 records, vs. 75.2 acres per resident throughout the county. Moreover, the majority of the park space in the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan is in the Kenneth Hahn Park in Baldwin Hills.

- 11). Whereas as of January 3, 2013, Appendix B: Washington Boulevard Design Guidelines of the Commercial Corridors and Major Intersection Nodes Subdistrict CPIO has not yet been made available to the public, UNNC reiterates to the Planning Department that UNNC has previously developed and endorsed a Washington Boulevard Specific Plan proposal that UNNC would like to have substantively implemented by the Community Plans (both West Adams and South Los Angeles).
- 12). The Community Plan should support libraries by exploring adaptive re-use of existing buildings, including the original and vacant Washington Irving Library at 1803 S. Arlington, and exploring creative solutions to create places for the community to access and share knowledge, including public access to libraries in schools and placing libraries in other community spaces.

Response 17-5

This comment summarizes earlier specific comments and generally relates to the approaches taken in developing the Proposed Project and is not directed towards the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Refer to Responses 2-2, 6-2 through 6-9, 6-11 through 6-26, 6-28 through 6-36, as well as responses 15-2 through 15-4, and 17-2 through 17-3, including references, for further detail. The commenter provides no specific comment on the environmental conclusions in the DEIR and provides no substantial evidence supporting the need for different analysis or conclusions from those in the DEIR. Therefore, there is no basis for additional analysis and no further response is required (CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15088; 15204(e)). Although a response is not required, this comment will be forwarded to decision makers for their consideration.