III. Responses to Comments (Continued)
Comment Letter No. 293

Deborah Lehman, MD  
Clinical Director, Pediatric Infectious Diseases  
Cedars-Sinai Medical Center  
8700 Beverly Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA  90048

Comment No. 293-1

As a member of The Archer School for Girls’ Board of Trustees, and a close neighbor, I believe that the Archer Forward Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan is necessary to ensure the school’s future success. I am writing to request your support for our project.

Archer has committed itself to being a good neighbor since the school moved to its current location on Sunset Boulevard in 1999. As specified by our CUP, Archer requires at least 50% of its students to carpool, which is much more stringent than any other school in the area, including Brentwood School and Saint Martin of Tours. Last year, roughly 80% of our students took the bus to school every day. As a result, we are responsible for only a small percentage of the traffic in the area. Archer works hard to find any avenues that would reduce additional traffic to an already congested area.

As a parent of an Archer graduate as well as a current student I can personally attest to the value of this school as an institution for girls all over the city. Our girls deserve a school with facilities comparable to other independent schools in the area. As a parent and a neighbor I can confirm Archer’s strict adherence to its CUP and applaud the school for being a leader with respect to traffic regulation in the area.

As you may recall, we have met or exceeded the requirements set forth in our CUP at every review. We intend to continue to hold ourselves to the same standard during the public review process through construction activities and beyond. We will reach out to every community organization and household who would like to hear about our project. Our goal is to answer all questions and concerns, and of course, to secure support. This project is a thoughtful plan that will fill a critical need for onsite athletics, academic, arts, recreational facilities, and more efficient on-campus parking.

We hope you’ll agree that Archer Forward is the best plan for our school and community. Your support of our efforts throughout the public review process would be greatly appreciated.
We hope you will agree that Archer Forward is the best plan for our school and for our community. Your support of our efforts throughout the public review process would be greatly appreciated.

**Response to Comment No. 293-1**

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 294

Mara Lenkov
4924 Agnes Ave.
Valley Village, CA  91607

Comment No. 294-1

I am the parent of an Archer girl and I am writing because I am a strong supporter of The
Archer School for Girls and it’s proposed plan, Archer Forward. I am requesting that you
and Council member Bonin work closely with Archer and help the school secure approval
for this well thought out plan.

Archer Forward both enhances the school and respects Archer’s location in residential
Brentwood. The design was created to buffer the community while creating more green
and beauty in the neighborhood. It is sustainable and creates an all-pedestrian campus,
with parking underground. The plan has already been modified several times at the
request of our neighbors, and we are continuing to meet with the community to ensure the
best plan.

Archer is a valuable institution in Los Angeles. Girls are taught to be good citizens and
leaders, and are involved in community service throughout the city. The Archer Forward
plan will provide deeply needed arts and athletic facilities as well as preserving the
beautiful, historic building. It’s a plan that works for both the School and the Community,
and I hope that the city will support it. The girls of Archer give so much back to the
community—I think it is time for the City to give back to them as well.

Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 294-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be
forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 295

Laurie Lerner
3626 Mandeville Canyon Rd.
Los Angeles, CA  90049-1024

Comment No. 295-1

I am writing you to ask that you veto, or at the very least support the alternative plan to The Archer School massive expansion plan.

Response to Comment No. 295-1

This introductory comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. The commenter does not provide a description of the alternative plan that could be considered. Refer to Topical Response No. 14, Residential Neighbors’ Proposed Alternative, for a detailed response to the alternative proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 295-2

As a resident of Mandeville Canyon for the past 15 years, I have seen traffic going East on Sunset and San Vicente Blvd. from Bundy Dr. increase to the point where I either have to take side streets (when possible—which it is not when going to the 405 Hwy.), or spend up to a half hour—or more if there is construction or an accident—to just get from Bundy to Barrington or the 405, or just turn around and not go to my local stores, restaurants, bank, etc. In fact the traffic has gotten so bad that it sometimes is stalled almost all the way to Mandeville Canyon itself.

As I am sure you probably know by now, the report from the Department of Transportation indicated that Archer’s proposed project will create SIGNIFICANT impacts on both Bundy Drive and Sunset, Barrington Ave. and Sunset, Wilshire, and Montana, as well as Barrington Place and Sunset, which CANNOT be physically mitigated. The consequences of this is truly a nightmare for those of us who live in this wonderful area.

Response to Comment No. 295-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to decision-makers for review and consideration.
Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

**Comment No. 295-3**

I think it is also very unfair for all of us who live here to have to suffer because the Archer School is choosing to renege on their agreement with the Brentwood Homeowners Association, neighbors and the City who put in place restrictions (made 15 years ago when they came here). Their new proposal has no commitment to keep the existing use restrictions in place.

**Response to Comment No. 295-3**

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 295-4**

PLEASE HELP!

Let the City and Councilman Mike Bonin know you do not support the proposed Archer Forward plan.

A number of my neighbors support an alternative plan that reduces the size and scope of the proposed project as well as traffic and puts less burden on the neighborhood. I myself would prefer it be vetoed in entirety but if not, I definitely support their alternative plan over the terrible Archer Forward Plan.
Response to Comment No. 295-4

In response to comments, the Project has been refined, including reducing the square footage and massing, width, and length of some of the proposed buildings, reducing the number of parking spaces, and creating expanded landscape buffers. Refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood. In addition, as detailed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, additional restrictions on Archer’s operations are also proposed, including additional limits on the hours of operation, reducing the number of proposed School Functions, and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses. Furthermore, as discussed in Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, additional measures to reduce noise associated with campus operations are proposed. Also refer to Topical Response No. 2, Removal of Athletic Field Lighting and Refinements to Lighting, regarding the removal of the athletic field lighting from the Project which would further reduce the Project’s already less than significant aesthetics, views, and lighting impacts. Additionally, refer to Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, for a description of the additional operational mitigation measures that would be implemented to reduce the Project's significant operational traffic impacts related to School Functions and Interscholastic Athletic Competitions to below a level of significance. As further detailed in Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been refined to reduce the construction period from six years to five years. With the above proposed refinements, potential Project impacts would be reduced.

Refer to Topical Response No. 14, Residential Neighbors’ Proposed Alternative for a detailed response to the alternative proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer. In response to comments on the Draft EIR, several of the refinements proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer have been incorporated into the Project.
Comment Letter No. 296

Rhonda Leshman
4900 Overland Ave., #235
Culver City, CA 90230

Comment No. 296-1

For the past seven years I have been Co-Director of College Guidance at The Archer School for Girls. Before that for several years, I annually visited Archer as an admissions officer for The George Washington University. It was due to my positive experiences recruiting at Archer that I sought employment here. As a College Counselor, I help students with their college applications and am proud that Archer students are admitted to top colleges and universities throughout the U.S. and abroad. Archer is a name that is recognized. The graduates are young women that are changing our world for the better and will continue to do so in the future.

I am writing to ask that the city support the plan to enhance the facilities at Archer. The school deserves a facility that matches the top-notch education being provided. I teach College Guidance classes but don’t have a designated classroom due to space limitations. As a result I have to carry my materials throughout the school and use the classrooms of other teachers. Often it is too hot or too cold in the classes and offices and Archer desperately needs climate control for the comfort of students, faculty and staff.

I hope Archer can count on your support to support this plan. The school deserves facilities and a climate-controlled environment typically enjoyed by students at other schools.

Response to Comment No. 296-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 297

James Levesque  
President  
Healthcare Development  
1112 Montana Ave., Ste. 545  
Santa Monica, CA  90403  

Comment No. 297-1  

Please see the attached SUPPORT Letter for the ARCHER FORWARD project.

Response to Comment No. 297-1

This introductory comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 297-2

I am the proud father of a recent graduate from The Archer School for Girls, a profound and unique academic environment for our young women of Los Angeles. I write with extreme joy and enthusiasm for you to consider as one more voice from a single father in full support of Archer’s campus improvement plan, Archer Forward.

My daughter attended Archer for three incredible years graduating only last year. While her success can be measured by grades and sports achievements on paper and by her current first year success at a UC campus this year, her inner strengths and confidence is a sight to behold. I suspect great things for her and a life fulfilled beyond most people's dreams. This success of this one young Archer woman and all who walk the halls of Archer is the result of the collective Archer environment and all that it gives daily to each and every young woman and family.

My daughter has been blessed with physical talents evidenced by her highly successful participation in the sport programs offered by Archer where she participated in several sports. In the few years she attended Archer and participated in the after school sports programs, it was exciting and challenging because the school campus facilities were not comparable to every other public and private school campus nearby. Indeed, my older daughter was also offered admission a few years earlier but declined because of the school’s lack of facilities.
It is hard to convey in one short letter all the great elements of Archer and its commitment to shaping young minds and delivering on its many promises. I have personally experienced Archer and can attest to this incredible and most unique school that gives so much to our community while managing so well the many needs and sensitivities of all who are impacted whether they are neighbors, businesses, families or students.

To fulfill its great promise, the Archer campus should have the same facilities that every other public and private school nearby has. If I had only one element to improve upon, it would be that my daughter could have experienced better regulation sized facilities, performing arts and support facilities. With better facilities available to future generations, Archer’s future will be bright and complete. Approval of the Archer plan will ensure a comprehensive academic and sports environment for all to benefit and maximize their Archer experience.

I would add a bit about my personal work and experience. I am a real estate development executive who has worked extensively in Los Angeles and nationally on large projects including hospitals, medical facilities, housing, self-storage and other commercial properties. I have extensive experience in new development, entitlements and land use planning. Because of this experience, I believe I have a strong perspective on the Archer plan. My personal history of Archer is their strong adherence to a policy of being great neighbors who not only comply not merely to the letter of their agreements with neighbors but way beyond! Given my personal experience as a parent, experience as a real estate expert and considering the plans before you for consideration, I offer the utmost support and ask you to do the same for this project.

I urge you to support Archer and their campus plan. It is the right thing to do for the girls and our community.

**Response to Comment No. 297-2**

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 298

James S. Levine
472 N. Barrington Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 298-1

Our family opposes the Archer School for Girls’ Archer Forward Plan as currently proposed. The size of this expansion in a residential neighborhood, the intensification of use of the school and its new facilities and the resulting increase in traffic from this use on an already over burdened area will adversely affect our local community as well the community at large. Please do not support a plan that will have significant impacts that cannot be mitigated on six key intersections in Brentwood.

Response to Comment No. 298-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to decision-makers for review and consideration.

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. Refer to Topical Response No. 7, Potential Traffic Impacts Associated with Proposed Campus Operations, for a detailed discussion of potential traffic impacts associated with proposed campus operations. Also refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood.

Comment No. 298-2

Please support a downsized alternative that reduces the impacts on the neighborhood. Our home and quality of life in this beautiful part of our city will be forever changed and adversely affected by the proposed plan.
Response to Comment No. 298-2

The commenter indicates support for a downsized alternative. However, a specific recommendation for a reduced Project alternative is not provided. It is noted that in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project includes refinements, such as reducing the square footage and massing, width, and length of some of the proposed buildings; reducing the number of parking spaces; and creating expanded landscape buffers. Overall, the Project’s net new floor area would be reduced from 75,930 square feet to 68,989 square feet.

Comment No. 298-3

Thank you—here is our mailing address:

James S Levine
472 north Barrington ave
Los Angeles ca 90049

Response to Comment No. 298-3

In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list.
Comment Letter No. 299

Mary Ann Lewis
221 S. Burlingame Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 299-1

Attached is my letter of concern regarding the proposed Archer Forward Plan (ENV-2011-2689-EIR). The outcome of this review is important not only for Brentwood but for the entire West Side of Los Angeles.

Thank you in advance for keeping me updated on the progress of the review.

Response to Comment No. 299-1

This introductory comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 299-2

When Archer School administration discussed their initial plan to expand and improve the campus the changes appeared modest. However the final plan seems to be as an old saying goes “asking for everything including the kitchen sink”.

My neighbors and I want Archer School to improve the learning facilities for their students. However the school is not located in an area that can accommodate the number and level of activities that is proposed in the current plan.

Response to Comment No. 299-2

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 299-3

The traffic gridlock in Brentwood off and on throughout the day is horrific as it is.
Response to Comment No. 299-3

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

Comment No. 299-4

We trust that the proposed plan will receive a fair and thorough review that will not destroy the quality of living in Brentwood. The outcome of the review is important not only for Brentwood, but for the entire West Side of Los Angeles.

Response to Comment No. 299-4

Refer to page I-19 of Section I, Executive Summary, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Process, for a discussion of the public review process for the Project. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 300

Miranda Lievsay
mirandalievsay@gmail.com

Comment No. 300-1

I am writing you today to pledge my support for the Archer Forward Plan.

My time at Archer had a lasting impact on who I am today. In addition to the lifelong friendships with students and teachers that I formed at Archer, the education I received there helped me succeed as an undergraduate student and helped me as I prepare to enter Law School this coming fall.

During my time at Archer, I was captain of the tennis team as well as president of the Service Learning Board. These activities were crucial to my development at Archer. For our meetings, we often had to share or compete for space with other organizations which often made it difficult to accomplish everything we wished to.

I support Archer Forward because I know it will make these experiences richer and more accessible for future Archer girls. The Archer experience is unique and this is accomplished largely by its small community. Archer has always been conscientious of its surrounding community and this plan will allow Archer to continue to be respectful of what is best for the neighborhood. I support the Archer Forward Plan because it will allow the school to enrich the Archer experience for future generations of girls while maintaining its small, close-knit community. I hope you will join me in supporting the Archer Forward Plan.

Response to Comment No. 300-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 301

Lauren G. Linde  
10431 Dunleer Dr.  
Los Angeles, CA  90064

Comment No. 301-1

My daughter is a student at a school that is at the forefront of the girls education movement in Los Angeles:  the Archer School for Girls.  I am writing this letter to show my strong support for the Archer Forward plan, which will offer a top-notch 21st century education to its students.  I hope you’ll agree that it is the right move for Brentwood too.

Even from my first day involved with the school, I saw Archer’s commitment to abide by its promises to its neighbors and the City as defined in its CUP.  With regard to traffic and parking, we are clearly instructed each year on the restrictions that we have to abide by when we drop and pick up our girls from school.  Because of the school administration’s efforts to reduce its traffic burden in the area and be a responsible neighbor, most parents elect to send their children by the bus.

The school continued its commitment to being a good neighbor throughout the introduction of the Archer Forward plan, with the School holding many community and stakeholder meetings specifically about the plan at Archer in the last year.  These meetings have created a productive dialogue to create a plan that is good for Archer and the community.

This project will promise a bright future for the school and for generations of young women who will walk through its doors.  I fully support this plan and look forward to the City’s approval.

Response to Comment No. 301-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 302

Susanna Linsley
12506 Pacific Ave., #10
Los Angeles, CA  90066

Comment No. 302-1

My name is Susanna Linsley. I am an 11th grade US history teacher at the Archer School for Girls, working as one year as a maternity leave replacement. Even though I won’t be here to enjoy the new facility should it be approved, I still wanted to write and tell you why Archer is such a special place. I have taught at a number of schools in several different states and countries at the middle school, high school, and university level. None of those experience compare to Archer. Never have I come across such a committed faculty, and a student body so inspired and motivated to learn and so committed to making a positive impact on the world. They could do even more with the proper tools—21st century classrooms, performance space, and athletic equipment. The lack of facilities is putting an unfair burden on students.

For example, the other night, I went to the quarterfinals of the soccer playoffs. Since Archer does not have a regulation soccer field, the team had to play its home game at Santa Monica College. The team had two options for time: 3:00 pm or 8:00 pm. Consequently, the girls had to make an unfair choice. If they played at 3:00, they would have to sacrifice instructional time. If they played at 8:00, they would be pushed farther than 16-year-old girls need to be pushed. They played at 8:00. Despite the late hour, the stands were packed with supporters and the girls pulled off an amazing win in a shoot out at 10:30 at night on a Wednesday. The next day during first period, at 7:50 am, one of my students in AP US History who had been playing her heart out the night before, stood up and gave a presentation, showing the poise and intelligence that defines an Archer girl. Still, she shouldn’t have had to do this.

For that reason, and countless others, I ask that the City support Archer’s plan for expansion.

Response to Comment No. 302-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 303

Anita and Bill Lischak
517 Ninth St.
Santa Monica, CA  90402

Comment No. 303-1

I'm proud to send my daughter to the Archer School for Girls and fully support the school's plans to enhance their existing campus facilities with the Archer Forward plan. I am writing to show my support and request that you help Archer move through the City process.

For the past fifteen years, Archer has been a responsible and active member of the Brentwood community. The school's administration is in constant contact with the Brentwood Community Council and hosts meetings with neighbors. Archer provides tremendous benefits to the City by requiring its own student body to participate in community service frequently, by providing scholarships to students and by providing an excellent, 21st century education for the next generation of female leaders.

The Archer Forward plan encompasses many of the values that are central to the school: a commitment to sustainability and preservation of its historic building, along with new facilities tailored for the performing arts and athletics. I agree that this is the most effective plan to meet the needs of the school and for future students. Throughout the formation of the plan, the school has asked for input from neighbors and has made several modifications in order to meet their concerns.

I have seen the school's dedication to providing excellent education for girls throughout Los Angeles and its commitment to being a good and responsible neighbor. I hope that Archer's responsible and diligent track record will encourage you to help the Archer Forward Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan move quickly through the City review process.

Response to Comment No. 303-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 304

Andrea Locke
8306 Wilshire Blvd., #506
Beverly Hills, CA  90211

Comment No. 304-1

My name is Andrea Locke. I have been at Archer since 2005 as the dance teacher and director of the after school dance program. Our motto is that every girl can dance if given the right teacher, the right inspiration and the right environment. The dance program has grown to include over 100 students. We have not been able to hold our Night of Dance performance on Archer’s campus since 2009. We have rented Paul Revere Middle School and currently bus our girls and hold our performance at the American Jewish University in Bel Air.

Archer is a unique place for girls to explore, take risk and experience dance in an embracing atmosphere where a novice dancer can dance along side [sic] an advanced dancer in a class taught by local and national dance professionals. We pride ourselves on giving our students this exceptional opportunity, but we need an appropriate space, our own theatre and larger dance studios to truly give them the education that they deserve.

I have danced professionally where I had to make adjustments and perform on concrete or rehearse on a grass field, if it was necessary, however, we are in the 21st century where students should have the best opportunity to have an education in a safe and accommodating school facility.

I plead with the City to please allow Archer to build new facilities that will not only benefit Archer students but will also be a place for Brentwood residents to enjoy the pleasures of good dance, theater and musical entertainment.

Response to Comment No. 304-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 305

Alexandra Lodge
530 Moreno Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 305-1

As a former Archer girl, I can personally attest to the confidence that an Archer education instills and I am writing today to express my support for Archer Forward and to urge you to do the same.

I know first-hand just how much the school expects out of its students. The faculty and staff teach all Archer girls a sense of community and respect for others. I was proud to attend school in Brentwood and know that the school cared deeply about being a good neighbor. The sense of community is what makes Archer special but they need basic facilities.

I hope you support their plan and let them build what they are requesting. It is not unreasonable for a school to want to provide its students with proper spaces for arts and facilities for athletics.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Response to Comment No. 305-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 306

Jacob London

Comment No. 306-1

I am a physics teacher, grade-level dean, and soccer coach on Archer campus. In my two years at Archer, I’ve found it to be a truly special place unlike any other school I’ve worked at or attended. One of the things that makes Archer stand out to me is how involved both the faculty and student body are.

It is rare to find a student who is not involved in at least one extracurricular activity, and most are involved in several. Students and faculty are able to pursue their interests and deeply engage in these activities. As a result, there are countless events throughout the year, ranging from soccer games and softball games, dance performances and music recitals, to art gallery openings and academic conferences that students are involved in. Each of these events requires space and unfortunately, many must take place off-campus because of our limited on-campus options. A consequence of this is that many students are not able to take advantage of all the wonderful extracurricular options our school has to offer. For athletes there is a strain on families having to transport from off-campus practice and game locations. As a soccer coach, I see first-hand the toll this can have on students and their families, having to travel to offsite practice and game locations. Performers are sometimes forced to miss valuable class-time in transit to their off-site rehearsals. Additionally, students and faculty who wish to support their peers are less able to do so when so many events occur elsewhere in the city.

Archer’s plan would provide modern athletic and performing arts facilities that would allow for most of these extracurricular activities to take place on campus. This will make it possible for more students to be involved, pursuing their passions and exploring new opportunities. It would also allow the rest of the community to attend events such as home games and performances. We have an incredibly supportive community here at Archer. This support helps the young women we serve become the confident and multi-talented leaders of tomorrow. Please consider supporting our plan and help these students take full advantage of the wonderful opportunities Archer offers.

Response to Comment No. 306-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 307

Marcos López
2531 S. Westgate Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90064

Comment No. 307-1

My name is Marcos Lopez, I came to work in this building in 1983, since then I have only seen one major renovation for the west wing and sports fields. However the rest remains the same. There is no air conditioning on most parts of the building and heat is limited. All school assemblies can only be held on the open courtyard. As a facilities team member it is very challenging to accommodate different events indoors due to lack of a school auditorium.

Archer School students and faculty need better facilities to reach their goals.

Please support Archer's Plan for development.

Response to Comment No. 307-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 308

Nicola Lubitsch
11901 W Sunset Blvd., No. 109
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Comment No. 308-1

My name is Nicola Lubitsch. I live at 11901 W Sunset Blvd at the NW corner of Sunset and Westgate. Previously I lived at 11901 Chaparal St where my children grew up attending local private schools. I am a huge supporter of private education. As you know most private schools are in residential neighborhoods but they are on campuses with enough acreage to encompass their needs. The landmark Eastern Star was never intended to be a highly trafficked high school.

Therefore I am writing to add my voice to that of my neighbors opposed to the expansion of the Archer School. It is hard for me to believe that this grandiose proposal has gained any traction. The thought that it may become a reality is incredibly distressing to all of us who live nearby. It shows in spades Archer’s total disregard for their neighbors. It also demonstrates how disingenuous they were when they acquired the property and signed the CUP some fifteen years ago.

Response to Comment No. 308-1

This introductory comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the school’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

Comment No. 308-2

If you lived where we live there would be no need to describe the horrific rush hour traffic at Barrington and Sunset. It is a total nightmare. In the afternoon it is impossible to make a left hand turn onto Sunset. Aggressive drivers run the lights, blocking left hand turns often
causing the traffic to come to a complete standstill. Chaparal, which borders the north side of the Archer School, is the preferred shortcut of frustrated drivers. Other drivers, trying to avoid Sunset and cut across from Bundy shooting down Barrington making the situation totally intolerable. There have been times when it has taken me over half an hour to turn onto Sunset from Chaparal. I urge you to experience this for yourself. What is going to happen to our neighborhood during the proposed 6 years of construction? How in the world is Barrington going to deal with 288 cars exiting Archer’s proposed underground garage?

Response to Comment No. 308-2

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site. Refer to Topical Response No. 7, Potential Traffic Impacts Associated with Proposed Campus Operations, for a discussion regarding cut-through traffic on Chaparal Street. Although the Draft EIR determined that Project operational impacts on neighborhood streets would be less than significant, pursuant to Project Design Feature K-5, the Project Applicant would coordinate with the City of Los Angeles and neighborhood residents to provide up to $15,000 toward the development and implementation of a traffic calming plan for Chaparal Street between Saltair Avenue and Barrington Avenue to minimize cut-through traffic on this street. Refer to Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, regarding the impacts of construction activities and the proposal to reduce the overall construction timeframe for the Project from six years to five years. Also refer to Topical Response No. 6, Overview of Construction Traffic and Parking, for a detailed discussion regarding construction traffic.

As described in Topical Response No. 3, Overview of Reduced Parking Spaces, Parking Demand, and Parking Enforcement, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the underground parking structure is proposed to be reduced. Also refer to Topical Response No. 7, Potential Traffic Impacts Associated with Proposed Campus Operations, for a discussion regarding egress from the parking structure.

Comment No. 308-3

Adding more cars to the already congested Sunset Boulevard is not acceptable and traffic will only get worse in an area where streets are gridlocked. LA Department of Transportation (LADOT) states in the DEIR that the proposed project will create SIGNIFICANT impacts at six intersections (including Barrington Avenue and Sunset Boulevard) that CANNOT be physically mitigated. THE LADOT goes on to say that even with the proposed mitigation measures, should the Project be built out, the impact at these intersections during various event-day scenarios will remain significant and unavoidable.
• How will LADOT’s recommendation alleviate traffic impacts when they state that even with mitigation the impact will be significant and unavoidable?

• How can any new car trips be justified when LADOT concludes that the improvements proposed by Archer under Voluntary Improvements are not expected to mitigate the significant traffic impacts at any of the six impacted intersections mentioned in the report?

• How will Archer prevent cars from turning right out of the parking garage onto neighboring side streets during peak hours when cars cannot go east on Sunset because of traffic?

**Response to Comment No. 308-3**

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Refer to Topical Response No. 7, Potential Traffic Impacts Associated with Proposed Campus Operations, for a discussion regarding cut-through traffic on Chaparal Street. Based on field observations and a license plate matching survey, few vehicles exiting Archer are anticipated to cut-through Chaparal Street. Although the Draft EIR determined that Project operational impacts on neighborhood streets would be less than significant, pursuant to Project Design Feature K-5, the Project Applicant would coordinate with the City of Los Angeles and neighborhood residents to provide up to $15,000 toward the development and implementation of a traffic calming plan for Chaparal Street between Saltair Avenue and Barrington Avenue to minimize cut-through traffic on this street.

The four “voluntary improvements” described as such in the LADOT traffic study assessment letter in Appendix P.2 of the Draft EIR (Project Design Features K-2, K-3, K-4, and K-5 in the Draft EIR) are not required to mitigate Project impacts.

**Comment No. 308-4**

The Archer School must be held to their original promises to this neighborhood and not add to what is already an intolerable situation.
I have read Archer’s proposal to expand and am frightened with what an expanded use of their property will do to this neighborhood. **Why in the world don’t they just move to a more suitable location to accommodate their needs rather than negatively impact the surrounding neighborhood?** When the Archer School sought to purchase the property years ago, they made a lot of promises to this neighborhood to gain the necessary permits to rehab the Eastern Star Home. The city put into place restrictions that balanced residents’ rights to the quiet peaceful enjoyment of their homes with the school’s ability to successfully operate. They did a great job of blending in and have been great neighbors. We believed their intent then but now they are pushing their boundaries beyond what is acceptable to this neighborhood. They must be told NO and honor their original promises....

**Response to Comment No. 308-4**

As evaluated in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the proposed buildings would be designed to complement the historic Main Building and respond to and respect the residential scale and character of the surrounding area. As such, the Project would be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and the Brentwood–Pacific Palisades Community Plan regarding conservation of and compatibility with the scale and character of the City’s residential neighborhoods. Also refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood.

Refer to Topical Response No. 15, Alternative Locations, for a detailed discussion of the analysis of alternative locations for the Project.

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the school’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 308-5**

Specifically, I am concerned about the following:
• Significant Traffic Impacts due to their proposed plans that have been studied and proven it is not possible to be physically mitigated

• Increased Use of Facilities for school operations as well as allowing outside commercial use of the property which will negatively impact the residential feel to our neighborhood with the added congestion and traffic and weekend use

Response to Comment No. 308-5

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. As discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on School operations are proposed, including eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses.

Regarding filming, as further discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, filming on the campus for commercial purposes would continue to be prohibited except when the School is not in session. Filming would be permitted for no more than 24 days per year. All trucks and equipment would be required to use the School’s underground parking structure and parking on neighborhood streets would be strictly prohibited. Hours would be restricted, with filming beginning no earlier than 9:00 A.M. and concluding no later than 6:00 P.M.

Comment No. 308-6

• The elimination of two residences which eliminates the current buffer between the school and current homeowners and will create an entrance on Barrington for their Aquatic Center and parking garage
  – The existence of the school already negatively impacts property values which was heard over and over by prospective buyers for a property recently on the market neighboring the school on Westgate
  – Creating an entrance/exit to the school onto Barrington just north of the Sunset intersection is INSANE! There is not a way to modify the area to handle the increased traffic and the elimination of this home will dramatically change the residential feeling for our neighborhood! Anyone who lives in the area can tell you this intersection could not possibly handle another vehicle!
Response to Comment No. 308-6

Refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood. With regard to buffers, as evaluated in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the proposed buildings would be designed to complement the historic Main Building and respond to and respect the residential scale and character of the surrounding area. The Project would also include the use of architectural features that add visual interest and reduce massing to maintain the residential street character when viewed from Chaparal Street and Barrington Avenue. It is noted that with the refinements proposed to the Project, the Performing Arts Center is now proposed to be developed within the Chaparal Parcel and the Aquatics Center is proposed to be developed within the Barrington Parcel. With these refinements, the 25-foot front yard setbacks along Chaparal Street and Barrington Avenue would remain.

The Project proposes enhanced landscaping buffers to provide privacy and reduce noise to nearby properties. As described in more detail in Section IV.A, Aesthetics/Visual Quality, Views, Light/Glare, and Shading, of the Draft EIR, along Chaparal Street is a solid cinderblock wall and wrought iron gate covered in vines. Also along Chaparal Street is a row of existing pine trees. In response to comments, Archer would plant additional trees along Chaparal Street and a second row of trees on the south side of the wall to create a double row of landscaping along Chaparal Street. In response to comments, the Project has also been refined to shift the athletic field approximately 7 feet 6 inches to the east. Shifting the athletic field would move the athletic field further away from the neighbors to the west of the campus property boundary while still maintaining regulation size soccer and softball fields. This expanded setback would allow for an enhanced landscape buffer along the western property boundary of the campus. In addition, in response to comments, the Project would add a row of landscaping along the southern boundary of the Barrington Parcel.

Regarding the entrance on Barrington Avenue, as described in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, primary access to the Project Site, including all student dropoff and pickup, would be unchanged and would continue to be from Sunset Boulevard. In addition, service and delivery vehicles would continue to access the Archer campus primarily from Sunset Boulevard. With the Project, Barrington Avenue and Chaparal Street would be used for limited service, delivery, and emergency vehicle access. The Project would not include access to the Aquatics Center or the underground parking structure from Barrington Avenue.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment No. 308-7

- The positioning of large buildings at the back of the property against the current fence on Chaparal. This eliminates the open view and feeling of green space for the existing homes which cannot be mitigated by their proposed landscaping efforts.

Response to Comment No. 308-7

Refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood. With regard to setbacks, the proposed School buildings would meet residential front yard setback requirements along Chaparal Street. The buildings would have a stepped profile and would be located behind 8-foot walls covered in vines and continuous landscaping to effectively screen the massing of the buildings along Chaparal Street with only portions of the buildings being visible along breaks in the landscaping. Additionally, the Project, as refined in response to comments, would maintain approximately 457 feet, or 64 percent, of the frontage along Chaparal Street as open space. On an overall basis, the Project would not obstruct an existing valued view, and view impacts would be less than significant.

Comment No. 308-8

In closing, please don’t allow this plan to move forward. The neighbors in good faith have proposed alternative efforts for Archer to expand. Please adopt the reasonable alternative that has been proposed by the neighborhood group:

- Expand and renovate the campus within the current footprint of the school, thus preserving the two residences and creating a needed buffer between the neighbors and the institutional use of the school,
- Increase the current size of the school by adding two new buildings, not four, which includes one gym, and one multi-use building,
- Add more landscaping to provide an attractive buffer between the school and residences,
- Increase the set back of the buildings placed adjacent to Chaparal Street,
- Maintain the number of special events and athletic events at the current level,
Maintain the current condition of no lights on the athletic field,

Follow the guidelines of the current Conditional Use Permit regarding hours of operation and limits on the use of the facilities at night, on the weekends and for outside use,

Improve the school’s facilities with only one phase of construction.

**Response to Comment No. 308-8**

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Refer to Topical Response No. 14, Residential Neighbors’ Proposed Alternative, for a detailed response to the alternative proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer. In response to comments on the Draft EIR, several of the modifications proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer have been incorporated into the Project.
Comment Letter No. 309

Mitchell and Roxanne Lucas
410 S. Barrington Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 309-1

Archer (a private company) negotiated and won the right to build their school (and business), under certain conditions.

Everything they propose is not aligned with those negotiated conditions and if allowed they will impact BHA negatively.

Simply, anybody who knows the stretch of Sunset between Bundy and Barrington is already beyond congested and adding more trips to this area will only make it worse.

These limitations are things that were known to the Archer Board when they started their business and remain relevant to this day.

To allow this private business to reek [sic] havoc on the community should not be allowed. If they need more space they should develop an annex somewhere else, NOT EXPAND THIS PROPERTY.

Response to Comment No. 309-1

Archer is registered as a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization.

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A CUP is a discretionary approval issued after environmental review and a public process. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood. As discussed in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, as part of the Project, existing conditions of approval pertaining to traffic, parking, carpooling, and busing are proposed to continue to be implemented, including maintenance of an average vehicle ridership of 3.0 persons per vehicle. In addition, as set forth in Mitigation Measure K-1, the existing condition requiring utilization of vans/buses to transport 50 percent of the student
enrollment on a daily basis would be increased to 70 percent of the student enrollment on a daily basis, thereby reducing potential traffic impacts associated with the Project.

Regarding traffic, also refer to Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts. As discussed therein, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional operational mitigation measures are proposed to reduce significant traffic impacts related to School Functions and Interscholastic Athletic Competitions to below a level of significance.

Also refer to Topical Response No. 15, Alternative Locations, for an analysis of alternative locations for the Project. As described therein, an alternative location would not meet many of the basic Project objectives, particularly those related to improving the existing Archer campus and ensuring the continued preservation of the historic Main Building.

Comment No. 309-2

EXPANDING THE USE OF THIS PROPERTY WILL NEGATIVELY IMPACT THE AREA, AND THE VALUES OF THE SURROUNDING PROPERTIES. ALLOWING ONE OWNER THIS WILL PAVE THE WAY FOR MORE ADVERSE DEVELOPMENT.

We respectfully urge you to not allow ANY deviation from the original use and permissions granted to this private business.

In case I missed it, how would these changes BENEFIT Brentwood? (they would not, just enrich a private company)

Response to Comment No. 309-2

As evaluated in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the proposed buildings would be designed to complement the historic Main Building and respond to and respect the residential scale and character of the surrounding area. As such, the Project would be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and the Brentwood–Pacific Palisades Community Plan regarding conservation of and compatibility with the scale and character of the City’s residential neighborhoods. Also refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood.

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which
was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the school’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

It is noted that Archer is a 501(c)(3) public charity. As such, all of the School’s revenue is used to support its educational mission.

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 310

Esther Lumer
849 Leonard Rd.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 310-1

As a long time resident of Kenter canyon, we used to use Sunset BLV going east towards the 405 FRW, on a daily basis.

When the Archer school come aboard, We’ve been promised that there will B limit on cars, parking spaces and events allowed by the school.

Me and my neighbors are all opposing the proposed development by Archer School, which includes double the currently authorized 48 events, annually, to 96 events.

In addition a 210 car, parking garage will be constructed compared to the 110 cars now parked on the campus!

In addition, the construction of the proposed improvements, a new, 80,000 sq. ft., (approximate) will accommodate 300 to 600 people at some events!

I hope that before your department commit to this development proposal, you will take the time to drive down here one day, between the hours of 7-10AM westward, and 3-8PM eastward on Sunset between Kenter and the 405 FRW!

You will understand that this is going to Keep the current traffic nightmare a permanent one, which is unacceptable not only for the residents, but also for all the people who work, visit or take this route for different purposes. We R strongly oppose this development!!

Response to Comment No. 310-1

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts
would be reduced to below a level of significance. As discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on School operations are proposed, including additional limitations on the hours of operation; reducing the number of proposed School Functions from 98 to 86, including eliminating Interscholastic Athletic Tournaments and two School Functions with up to 650 guests; and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses.

As described in Topical Response No. 3, Overview of Reduced Parking Spaces, Parking Demand and Supply, and Parking Enforcement, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, underground parking structure is proposed to be reduced.

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding the compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.
Comment Letter No. 311

Janet Lyon
1114 Princeton St., Apt. 4
Santa Monica, CA  90403

Comment No. 311-1

I am writing to express my support of Archer’s Campus Plan.  My support is from two perspectives:  Mom of an Archer Alum and as a long-time Archer employee.

My daughter attended Archer from 6th through 12th grade, and is now a senior in College.  I cannot say enough about how my family appreciates Archer’s role in Brooke’s development.  This unique community allowed her to develop and determine her own path through academics, community service, social and extra-curricular activities.  Brooke learnt her strengths and passions through invigorating opportunities in a supportive environment that recognized her as an individual.  Archer’s college guidance program ensured Brooke had valid right-fit choices after Graduation.  Now, as she nears becoming a college graduate as a happy, self-driven, successful, independent and engaged citizen, we say the track record is proven.

For myself, I have found Archer to be a unique employee culture.  Co-workers are passionate, hard-working and ‘in-it-for-all’.  An invigorating environment allows for personal growth.  I started at Archer when we were in the Palisades and can speak to many years of support roles during the founding classes, through full enrollment and now as we look to Archer Forward.

In my current operations role, I am managing campus limitations on a daily basis, juggling to support the academic program.  This falls into general areas of transportation, events, room reservations, student lunch program, catering, campus safety, security, facilities, custodial and grounds.  The general logistical challenges are:

- No air conditioning in many classrooms (and offices).
- Steam pipe heating system that makes it difficult to maintain an overall consistency.
- No indoor space that can accommodate the full student or parent body.
- No purpose-built indoor fitness spaces.
• Classrooms that have morphed along with the program with many created by knocking down a wall between small Eastern Star bedrooms.

• Programs such as dance troupe, film festival and athletics held off campus to accommodate the program, participants and guests.

• Transportation to such programs off campus requiring school bus transportation expense and missed time in the classroom for students and chaperones.

• No kitchen for the student lunch program, catering, after school snacks etc., or the ideal of instructional cooking.

• Difficult traffic flow on campus and limited parking.

• Few large rooms mean shared space for guests, student assemblies, class activities, faculty meetings and general meetings.

• No real storage or area to accept large packages.

• An infrastructure that does not allow modern efficiencies or the basic best use of space, security and technology systems or building management systems.

In short, I believe in Archer’s continuing commitment to both our mission and neighborhood community.

**Response to Comment No. 311-1**

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 312

Patrick and Mia Lyons
1740 Stearns Dr.
Los Angeles, CA  90035

Comment No. 312-1

Archer Forward is an important step forward for the Archer School girls’ in West Los Angeles. I hope that you and Councilmember Bonin will support the project and help it move forward as quickly as possible.

My daughter loves Archer and my wife and I thank God every day for the opportunity that we have to attend such a wonderful and dynamic school. Archer has been around for a while and it needs to be allowed to update. I first heard of Archer from my grandmother when I was a young teen. My grandmother cooked and cleaned for the McMahons of Bel-Air and their daughters attended the school. For my daughter to attend such a school is truly a miracle. For the powers to be to allow Archer to upgrade and expand is a further Blessing for the young ladies that attend the school. I know Archer will comply with all necessary requirements that would be and have been placed on them.

The Archer Forward plan is simply critical for the School. The girls need spaces where they can compete and perform and enjoy the outside. The current campus has no gym, no regulation-sized playing fields and inadequate performing and visual arts spaces. Our girls need their own home facilities to help promote school/self pride. We have all had the opportunity to have home games and home field advantage. We know what that has meant to us during our school years and later on into life. Archer is at a severe disadvantage without the ability to provide these things for its students. I believe that having these facilities are essential for the middle school and high school experience.

I hope/pray that the City and the Councilman will support this plan and move it quickly through the review process. Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 312-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 313

Susan Macdonald
smacdonald@getty.edu

Comment No. 313-1

I am writing to voice my support for the current proposal for Archer Forward. The Archer School for Girls is a wonderful educational institution that contributes to the community in many ways. I am the parent of an eighth grader and am very conscious of the location of the school in relation to the local community and also proud of how very thoughtfully and well managed this is.

As an architect with considerable expertise in the conservation of historic resources I can honestly say that the development proposal has through superior planning and design, maximized the use of the site in a manner that is appropriate to its context. the scale is well resolved, planning exceptionally well developed to minimize impact on surrounding properties and the proposals for its implementation have addressed all manner of concerns. The integration of the new building with the existing important historic building has been undertaken in a manner that retains and promotes the heritage significance of the building and yet adds a new contemporary layer that is sympathetic in form, scale, siting and makes the entire site work much better than presently. It is often the case that sites with the most constraints have to work much harder to achieve suitable outcomes—focusing more attention and demanding more skill to design in a way that meets all the constraints. I think this proposal exemplifies this fact.

This proposal will ensure the viability of the school is sustained as it moves into its next phase of life, facilitating 21st century educational standards and requirements. the mission of the school—to provide the best educational experience to the next generation of women is clearly as important as ever and it is important such an institution should continue to grow and meet the aspirations of current and future students. Whilst the current facilities housed in the historic building provide a wonderful experience and ambiance—clearly new facilities are needed to meet current expectations and standards. Given the schools success at managing the interface between school and community to date I have every confidence this will continue to be managed in a way that is both respectful and appreciative of the schools neighbors. Indeed the new building will considerably improve the interface to the rear of the property with adjacent properties.

I believe the school has worked hard to successfully design a proposal that will balance the need for growth and change in a way that is [sic] manages the impact on what is important about the exiting site and within its urban context.
Response to Comment No. 313-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 314

Marci Pool
David Madden
254 N. Barrington Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 314-1

I’ve forwarded my letter to Councilman Bonin for your records as well.

Response to Comment No. 314-1

This introductory comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 314-2

We are writing to express our deepest concerns about the Archer School Expansion project. As you are aware, our neighborhood has been profoundly impacted by the 405 expansion. Many frustrated drivers, in an effort to avoid being stagnant heading east on Sunset, cut through our neighborhood streets, jamming the roads for many hours and making it nearly impossible to get out of our own driveways. I cannot count the many times we have had to abandon plans to leave the house after 4:00 pm because we simply could not get down the road to Sunset.

Response to Comment No. 314-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to decision-makers for review and consideration.

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site. Refer to Topical Response No. 7, Potential Traffic Impacts Associated with Proposed Campus Operations, for a discussion regarding cut-through traffic in the vicinity of the Project Site.

Comment No. 314-3

As we contemplate another major construction project, we are committed to making sure any new project is kept to an appropriate scale for our suburban neighborhood. While most
of us support having a school in our neighborhood and are willing to make sacrifices to allow the school to grow, we feel that the current plan is hugely over scale and ambitious and will turn our community into a loud, overly lit, massive campus.

**Response to Comment No. 314-3**

In response to comments, the Project has been refined, including reducing the square footage and massing, width, and length of some of the proposed buildings, reducing the number of parking spaces, and creating expanded landscape buffers. Refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood. In addition, as discussed in Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, additional measures to reduce noise associated with campus operations are proposed. Regarding lighting, as discussed in Topical Response No. 2, Removal of Athletic Field Lighting and Refinements to Lighting, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been refined to eliminate the athletic field lighting.

**Comment No. 314-4**

The construction alone will create enormous traffic problems to a neighborhood already severely overtaxed.

**Response to Comment No. 314-4**

Refer to Topical Response No. 6, Overview of Construction Traffic and Parking, for a detailed discussion regarding construction traffic.

**Comment No. 314-5**

Archer’s goal of adding a 40,000 square foot Visual Arts Center, *(bigger than the Geffen Playhouse)*, a Pool Pavilion, Two Gyms, a Lighted Playing Field—and six days a week operation in a residential neighborhood—is untenable. It will substantively and negatively change the character of our neighborhood.

Please register our opposition to the current expansion plan. If Archer wants the neighborhood support, they need to consider our dissatisfaction and work with the neighborhood to construct a plan with which everyone can live.
Response to Comment No. 314-5

The Project does not include a 40,000 square foot Visual Arts Center. As described in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Visual Arts Center would be 7,400 square feet.

As further described in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Project includes the North Wing Renovation and the development of new athletic, performing arts, and visual arts facilities, including an approximately 41,400-square-foot Multipurpose Facility, a 22,600-square-foot Performing Arts Center, a 7,400-square-foot Visual Arts Center, and a 2,300-square-foot Aquatics Center. Refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood. As summarized therein and described in Section II, Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, refinements to the Project are proposed, including a reduction in the size of certain proposed buildings. Specifically, the Multipurpose Facility would be reduced from approximately 41,400 square feet to 39,300 square feet and the Performing Arts Center would be reduced from 22,600 square feet and 650 seats to 19,025 square feet and 395 seats. In addition, the North Wing Renovation would be reduced by approximately 8,671 square feet. Overall, the Project’s net new floor area would be reduced from approximately 75,930 square feet to 68,989 square feet. As described in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the proposed buildings would be designed to complement the historic Main Building and respond to and respect the residential scale and character of the surrounding area. The Project would also include the use of architectural features that add visual interest and reduce massing to maintain the residential street character when viewed from Chaparal Street and Barrington Avenue. In addition, the Project would represent a continuation of an existing private school use and would not substantially and adversely change the existing land use relationships between the Project Site and existing off-site uses.

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 315

Brooke and Jonathan Maile
468 22nd St.
Santa Monica, CA  90402

Comment No. 315-1

Our two daughters attended Archer. One graduated in 2008, the other in 2013. Altogether, our family was involved with Archer for twelve years. We are writing today to express our support for the Archer Forward Plan.

Our daughters chose to attend Archer because the school is unique. Archer's student body reflects the diverse character Los Angeles and we believe that the school is educating the future leaders of this country. However, in order for Archer to fully deliver on its mission, it needs adequate facilities to create a 21st century campus.

Our younger daughter was a varsity volleyball player at Archer. Although she thoroughly enjoyed her time at the school she encountered hurdles in one area—the lack of space on campus for daily practice and home games. Archer is trying to change all of this with Archer Forward. If approved, the school will finally have a performing and visual arts center, a regulation-sized field to practice and play on, and even an aquatics center for the swimmers to finally hold meets on campus.

We don't believe the school is asking for much—just the same facilities that their peer schools have. We hope that you support this plan and move it through the city process quickly.

Response to Comment No. 315-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 315-2

Yes, please include me as an interested party in your mailings.

Our address is:
Brooke and Jonathan Maile
468 22nd Street
Santa Monica, CA 90402

Response to Comment No. 315-2

In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list.
Comment Letter No. 316

Monna and Simon Mainwaring
2515 Patricia Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Comment No. 316-1

I have a daughter who attends Archer. I am very excited and strongly in support of the Archer Forward plan.

My daughter chose to attend Archer because the School is truly unique in Los Angeles. The only secular girl’s school on the west side of Los Angeles, Archer’s student body reflects the diverse character of the entire City. I believe that Archer is truly educating the future leaders of this country. But, in order for Archer to fully deliver on its promise to the City, the School needs adequate facilities to create a 21st century campus.

The Archer Forward plan would provide what the School really needs: modern classrooms, athletic fields and facilities and visual and performing arts spaces. Archer girls fully participate in academic, arts and athletics, and need the facilities to support these activities. If you were to see the stages the girls currently perform on you wouldn’t believe it—they have to modify performances just so they can all fit on the stage. It looks very uncomfortable!

I recognize that there are concerns about development in Brentwood, but it’s important to acknowledge that Archer has fully complied with the most stringent conditions imposed by the City on any independent school in Los Angeles. In fact, Archer has gone beyond the City’s requirements to ensure that the school has a minimal impact on traffic. This track record should be celebrated, and the City should help Archer move forward with the reasonable new hours and operations that they are proposing. Archer is a gem in Los Angeles, and I hope that you, Councilman Bonin, and the rest of the City will help move the Archer Forward project quickly through the City process. Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 316-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 317

Sloane K. and Robert Malecki
sloane@brasshornet.com

Comment No. 317-1

We are writing to ask that the City support the Archer School for Girls’ Archer Forward campus improvement plan.

Our youngest daughter currently attends the Archer School for Girls and our oldest daughter graduated five years ago. During the nine years that our family has been part of the Archer community, we have been impressed by Archer’s commitment to educating girls from all over Los Angeles and providing millions of dollars in scholarships and financial assistance. We have also been impressed by how Archer teaches the value of community service and has shown its own commitment to its local community by working with the neighborhood and local stakeholders to create a campus improvement plan that will greatly enhance the students’ overall educational experience while benefiting the community.

Archer is simply requesting the facilities that many of its peer institutions already have. We live in Hancock Park near the Marlborough School for Girls and remember vividly the concerns raised in our neighborhood when Marlborough proposed and gained approval for its own expansion plans over ten years ago. Those plans involved the demolition of several historic homes in Windsor Square and Hancock Park, neighborhoods which are both in historic preservation overlay zones. While these neighborhoods raised many legitimate concerns, we think today you will find that most neighbors are pleased with the outcome. In fact, a few years ago when Marlborough renovated its Munger Hall and added underground parking and more recently when Marlborough proposed its Arden Project to demolish two more historic homes in order to expand its aquatic center, lengthen its tennis courts and add more student parking, the school found much less resistance from the local community.

The Archer plan, in contrast to the actions taken by Marlborough, is far less intrusive and does not involve the razing of nearly an entire residential block’s worth of historic homes to expand the campus nor does it involve demolishing and converting historic home sites into parking lots. In fact, Archer has worked hard with community members who have concerns about the plan to ensure that everyone benefits from what they’d like to make happen on campus. They plan to streamline parking to help improve traffic flow and reduce noise in the busy Brentwood neighborhood. Furthermore, when they move the essential athletic and arts facilities onto campus, they will no longer need to have added carpools in order to transport the girls to off-campus venues for practices and events. Finally, Archer is taking
great care to preserve the historic character of its existing facility. With this plan, everyone wins.

We firmly believe that many future leaders will graduate from Archer, and we hope that future generations of Archer students will be able to enjoy the benefits of Archer Forward. Please join us and support the plan.

**Response to Comment No. 317-1**

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 318

Rachel Mandelbaum
10840 Lindbrook Dr., No. 4
Los Angeles, CA  90024

Comment No. 318-1

I graduated from Archer and I’d like to personally urge the city to support the school’s improvement project, Archer Forward. It is a good step forward for the community and more importantly, it is in the best interest of the girls who attend the school.

As a former Archer student, I remember my peers who were involved in sports having to spend hours commuting all over the city just to practice. I know current Archer girls are doing the same thing and it is time for a change. In order for the girls to have a well-rounded middle school and high school experience, they need to have the facilities that every other school in this area is fortunate enough to have.

Archer prides itself on being a responsible and active member of the community. I hope you will do the right thing and support the school’s plan.

Response to Comment No. 318-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 319

Katarzyna Marciniak
400 S. Cloverdale Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90036

Comment No. 319-1

We are writing in enthusiastic support of Archer’s Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan. We are parents of an Archer 9th grade student. Our daughter has been attending the school for the past two years. Based on her reports, our own observations, as well as our interactions with the school, students and their parents, we rush to testify that the school is a phenomenally effective pedagogical organization. The school has triggered in our daughter a consistent expansion of her intellectual, academic and emotional horizons. Almost as importantly for us, the school maintains a climate of casual, unpretentious collegiality in which students and parents from all sorts of backgrounds, and from all over the city (and beyond), come together, at ease, joyfully. In order to continue their success, the faculty, students, and administrators do need to improve the grounds where the teaching, learning, sports and frolics take place. With the record of Archer’s responsibility, care, transparency, and approachability, the school’s plans for self-contained expansion (inside the parameter of its interior grounds) are, in our conviction, impressive in their modesty and visionary in their projected longevity, outstanding aesthetics, and architectural agreement with the neighborhood. Most importantly, the accomplishment of the plan will result in a significant betterment of the educational facilities. How cool is that? Insanely cool, as Steve Jobs used to observe and as our daughter and we agree.

Please help strengthen in every possible way you can your support for this extremely important educational project. And please let us know what else we can do to make sure this plan moves forward.

Thank you so much for your consideration and care.

Response to Comment No. 319-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 320

Maddie Marcus  
132 N. Hayworth Ave., No. 5  
Los Angeles, CA 90048

Comment No. 320-1

I am writing you today in support of the Archer Campus Plan. I attended Archer from 2000 to 2007, and I cannot begin to describe the countless ways that Archer has positively affected me. As a member of the Varsity Tennis team, Dance Troupe, and Student Council throughout the years, I was able to experience and participate in all of the amazing activities and organizations Archer offers. I fully support the campus plan and believe that it will continue to benefit Archer women for many generations to come.

Response to Comment No. 320-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 320-2

132 N. Hayworth Ave. #5  
Los Angeles, CA, 90048

Thank you!

Response to Comment No. 320-2

In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list.
Comment Letter No. 321

Laura and Kevin Marks  
ksm@grtb.com

Comment No. 321-1

Please see the attached letter in support of the Archer Forward Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

Response to Comment No. 321-1

This introductory comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 321-2

We write in reference to the Archer Forward Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan (with the site location at 11725 West Sunset Boulevard and two neighboring addresses) (the “Plan”). The Plan is the subject of a Draft Environmental Impact Report before the Department of City Planning.

The purpose of this letter is to let you know of our strong support of the Plan.

As background, we are parents to twin daughters who are enrolled in seventh grade at the Archer School for Girls (“Archer”). Archer offers its students a shining, thrilling, challenging, disciplined, supportive and joyous education. We deeply believe that our city’s future—indeed, our country’s future—depends on how we educate our next generations. As Nelson Mandela said, “Education is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world.” It is for this reason that we have been active in matters of education. For example, Kevin is a former Board Chair of a local independent elementary school.

Archer is an all girls school with a mission in educating girls in an environment where they can be their most genuine, open and adventurous selves. More than having an identity as a single sex school, however, Archer is a school that is committed to strong academics, the arts, athletics, the environment and the community. It is committed to its students finding their fullest potential.
Archer is housed in a wonderful historic building, and its adjoining structures. It has worked magic in making the existing spaces workable, but in truth, they are not sufficient. There is no girls’ gym (and girls’ locker). There is no proper auditorium and performance center. There is no air conditioning. Available green space (and field space) is limited by parking. The constraints force activities off campus, which actually increases local traffic burdens and transportation safety risks, and cuts into student study time. Archer is currently without facilities comparable to co-ed peer schools in West Los Angeles, notwithstanding that this all girls school is every bit as deserving and has a community behind it that will work hard to create and sustain them.

Archer is an excellent steward for its site. It is devoted to preserving its historic, Spanish Revival building (something quite important to us as aficionados of architecture, art and design from 1920s and 1930s Los Angeles). Archer is an outstanding neighbor in terms of its commitment to bus transportation and car pooling, all for the betterment of traffic flow in the neighborhood. (As a family there, we can tell you that this policy is not optional, and is strictly enforced.) Archer is devoted in its plan to green space and energy efficient design. Imagine a school that embodies both Los Angeles’ history in classic design, and its future in innovative design. That is what the Archer Forward Plan does.

We personally know three families who own residences across the street or near Archer. All three support the plan. They know Archer to be a good neighbor. They understand that they annoyance of construction in the near term is offset by a secure, green, community minded girls school in the long term.

Oliver Wendel [sic] Holmes wrote: “Man’s mind stretched to a new idea never goes back to its original dimensions.” We urge the Department of City Planning to approve the EIR, so that for years to come, Archer will have a fitting new campus where students can stretch their minds, stretch their abilities, and ultimately stretch their contributions to our community.

Thank you for your consideration.

**Response to Comment No. 321-2**

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 322

Laura Marks
567 Almoloya Dr.
Pacific Palisades, CA  90272

Comment No. 322-1

The Archer Forward plan will enhance the school with new and improved facilities and as a parent of a current student at Archer and someone who lives in the 11th District, I am writing to show my strong support for Archer and Archer Forward.

Archer is an active member of the Brentwood community. It participates in the Brentwood Community Council, and hosts meetings for parents, neighbors, stakeholders, officials and trustees throughout the year. At these meetings, the school administration provides updates on upcoming school events and projects, and provides a forum for participants to air their questions and concerns. Through the Archer Forward community outreach process, the School has continued to provide this level of engagement and transparency—creating a dialogue that is unprecedented for a school development project.

The Archer Forward plan has been in the works for many months, and I’m excited for what it means for the future of the school. The plan envisions the much-needed athletics, arts and parking facilities that nearly every other independent school in the area already has. I know that Archer has made every effort to address the concerns of the neighbors with regards to this plan, and I am confident that this is the best result for the school and community alike.

I am proud to be member of the Archer Parent Association and share Archer’s commitment to excellent education and a heart for service and the community. I hope you will help Archer by moving this project forward quickly through the review process.

Response to Comment No. 322-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 323

Jane Marlis
409 N. Bundy Dr.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 323-1

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Archer school expansion. Rather, I support a downsized alternative. Archer should honor their original agreement with the city when the school began in our community 15 years ago.

Response to Comment No. 323-1

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration. The commenter indicates support for a downsized alternative. However, a specific recommendation for a reduced Project alternative is not provided. It is noted that in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project includes refinements, such as reducing the square footage and massing, width, and length of some of the proposed buildings; reducing the number of parking spaces; and creating expanded landscape buffers. Overall, the Project's net new floor area would be reduced from 75,930 square feet to 68,989 square feet.

Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements.

Comment No. 323-2

We live at 409 North Bundy (since 2000).

We have lived through years of 405 freeway work. I have to cross Sunset at Bundy as well as Sunset at Barrington regularly at various times during the week. Often these intersections are completely gridlocked. Our crowded residential streets can not possibly accommodate the estimated 20,000 additional visitors to an expanded Archer School. Emergency vehicles will not be able to push through the gridlock & additional traffic will create very undesirable living conditions for our residents.
Response to Comment No. 323-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to decision-makers for review and consideration.

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site. Regarding the comment on the estimated number of visitors to the campus, the transportation analysis in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, the City of Los Angeles 2006 CEQA Thresholds Guide, and the LADOT Traffic Study Guidelines, which provide for evaluation of traffic impacts during peak hours on a daily basis. In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Refer to Section IV.J.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, and Section IV.J.2, Public Services—Police Protection, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response No. 9, Emergency Vehicle Access, regarding emergency vehicle access.
Comment Letter No. 324

Bob Marshall
marshall@usc.edu

Comment No. 324-1

I am writing to say that I am opposed to Archer’s proposed project, Archer Forward: Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan. Archer’s project represents a substantial expansion in a quiet residential neighborhood that will result not only in an increase in use but in a significant impact on traffic. I am concerned about the potential adverse effects Archer’s expansion will have on our community due to the intensification of use and the resulting increase in traffic.

Archer proposes constructing four large-scale buildings that include two gyms that could potentially accommodate 600 spectators as well as a performing arts center that could seat 650. In addition to the two gyms and performing arts center, the aquatic center and visual arts center, as well as the outdoor athletic field, could be used simultaneously after school from 3:30pm to 10:00pm and on weekends. This simultaneous use will lead to an increase in traffic as thousands of visitors use Sunset Boulevard as well as the 405 freeway to get to the campus during peak traffic periods (3:30pm to 7:00pm). With two gyms, an aquatic center, an outdoor field and a softball diamond, Archer proposes moving the majority of its athletic activities onto campus, increasing the number of games held on campus from the current 39 to 145. This increase will bring 6,800 visitors into the area during the peak traffic periods when previously only 1,300 visitors came to the area.

With an expanded campus that now includes five buildings instead of one, Archer proposes an increase in other activities that will lead to more visitors and car trips. Archer’s plan includes

- Doubling the number of special events to 98 from the currently allowed 47, bringing 24,000 visitors to the campus during the school year, an increase of 16,000 guests,

- Allowing outside rental use of the facilities for weddings and private parties for up to 200 guests, 24 times a year, Monday through Saturday, 8:00am to 10:00pm, will bring 4,800 visitors that currently do not come to the campus, thus adding a new use that will contribute to traffic and noise;

- Expanding the size of events held on campus to include special events with attendance of 650 people as well as 10 Athletic Tournaments with 200 visitors in attendance will increase use on the weekends and add to traffic and noise.
III.D Comment Letters

**Response to Comment No. 324-1**

In response to comments on the Draft EIR, refinements to the Project are proposed, including a reduction in the square footage of some of the proposed buildings, a reduction in the number of seats within the Performing Arts Center, and a reduction in the number of events and athletic activities. Refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood.

As discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on School operations are proposed, including additional limitations on the hours of operation; reducing the number of proposed School Functions from 98 to 86, including eliminating Interscholastic Athletic Tournaments and two School Functions with up to 650 guests; and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses. In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. Also refer to Topical Response No. 7, Potential Traffic Impacts Associated with Proposed Campus Operations, for a detailed discussion of potential traffic impacts associated with proposed campus operations.

Regarding the comment’s estimates of visitors to the campus, the transportation analysis in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the City of Los Angeles 2006 CEQA Thresholds Guide, and the LADOT Traffic Study Guidelines, which provide for evaluation of traffic impacts during peak hours on a daily basis.

With regard to noise, refer to Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, for a description of additional mitigation measures proposed to be implemented to reduce noise associated with campus operations.

**Comment No. 324-2**

To accommodate this increased use, Archer proposes building a 212 car-parking garage that would be utilized during school hours at capacity for staff and students and then again from 3:30pm to 10:00pm for visitors coming to campus for athletic events, special events, and performing art events. This represents more than a 100% increase in the number of cars currently exiting onto Sunset Boulevard during peak hours. Not only will this increase the number of vehicles on Sunset Boulevard, but the surrounding neighboring streets that
have already seen an increase in cut through traffic from the five other schools in a one mile radius. We know from experience that our neighborhood will suffer from the impact of more traffic coming into our area at peak hours as Sunset becomes gridlocked and cars cut through our neighborhood to avoid the congestion on Sunset.

Response to Comment No. 324-2

As described in Topical Response No. 3, Overview of Reduced Parking Spaces, Parking Demand, and Parking Enforcement, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the underground parking structure is proposed to be reduced. In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. Refer to Topical Response No. 7, Potential Traffic Impacts Associated with Proposed Campus Operations, for a discussion of vehicles exiting the campus and a discussion regarding cut-through traffic on Chaparal Street.

Comment No. 324-3

For the last five years my community has had to endure the effects of the I-405 widening project—cars backed up on Sunset Boulevard for miles making it difficult to get to our homes and an increase in cars cutting through our neighborhood trying to avoid the congestion on Sunset Boulevard to get onto the 405 freeway. Now we will have to endure another six years of construction with Archer’s overly ambitious plan that will make traffic unbearable, an impact the DEIR says will be significant and unavoidable. While construction traffic may appear to be temporary, the reality is that it is not. With one project ending, another begins—widening of Wilshire Boulevard near the VA for the Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit Project; California Incline Replacement; Archer School Expansion. Not only is traffic increased because of road closures and lane reduction, but the insertion of thousands of slow moving construction vehicles into the flow of traffic. And what began as a temporary inconvenience becomes a permanent one as traffic patterns are forever altered as cars seek new ways (i.e. cutting through our neighborhood) to get to points east of the freeway.

Response to Comment No. 324-3

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site. Refer to Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, regarding the impacts of construction activities and the proposal to reduce the overall construction timeframe for the Project from six years to five years. Refer to Topical Response No. 6, Overview of
Construction Traffic and Parking, for a detailed discussion regarding construction traffic. The traffic analysis in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR considered the effects of traffic diversions due to the Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit Project. Regarding the pending California Incline reconstruction, since the California Incline primarily carries traffic destined to the downtown Santa Monica area, the primary effect of its temporary closure will be to divert traffic to Chautauqua/Channel and to Moomat Ahiko Way in Santa Monica, not to Sunset Boulevard in Brentwood.

**Comment No. 324-4**

If Archer reduces the size and number of buildings, traffic will be mitigated through reduced programming—less events means less cars coming to campus. Archer can mitigate the impacts of traffic by reducing the size of its expansion and still meet its academic and athletic objectives. I support Alternative 4 Option B (Reduced Program within Existing Campus Boundary, No Aquatic Center) with the following modifications:

- Increase the current size of the school by adding two new buildings, not four, including one gym underground, and a Performing Arts Center that seats 300,
- Renovate the North Wing,
- Eliminate the Visual Arts Center,
- Expand and renovate the campus within the current footprint of the school, thus preserving the two residences and creating a needed buffer between the neighbors and the institutional use of the school,
- Continue to use the two residences adjacent to the school as residences,
- Maintain softball field’s current orientation of northwest,
- Add more landscaping on the northern and western property lines to provide an attractive buffer between the school and residences,
- Increase the set back of the building placed adjacent to Chaparal Street,
- Maintain the number of special events at the current level permitted in the Conditional Use Permit, which, as set forth in the DEIR’s analysis of Alternative II, reduces impacts to traffic to a level less than significant after mitigation;
- Maintain the current condition of no lights on the athletic field,
- Follow the guidelines of the current Conditional Use Permit regarding hours of operation for school instruction and functions,
- Allow no outside use for rental or lease, as required by the current Conditional Use Permit, which would eliminate and/or reduce noise, aesthetic, and traffic impacts;

- Improve the school's facilities with only one phase of construction.

Alternative 4-B has reduced impacts over the Project and the other alternatives in almost every area evaluated in the DEIR. With the modifications set forth above, the impacts are further reduced and Archer can meet nearly all of its objectives.

**Response to Comment No. 324-4**

Refer to Tropical Response No. 14, Residential Neighbors’ Proposed Alternative, for a detailed response to the alternative proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer. In response to comments on the Draft EIR, several of the modifications proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer have been incorporated into the Project.
Comment Letter No. 325

Frank Marshall
President
The Kennedy/Marshall Company
619 Arizona Ave.
Santa Monica, CA  90401

Comment No. 325-1

One of the things I enjoy most about being a member of the Board of Trustees at The Archer School for Girls, is being on campus to experience the joyful exuberance of the girls and to see the powerful and positive impact our school is having on these young women’s lives. As we move forward, our proposed campus improvement plan is critical for our school to continue to provide excellent, research-based education that allows girls to succeed in the classroom and beyond. I’m writing to you today to request your support for this project.

We have spent countless hours putting together a plan that will most benefit the students and cause the least amount of disruption to the neighborhood. This plan includes essential new facilities, ones that most local independent schools already have: regulation-sized athletic fields, a gymnasium, modern classrooms, and performing and visual arts centers. It is important to note that we will not increase our enrollment cap and we will continue to enforce our strict traffic management standards. All of our students are required to use carpools or the school bus to get to campus.

Archer is one of the most diverse independent schools in the area, with a community of 460 students who come from all over Los Angeles, including 92 zip codes and 146 different schools. In addition, we take enormous pride in the level of financial aid that we afford students, making Archer accessible to girls from all backgrounds. The Archer Forward Plan will allow us [sic] complete our campus and continue to provide the highest quality education to girls in the Los Angeles area.

As we have throughout this process, we will continue to work with our neighbors and community stakeholders to refine the plan and ensure that it is respectful of our residential location. I hope you will support Archer and our plan as we move forward in the public process for Archer Forward.
Response to Comment No. 325-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 326

Mrs. Nancy Martin
nancybmartin@aol.com

Comment No. 326-1

The Archer School for Girls has been a responsible and dedicated member of the Brentwood community for the past 15 years. As an Archer parent, I am writing to ask for the City’s support for the school’s upcoming campus enhancement plan, Archer Forward.

As times change, schools must change as well. Archer uses the same facilities that it had when it moved to its current location in 1998. The school prides itself on providing an education that allows girls to learn in a style tailored for them, yet many classrooms are cramped and outdated. Furthermore, the school itself lacks key athletic and arts facilities. There’s not even a place on campus for the entire student body and teachers to gather together. This plan will change all of that and it won’t be to the detriment of the neighborhood.

Most of the other independent schools in the area already have the facilities that Archer is asking for, including gymnasiums, performing arts and visual arts facilities, regulation fields and aquatics centers. These improvements will greatly enhance the value of our daughters’ education. Not mention, it will save the school and the girls the time and resources they currently waste commuting around town to access the facilities located at other schools.

The school has done an excellent job of thinking this plan through completely. I am confident that it is the best move forward for our girls and for the community that they will be a part of in the years to come. I hope that the City will join us in support of this project.

Response to Comment No. 326-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 327

Sarah E. Martin

Comment No. 327-1

I am writing in support of the Archer School for Girls’ campus plan. Before I became a math and science teacher at Archer, I taught at several public and charter school throughout Los Angeles. Archer truly provides a unique and special learning environment for girls.

Archer’s educational program educates the whole student. It deserves to be supported in its plan to provide an even better education for girls from all over Los Angeles, by adding modern classrooms utilizing the latest in educational tools, as well as a regulation-size athletic field, a gymnasium and spaces for swim and performing and visual arts.

Currently in my math classroom, girls literally stick to their chairs because of a lack of air conditioning during the peak hot months. Students learn math and science best when classrooms are filled with differing points of view which allows for a diverse discussion of concepts. But our small classroom sizes limit our ability to support different learning styles in these spaces and facilities.

I strongly urge the City to support Archer’s campus plan. The plan meets Archer’s core needs while limiting impact to the neighborhood by including many features that are responsive to the needs of our neighbors. The improvement plan takes numerous steps to reduce noise, traffic and visual impacts in the community.

Thank you. I appreciate your time and consideration.

Response to Comment No. 327-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 328

Kelly Rapf Martino
11773 Sunset Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 328-1

Please see my attached letter. Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 328-1

This introductory comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 328-2

I am writing to say that I am opposed to Archer's proposed project, Archer Forward: Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan. Archer's project represents a huge expansion in a quiet residential neighborhood that will result not only in an increase in use but in a Significant impact on traffic.

Response to Comment No. 328-2

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

As evaluated in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the proposed buildings would be designed to complement the historic Main Building and respond to and respect the residential scale and character of the surrounding area. As such, the Project would be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and the Brentwood–Pacific Palisades Community Plan regarding conservation of and compatibility with the scale and character of the City’s residential neighborhoods. Also refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood.

As evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures
presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all operational Project traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

As discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on Archer’s operations are proposed, including additional limitations on the hours of operation and additional limitations on Saturdays, reducing the number of proposed School Functions from 98 to 86, and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses.

Comment No. 328-3

I live in very close proximity to eight educational institutions within a short two miles of my house. I know first hand the impact of traffic and noise from the schools’ operational use and the Importance of Conditional Use Permits. That is why I am especially alarmed at Archer’s request for an underground parking structure, lights on the field, outside use of the facilities, extended hours of operation and the construction of four new buildings on a small parcel of land situated in a densely populated residential neighborhood. Please remember that two of the homes they intend to build these facilities on are zoned for residential use.

Response to Comment No. 328-3

In response to comments on the Draft EIR, refinements to the Project are proposed, including reducing the size of the proposed underground parking structure and the square footage and massing, width, and length of some of the proposed buildings. Refer to Topical Response No. 8, Summary of Impacts from Parking Structure, for a discussion of the proposed refinements to the parking structure and Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood. As described further in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, additional restrictions on School operations are also proposed, including additional limits on the hours of operation, reducing the number of proposed School Functions, and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses. Further, as discussed in Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, the Project has also been refined to include additional measures to reduce noise associated with campus operations. In addition, as described in Topical Response No. 2, Removal of Athletic Field Lighting and Refinements to Lighting, the Project has been refined to remove the athletic field lighting. As discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, additional operational mitigation measures are also proposed to reduce significant traffic impacts related to School Functions and Interscholastic Athletic Competitions to below a level of significance. Lastly, as discussed in Topical Response No. 13, Use of
Existing Residential Properties, school uses are permitted in the RE and R3 zones with a conditional use permit.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 328-4**

We live in a neighborhood that is already too congested. We have to schedule our daily lives around traffic on Sunset Boulevard. We cannot come and go as we please. My parents, who live in Malibu, no longer want to come visit due to the amount of time they must spend in traffic. We need to find ways to lessen the traffic, not increase it!

**Response to Comment No. 328-4**

This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to decision-makers for review and consideration.

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

**Comment No. 328-5**

I am also very concerned about the excavation for the underground parking structure directly behind my property. How will the excavation process be mitigated? Can they guarantee that our property will not be affected? What if I get cracks in my unit? Will our swimming pool be filled with dirt? What will be done to address all of our concerns? There are 31 other homeowners who own in the complex where I own my townhouse. We are all strictly opposed to this project. We are concerned about what will happen to our homes during construction. How will our quality of life be impacted? How much more traffic will we have to endure?

**Response to Comment No. 328-5**

In accordance with City of Los Angeles, Department of Building and Safety Information Bulletin Document No. P/BC 2011-034 requirements, shoring installation would be performed during continuous observation of a representative of the geotechnical engineer. The shoring installation would be designed to account for the loads imposed by adjacent structures and site improvements, including buildings, pools, and property line walls.
With regard to vibration impacts from excavation activities, refer to pages IV.I-62 and IV.I-64 of Section IV.I, Noise, in the Draft EIR, for a discussion of on-site construction vibration impacts associated with potential building damage. As noted therein, with implementation of Project Design Feature I-1, which provides that pile drivers and vibratory rollers shall not be used during construction and requires that the use of large bulldozers and hoe rams occur a minimum of 15 feet from the nearest off-site building, vibration impacts associated with potential building damage during on-site construction activities would be less than significant.

Further, with regard to noise impacts from excavation activities, Mitigation Measure I-1 on page IV.I-114 of Section IV.I, Noise, in the Draft EIR, provides for the use of temporary sound barriers between the Project construction area and affected receptors, where feasible, to provide 5 to 10 dBA of noise reduction. However, as discussed on page IV.I-115 of Section IV.I, Noise, of the Draft EIR, temporary sound barriers would not be provided for mitigation should it be determined that the proposed temporary noise barriers shall not be installed due to the noise impacts created by their installation, or the significant shading and aesthetics impacts they could create.

In regard to fugitive dust, in accordance with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403 as set forth in Regulatory Compliance Measure B-1 on page IV.B-32 of Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, the Project shall incorporate measures to control fugitive dust, which may include watering, street sweeping, installation of wheel washers, covering of haul trucks, suspending earthmoving operations if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour, and installing an information sign at the entrance of the construction site that provides a telephone number to report complaints regarding excessive fugitive dust generation.

In addition, as detailed in Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been refined to reduce the construction period from six years to five years. The Project has also been refined to include the reduction in the square footage and massing, width, and length of some of the proposed buildings, reducing the number of parking spaces, and creating expanded landscape buffers. Further, as described on page IV.K-109 of Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, the Project would include implementation of Mitigation Measures K-4 through K-14 to address potential traffic and access issues during construction. Also refer to Topical Response No. 6, Overview of Construction Traffic and Parking regarding construction traffic.
Comment No. 328-6

Why will we have to listen to amplified noise and have lights shining into our homes? This is all unacceptable to us.

Response to Comment No. 328-6

As discussed in Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, the Project has been refined to eliminate the proposal for use of a non-permanent audio system for public address and amplified music in conjunction with Instruction, Interscholastic Athletic Competitions, and School Functions. Archer would continue to use a non-permanent audio system for use during Graduation as permitted under Archer's existing CUP.

As discussed in Topical Response No. 2, Removal of Athletic Field Lighting and Refinements to Lighting, the athletic field lighting has been removed from the Project. As set forth in Section IV.A, Aesthetics/Visual Quality, Views, Light/Glare, and Shading, of the Draft EIR, the Project would not result in significant lighting impacts associated with the Project.

Comment No. 328-7

I share the concerns of the Residential Neighbors of Archer and believe that the existing Conditional Use Permit should remain in effect and Archer should find an offsite location for their arts and athletic programs. The CUP, which was carefully negotiated 15 years ago, was an agreement between the City, the school and the neighbors that balanced the residents' rights to the quiet peaceful enjoyment of their homes with the school's ability to successfully operate. Critical features of the CUP under which Archer currently operates, include:

- Hours of operation that limit night time use and weekend use and outside use of facilities
- A set number of special events that take place at night and on the weekends
- Limited use of the field and no lights on the field
- Noise restrictions that include no amplified or loud music outside
- Allowance for the building of one gymnasium, whose size and location was carefully chosen
Now Archer proposes a substantial expansion of the school’s facilities and operations with no commitment to keep the existing use restrictions in place. (see table below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current CUP</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>450</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gym</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12,000 sq ft</strong></td>
<td>12,000 sq ft</td>
<td>41,400 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of physical plant</strong></td>
<td>95,000 sq ft</td>
<td>174,253 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside Use</strong></td>
<td>No rental or lease</td>
<td>24 days of outside use of all facilities plus 30 day summer school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Special Events</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Hours of Operation</strong></td>
<td>Monday through Friday 7:00am to 6:00pm</td>
<td>Monday through Saturday 7:00am to 6:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lights on field</strong></td>
<td>No lights</td>
<td>Addition of lights on the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking on campus</strong></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>212 (max of 282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amplified Music or Loud Music Outside</strong></td>
<td>No amplified music or loud non-amplified music</td>
<td>Amplified or Loud Music allowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response to Comment No. 328-7**

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A CUP is a discretionary approval issued after environmental review and a public process. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

Regarding enrollment, as discussed on page II-2 of Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the existing CUP provides for a maximum total enrollment at 518 students. The Project does not propose to increase the maximum enrollment cap of 518 students.

Regarding campus operations, as discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on School operations are proposed, including additional limitations on the hours of operation on Saturdays, reducing the number of proposed School Functions
from 98 to 86, and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses. Appendix FEIR-B of this Final EIR includes additional limitations for the proposed School Functions and includes a table with limitations on hours and days and illustrative examples.

Additionally, as described in Topical Response No. 2, Removal of Athletic Field Lighting and Refinements to Lighting, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been refined to remove the athletic field lighting.

Regarding noise, as discussed in Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been further refined to include additional measures to reduce noise associated with campus operations. In particular, the proposed use of a non-permanent audio system for public address and amplified music in conjunction with Instruction, Interscholastic Athletic Competitions, and School Functions would be eliminated. Use of a non-permanent audio system during graduation, as permitted under Archer’s existing CUP, would continue.

Also refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood. As summarized therein and described in Section II, Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, refinements to the Project are proposed, including a reduction in the size of certain proposed buildings. Overall, the Project’s net new floor area would be reduced from approximately 75,930 square feet to 68,989 square feet. The Multipurpose Facility, which includes gymnasium space for Archer’s Upper School and Middle School, would be reduced from 41,400 square feet to 39,300 square feet. The Multipurpose Facility would support the project objective of providing separate gymnasium space for the Middle School and Upper School so both the Middle School and Upper School volleyball and basketball teams can practice and compete on the Archer campus. The Middle School gymnasium space would be located below grade. Accordingly, 19,950 square feet of the Multipurpose Facility would be above grade.

Lastly, as described in Topical Response No. 3, Overview of Reduced Parking Spaces, Parking Demand and Supply, and Parking Enforcement, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been refined to reduce the size of the parking structure. With this reduction, the number of parking spaces would be reduced from 212 spaces to 185 spaces, expandable to 251 spaces with the use of attendant assisted parking.
Comment No. 328-8

If approved, Archer's proposed project would completely change the character of the neighborhood and cause many negative impacts on traffic and the peaceful way of life its neighbors enjoy. I hope that you will put our neighborhood first and oppose the Archer Forward project.

Response to Comment No. 328-8

As evaluated in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the proposed buildings would be designed to complement the historic Main Building and respond to and respect the residential scale and character of the surrounding area. The Project would also include the use of architectural features that add visual interest and reduce massing to maintain the residential street character when viewed from Chaparal Street and Barrington Avenue. In addition, the Project would represent a continuation of an existing private school use and would not substantially and adversely change the existing land use relationships between the Project Site and existing off-site uses.

Refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project's consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood. In addition, as discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, additional restrictions on School operations are proposed, including additional limits on the hours of operation, reducing the number of proposed School Functions, and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses. As discussed in Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project is also incorporating additional measures to reduce noise associated with campus operations. As provided in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, the Project is incorporating additional operational mitigation measures to reduce operational significant traffic impacts related to School Functions and Interscholastic Athletic Competitions to below a level of significance. With these refinements, the Project would further preserve the residential scale and character of the surrounding neighborhood.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 329

Amelia R. Mathis

Comment No. 329-1

My name is Amelia Mathis and I am a Fitness and Wellness teacher as well as the Cross Country, Track, and Soccer coach here at the Archer School for Girls. The Archer School has been a valuable and responsible member of the Brentwood community since 1999 and welcomed me to the community in the Fall of 2011. I am a proud member of the community, however I believe that we are lacking some facilities that would benefit my teaching and the girls’ understanding of health and fitness.

The Archer Forward plan will add new facilities that will allow the students to receive the education that they deserve. Already about 50% of Archer students participate in interscholastic athletics, requiring these facilities that the school does not provide. We spend a significant amount of recourses renting offsite facilities to hold practices, games and performances. The school lacks locker rooms for students in fitness to change. It lacks a common space for all students, faculty, and staff to congregate. Not having facilities on our campus eliminates school spirit and attendance from peers, teachers and even parents.

This season the Soccer team has done what no other soccer team at Archer has done. We are forced to wait until 8 pm to play a playoff game because we have no facility that is regulation-sized with lights. I think the Archer Forward Plan would benefit these student-athletes because they would be able to maximize their learning for collaboration, teamwork, dedication, responsibility and competitive greatness. Archer believes that this is the most effective plan to offer a competitive array of opportunity for future students.

I am very fortunate to be apart [sic] of a community that believes in empowering girls and even more young women. I believe that this school has made strides to provide each girl and her family with the proper resources that are available at this point. Now we are reaching out to you and asking to help us achieve our goal in improving our campus.

Please support the Archer Forward plan to allow the school to provide an even better education for students.

Response to Comment No. 329-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 330

Shawn F. and Sepideh Rabi Matian
shawnmalian@icloud.com

Comment No. 330-1

My wife and I recently purchased our first home located at 134 N Westgate, Los Angeles, CA 90049. My wife is a pediatrician and I am an attorney; we are pleased to be in the neighborhood, and hope it stays a neighborhood and not a commercial zone benefiting the Archer School while destroying the quiet peace and enjoyment we not only expect, but quite frankly, have the right to possess.

We purchased this home in the early part of 2014, and as a part of our due diligence process we investigated and reviewed the initial CUP given to Archer allowing it’s existence. During that process, it was made clear by local officials that Archer School should always be aware that IT is in a residential area and not the other way around. It was made crystal clear that Archer should always adhere to the understanding that it must always act and conduct itself in a manner consistent with the peaceful quite right of enjoyment that the residents expect and have a right to.

The very warnings and words given to Archer as a condition to it’s existence are now being threatened by Archer’s plan. The existing traffic is nothing short of a nightmare; and not only does Archer’s Plan add to it greatly, it completely tears apart its boundaries and reaches for expansions and requests that are far beyond the scope of the CUP & policy under which the original CUP was given. If Archer’s far-reachign plans are accepted not only will it infringed on our quiet peace and enjoyment, it will certainly lower the property value of all of our parcels; and as a real estate litigator, it is not something I will stand for.

Response to Comment No. 330-1

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A CUP is a discretionary approval issued after environmental review and a public process. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding the compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.
Regarding traffic, refer to Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts. As discussed therein, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been refined to include additional operational mitigation measures to reduce significant traffic impacts related to School Functions and Interscholastic Athletic Competitions to below a level of significance.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 330-2**

Traffic:

The department of transformation [sic] has stated that the DEIR will create significant [sic] impact on traffic to the following areas:

Bundy & Sunset

Saltair Ave & Sunset

Barrington & Sunset

Barrington Place & Sunset

Barrington Ave & Montana

Barrington Ave & Wilshire

The current traffic is outrageous. It is not even in the realm of reality to think it can get even worse than it already is, but allowing this plan to move forward assures it will. Not only does traffic get effected [sic] in the immediate area of the Archer School, but also areas miles away (Wilshire, Montana). I currently live on Kenter Ave, and although the DOT did not include Kenter & Sunset in its impact area, I invite you to come over for breakfast, if you can make it on time I’d be astonished. Not only is there traffic on Kenter Ave, there line to enter Sunset that feels like a never ending marathon. Is there a way to work around it? Is there any way to mitigate it? If you accept Archer’s plan, the answer is NO.
Response to Comment No. 330-2

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. As described in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, the Traffic Study evaluated the intersection of Sunset Boulevard and Kenter Avenue, and the project impact at this intersection was determined to be less than significant. Therefore, no project mitigation is required for that location.

Comment No. 330-3

Not only would Archer’s plan essentially turn a high-end residential neighborhood into the 405 freeway during rush-hour, it also calls for expansions that would make Archer feel more like a for-profit company rather than a school who is operating under the promise of restraint and respect for it’s neighbors. Some clauses include:

(1) Allowing outside rental use of the facilities for weddings and private parties for up to 200 guests, 24 times a year, Monday through Saturday, 8:00am to 10:00pm;

This clause captures the selfish disregard the school has for the neighborhood and city officials who afforded them their initial CUP. What will our neighborhood turn into? The Bel Air Hotel? The school isn’t even attempting to hide the fact that they would like to construct an commercial building to wit, produce revenue. This has nothing to do with teaching, it has nothing to do with the school. How does this even benefit the students? It only creates more traffic, more outsiders, more noise, more trash, more problems. What precedent would this be setting? What’s next? A hotel? The line must be drawn.

Response to Comment No. 330-3

Archer is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization.

Regarding traffic, as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional operational mitigation measures are proposed to reduce significant traffic
impacts related to School Functions and Interscholastic Athletic Competitions to below a level of significance.

Regarding outside use of the facilities, as discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on School operations are proposed, including eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses.

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood. Regarding noise, as discussed in Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been further refined to include additional measures to reduce noise associated with campus operations.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 330-4**

(2) Doubling the number of special events allowed in its current Conditional Use Permit, which would bring over 20,000 visitors to the campus during the school year

The original CUP chose that number for a reason, to keep this area residential and not a carnival. The neighborhood properties haven’t doubled, so why should their special events be doubled.

**Response to Comment No. 330-4**

As discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions to School operations are proposed, including reducing the number of School Functions from 98 to 86. Appendix FEIR-B of this Final EIR includes additional limitations for the proposed School Functions and includes a table with limitations on hours and days and illustrative examples.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment No. 330-5

(3) Adding 30 more days of use with a summer school program;

Response to Comment No. 330-5

As discussed in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Project proposes that summer academic and camp programs may occur for up to six weeks when the academic year is not in session between the hours of 8:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. Monday through Friday. Refer to Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, for additional information and proposed restrictions on Archer’s summer academic and camp programs.

Comment No. 330-6

(4) Moving the majority of the athletic activities onto campus, thus increasing the number of games and visitors coming into our area during peak traffic periods (3:30pm to 7:00pm)

Response to Comment No. 330-6

As discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional operational mitigation measures are proposed to reduce significant operational traffic impacts related to Interscholastic Athletic Competitions to below a level of significance.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 330-7

Adding lights to the field, setting a precedent for other private schools in the Brentwood Community Plan area;

Clause (4) is increasingly problematic. Attaching lights to the field essentially takes the title “residential area” and throws it out of the window. Would you ever approve an drive-in movie theatre smack in the middle of a residential neighborhood? Well, essentially that’s what is happening. Not only does increasing the number of athletic games increase traffic, noise and trash (it brings visitor team’s family, friends, students as well) but placing lights turns our one time quiet neighborhood into the Staples Center without a roof. When the sun goes down, the last thing we want as homeowners is the see industrial lights lighting up the sky like we are in some sort of construction zone. Again, the school has survived without it & they have been fine. The pain, suffering, loss of enjoyment of the neighbors
severely outweighs any inconvenience [sic] to the school. Let's not forget schools that have lights, for the most part, are NOT literally adjoining to homes; there is separation and again, for the most part, the schools that do have lights are schools that have been there for decades. This is not the case with Archer. Archer school is adjoining [sic] it's residential neighbors, in some cases a small wall is the only buffer between a nice home & being in the school. The policy behind granting Archer a CUP was clear: YOU ARE A SCHOOL IN A RESIDENTIAL AREA AND NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND. Allowing this aggregious [sic] request would be devastating and set a very dangerous precent [sic] to the community and other residents/businesses that may request the same.

**Response to Comment No. 330-7**

Regarding athletic field lighting, as discussed in Section IV.A, Aesthetics/Visual Quality, Views, Light/Glare, and Shading, of the Draft EIR, impacts associated with the athletic field lighting would be less than significant. However, as discussed in Topical Response No. 2, Removal of Athletic Field Lighting and Refinements to Lighting, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has removed the athletic field lighting. With the removal of the athletic field lighting, light and glare impacts from the Project would be reduced.

**Comment No. 330-8**

(5) Constructing a 96,000 square foot underground parking garage to hold, at capacity, 282 cars, from its current 109 parking spaces;

I'm [sic] not an environmental expert but have litigating cases with environmental issues and I can assure you, there will be issues if the school constructs an underground lot of this magnitude. The project would require so much earth to moved that the risk of shifting earth during construction and after construction is real, severe and dangerous. Recent listings of the area shows that houses around the school have sold for no less than $2,400,000 for a [sic] some time now. It is an extremely worrisome proposition for the city, the residents and the schools to embark on a task that inherently poses extreme risk. The liability for both the city and the school in moving forward with such an undertaking, especially after being put on notice of associated risks, is shocking to the conscious.

The years of construction, noise, traffic and dirt the construction would surely produce is also alarming. Specifically, the immense amount of dirt that is to be moved can cause serious and significant health concerns to the neighbors. The school has survived without a lot since it's inception, it can continue to do so.
Response to Comment No. 330-8

Refer to Response to Comment No. 27-62 regarding shoring. As discussed therein, the purpose of the proposed temporary shoring system is to prevent soils movement, or shifting, during construction. Once the structures have been built, the new retaining walls would permanently stabilize the excavations required for the proposed underground levels.

In response to the commenter's opinion regarding health concerns to the neighbors, an evaluation of potential health effects from toxic air contaminants emissions during construction of the Project is provided on pages IV.B-38 to IV.B-42 in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. As discussed therein, the greatest potential for toxic air contaminant emissions during construction would be related to diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during grading and excavation activities. According to SCAQMD methodology, health effects from carcinogenic air toxics are usually described in terms of individual cancer risk. “Individual Cancer Risk” is the likelihood that a person exposed to concentrations of toxic air contaminants over a 70-year lifetime will contract cancer, based on the use of standard risk-assessment methodology. Although the SCAQMD CEQA Handbook does not recommend a health risk assessment for short-term construction emissions, an assessment of diesel particulate emissions was conducted. As provided on page IV.B-42 of the Draft EIR, the results of the analysis for the construction of the Project yield a maximum incremental increase in offsite individual cancer risk of 9.1 in a million over the duration of construction and an excess cancer burden of 0.2, where the maximum impact occurs at residential uses directly northeast of the Project Site. The chronic hazard index is approximately 0.01 and is less than the SCAQMD significance threshold of 1.0. As the Project would not emit carcinogenic or toxic air contaminants that individually or collectively exceed the maximum individual cancer risk of 10 in one million or result in an excess cancer burden of 0.5 or more, Project-related toxic emission impacts from construction activities would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

In addition, with implementation of Mitigation Measures B-1 through B-9 included in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, including measures to control dust and operating construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions, impacts from localized NO\textsubscript{x}, PM\textsubscript{10}, and PM\textsubscript{2.5} emissions would be reduced between 55 and 60 percent. As such, with incorporation of mitigation measures, maximum localized construction emissions for off-site sensitive receptors would not exceed the localized screening thresholds for CO, NO\textsubscript{x}, PM\textsubscript{10}, and PM\textsubscript{2.5}. Local significance thresholds represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard, which are health-based standards. Therefore, Project-level and cumulative localized construction emissions would result in a less than significant impact with incorporation of mitigation measures.
Furthermore, in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 403 as set forth in Regulatory Compliance Measure B-1 on page IV.B-32 of Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, the Project shall incorporate measures to control fugitive dust, which may include watering, street sweeping, installation of wheel washers, covering of haul trucks, suspending earthmoving operations if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour, and installing an information sign at the entrance of the construction site that provides a telephone number to report complaints regarding excessive fugitive dust generation.

It is noted that in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been refined to reduce the square footage of some of the proposed buildings and the underground parking structure. With the reduced underground parking structure, the amount of soil to be exported would be reduced.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 330-9**

Other elements of the proposal like extending school hours to include Saturdays, hosting activities until 10pm, doubling the campus size, tearing down residential areas, are all entirely contradictory and unnecessary.

**Response to Comment No. 330-9**

Refer to Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, regarding additional restrictions on School operations proposed in response to comments on the Draft EIR, including additional limitations on the hours of operation on Saturdays. Appendix FEIR-B of this Final EIR includes additional limitations for the proposed School Functions and includes a table with limitations on hours and days and illustrative examples.

Refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood. Refer to Topical Response No. 13, Use of Existing Residential Properties, for a discussion of the use of residential properties for school uses.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment No. 330-10

The irony behind the strict sentiment that Archer must adhere to and respect this neighborhood setting, while requesting to tear down RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS is disgraceful. It also serves as a clear sign of Archer’s attitude towards the law and total deceitful and dishonest character.

When Archer school requested to take over the building both residents and city officials spend months negotiating the schools CUP. Residents spent countless hours and funds to research, inspect and seek guidance in an effort to negotiate in good faith for the benefit of both parties involved. This proposal is a slap in the face, it’s a complete annihilation of the CUP and the promises made by Archer representatives. Archer would not exist but for it’s promises, and now Archer does not want to keep those very promises, thus logic would conclude that Archer should not exist; however, if this proposal shall be adopted the neighborhood will cease to exist.

I only hope the a [sic] reasonable resolution will come to fruition so that we can all live in a harmonious environment based on the promises made; I would hate to see the neighborhood have to take measures outside the scope of the city’s powers.

Response to Comment No. 330-10

As evaluated in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the proposed buildings would be designed to complement the historic Main Building and respond to and respect the residential scale and character of the surrounding area. As such, the Project would be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and the Brentwood–Pacific Palisades Community Plan regarding conservation of and compatibility with the scale and character of the City’s residential neighborhoods. Also refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood.

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the school’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.
This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 331

Malia McClurg

Comment No. 331-1

This is my second year as a teacher at the Archer School for Girls, and I see the positive impact that Archer has on its students everyday. Archer is unique in that we empower our girls to apply what they learn to better their school, homes across Los Angeles, and local and global communities, so I would be remiss if I did not raise my voice for their education. We need better facilities to support student learning.

Currently, my students, in a class of 14, cannot enter the room without the door hitting one of their tables. My classroom does not allow for basic movement that good teaching and collaboration requires. We also do not have the ability to meet as a whole school. With the new facilities, we would be able to facilitate group discussion, meet as a school, and continue our mission to create joyful, ambitious learners.

Please support Archer’s Campus Plan.

Response to Comment No. 331-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 332

Bowen H. McCoy  
11755 Chaparal St.  
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Comment No. 332-1

I am a thirty year resident of a single family home on Chaparal Street, just behind Archer School. Chaparal Street is but two blocks long. It was the last street to be paved in Brentwood, being an old ranch road (including Gary Cooper's ranch). It is one of the narrowest street in Brentwood. As such it is a heavily congested thoroughfare, with no room for two way traffic along with parked vehicles.

Prior to that I grew up on Westgate, just south of Sunset, where in the 1950s I hiked up the large gulley between Barrington and Westgate, scaring the thirty or so sheep in residence there.

Prior to that my mother grew up in the Commandant’s house on the Veterans' Administration property at Sawtelle. Her father was a retired Army General who worked for the Veterans' Administration. There is still a street named for him on the V.A. property. She and my grandfather used to take horses from the Army stable and ride down to the beach at Santa Monica.

I provide this somewhat unique background to indicate my appreciation of the need for change and adaptability over the years.

Response to Comment No. 332-1

This comment does not raise an issue specific to the Draft EIR and the environmental impacts addressed therein. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 332-2

When I paid the high price the market demands for a home on Chaparal I took assurance from the fact that the Eastern Star home was zoned R-1 and R-3. In fact, we welcomed the development of single family homes along Chaparal as it would add to our feeing of community and security.
Accordingly we were deeply disappointed when we discovered several years ago that we could not depend on the zoning that had been in place for so many years. While Archer appears to be well intentioned, they have not always lived up to the restrictions they agreed to in the current CUP. Among other things, visiting students and athletic teams arrive by bus, and just this past week one of the buses bringing another school’s students to the Archer campus was parked on Chaparal, in front of our property, making it difficult to navigate Chaparal and for us to access our home.

Response to Comment No. 332-2

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding the compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood. As discussed in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, as part of Project Design Feature K-1, the Project shall include implementation of a comprehensive Traffic Management Program that would include, but not be limited to, prohibitions on parking on neighboring streets. Visiting team school buses would park on-site in the underground parking structure.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 332-3

During the reconstruction of Sunset and the 405 over the past six years we have on many occasions been marooned in our driveway, unable to gain access or egress from our home, as frustrated commuters seek to avoid Sunset. [sic] This is not only unacceptable, but it also presents a public safety issue.

Approval of the Archer Plan as proposed will be destructive of property values during the proposed six year construction period as well as thereafter and forever diminish the quality of life and security of the residents of Chaparal Street and the neighborhood in general.
Response to Comment No. 332-3

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. Refer to Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, regarding the impacts of construction activities and the proposal to reduce the overall construction timeframe for the Project from six years to five years. Refer to Topical Response No. 6, Overview of Construction Traffic and Parking, for a detailed discussion regarding construction traffic.

Refer to Section IV.J.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, and Section IV.J.2, Public Services—Police Protection, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response No. 9, Emergency Vehicle Access, regarding emergency vehicle access.

Comment No. 332-4

It seems to me the primary role of city planning should be to balance the varying interests with a goal to preserving the unique character of Brentwood before it is too late.

The proposed Archer Plan overreaches any acceptable balance of the competing issues.

Your attention to resolving these issues will be appreciated.

Response to Comment No. 332-4

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

As evaluated in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the proposed buildings would be designed to complement the historic Main Building and respond to and respect the residential scale and character of the surrounding area. As such, the Project would be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and the Brentwood–Pacific Palisades Community Plan regarding conservation of and compatibility with the scale and character of the City’s residential neighborhoods. Also refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the
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Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood.
Comment Letter No. 333

Christina McIntosh
The Archer School for Girls
11725 Sunset Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 333-1

Eight years ago, I moved from New Mexico to Los Angeles specifically to work at The Archer School for Girls because I believed in the importance of its mission. Archer is a unique environment where every girl is given the opportunity to be her best self. Our talented students and innovative faculty challenge and inspire me every day.

As the Director of Communications I have closely participated in the significant outreach concerning Archer’s Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan. I personally believe that we have made good faith efforts with our neighbors and community stakeholders to ensure that people are informed about the plan while having the opportunity to register feedback. The school has shared ample information throughout the process and even created a dedicated website with facts and information (www.archerforward.org).

I currently serve on the Brentwood Community Council as a representative for the private school sector in Brentwood. I personally have spent countless hours meeting with community members and neighbors to discuss Archer’s plans. I am heartened by the amount of vocal support that Archer has received and I believe this is because the school has been a great neighbor. They say the best indicator of future behavior is past behavior, and Archer has a proven time and time again that we take our CUP seriously and we understand our role as a school in a residential neighborhood.

I have seen for myself the magic of an Archer education. Watching the growth of a 6th grader from a shy, coy girl to a confident, empowered woman is one of the best parts of my job. The Archer Forward plan is designed to meet the needs of Archer students now and in the future and I hope the city of Los Angeles will support Archer by allowing the school to build the facilities that our girls need and so rightly deserve.

Response to Comment No. 333-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 334

Ann and Don McLennan
woodlandfilm@aol.com

Comment No. 334-1

We are writing this letter to express our strong support for Archer’s plan for its future, Archer Forward. We are parents of a girl at Archer and I live in Council District 11. We look forward to the new campus design and facilities that this plan will provide.

The plan will allow Archer to provide the core programs that are integral to the school’s curriculum. Furthermore, the school will be able to have facilities for both the arts and athletics right on campus. Nearly all schools, both public and private, already have these facilities, including gymnasiums, performing and visual arts centers, regulation athletic fields and a pool.

The entire public process for Archer Forward is a testament to the values of the school. Archer has conducted an unprecedented amount of outreach, before the plan was even finalized! Numerous modifications have been made to the plan and more may come. These modifications were all made to reduce burdens on the neighbors.

Archer is a wonderful, unique treasure in the city and we hope that the city works with Archer to move this plan forward quickly through the review process. Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 334-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 335

Steven. McMillion  
2044 W. 64th St.  
Los Angeles, CA  90047

Comment No. 335-1

My daughter is currently a student at the Archer School for Girls in Brentwood. I am writing to urge the City to support the school's improvement project, Archer Forward. It’s in the best interest of the school and the students, and therefore is a good step forward for the community and the City as well.

Our girls spend countless hours commuting to practices, games and performances because Archer lacks the adequate facilities to host these events on campus. It’s truly an amazing school that offers our girls a top-notch, 21st century education—but in order for the school to continue to make good on its mission, it needs the facilities and space every modern school requires.

There’s no doubt that Archer prides itself on being a responsible and active member of the community. As parents, we abide by many rules—particularly with regards to carpools and buses—to make sure that the school is doing its part to reduce traffic in Brentwood. The school administration values community service, something they put into practice by participating in local neighborhood councils and groups, and requiring all students to complete community service hours in the local area.

Archer Forward is a good plan for the students, the school and the city. I respectfully request the City’s support.

Response to Comment No. 335-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 336

Tanya R. McMillion
2044 W. 64th St.
Los Angeles, CA  90047

Comment No. 336-1

My daughter is currently a student at the Archer School for Girls in Brentwood. I am writing to urge the City to support the school's improvement project, Archer Forward. It’s in the best interest of the school and the students, and therefore is a good step forward for the community and the City as well.

Our girls spend countless hours commuting to practices, games and performances because Archer lacks the adequate facilities to host these events on campus. It’s truly an amazing school that offers our girls a top-notch, 21st century education—but in order for the school to continue to make good on its mission, it needs the facilities and space every modern school requires.

There’s no doubt that Archer prides itself on being a responsible and active member of the community. As parents, we abide by many rules—particularly with regards to carpools and buses—to make sure that the school is doing its part to reduce traffic in Brentwood. The school administration values community service, something they put into practice by participating in local neighborhood councils and groups, and requiring all students to complete community service hours in the local area.

Archer Forward is a good plan for the students, the school and the city. I respectfully request the City’s support.

Response to Comment No. 336-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 337

Sara E. Melzer
920 Amherst Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Comment No. 337-1

I am an educator and have been a resident of Brentwood for 25 years. The area near Archer has become progressively more congested over the years. Routinely it now takes me about 15-30 minutes to drive to Sunset from Barrington and Montana in rush hour traffic. The proposed new extension of the Archer school is very unreasonable and does not truly consider the impact it will have on the entire neighborhood.

Response to Comment No. 337-1

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

The transportation analysis in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, the City of Los Angeles 2006 CEQA Thresholds Guide, and the LADOT Traffic Study Guidelines. In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Comment No. 337-2

As an educator myself, I am interested in supporting the schools, BUT within measure. The current proposal is completely out of bounds. Please support a significant downscale of the current proposal.

Response to Comment No. 337-2

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. The commenter indicates support for a downsized alternative. However, a specific recommendation for a reduced Project alternative is not provided. It is noted that in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project includes refinements, such as reducing the square footage and massing, width, and length of some of the proposed buildings; reducing the number of parking
spaces; and creating expanded landscape buffers. Overall, the Project’s net new floor area would be reduced from 75,930 square feet to 68,989 square feet.
Comment Letter No. 338

Tim Miklaucic
Cordoba Music Group
1455 19th St.
Santa Monica, CA  90404

Comment No. 338-1

Archer Forward is an important step forward for the only secular girls’ school in West Los Angeles. I hope that you and Councilmember Bonin will support the project and help it move forward as quickly as possible.

Archer has been an excellent neighbor since moving to Brentwood in 1998. It has gone beyond what was required in compliance with the city’s mandates, as shown by the excellent reports during its plan approvals. As a parent at the school and 11th District resident, I can attest to the importance that the Archer leadership places on ensuring that we comply with the traffic management program—which is designed to reduce any burden on the neighbors.

The Archer Forward Plan is simply critical for the school. The girls need spaces where they can compete and perform. The current campus has no gym, no regulation-sized playing fields and inadequate performing and visual arts spaces. Nearly all other independent and public schools have these facilities or have the ability to build them under their CUP’s. Archer is at a severe disadvantage without the ability to provide these things for its students.

I hope that the city and the Councilman will support this plan and move it quickly through the review process. Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 338-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 338-2

I'm not sure if we have signed up as an interested party, but please use my address in the signature below.
[Cordoba Music Group
1455 19th St.
Santa Monica, CA  90404]

**Response to Comment No. 338-2**

In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list.
Comment Letter No. 339

Arleen Milian
1008 N. Heliotrope Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90029

Comment No. 339-1

I am writing today to request that you support Archer and their campus improvement plan. My daughter graduated in 2008 and was involved in many activities at Archer. This includes: Arts Editor for the school newspaper, rounder of the Contemporary Arts Appreciation Club, President of the Student Store, and member of the Educate Girls Globally. Her experiences at Archer still play large part in her life today. She is currently at United Talent Agency, which Archer prepared her for by teaching her leadership skills and self-confidence.

Although my daughter greatly benefited from her Archer education, all students felt the impact from the lack of space. With the Archer Forward Campus improvement Plan that will all be changed. The school is simply asking to add facilities that they do not currently have. The new facilities would allow the girls to have a more enjoyable experience at school. Furthermore, the changes on the campus will help improve pedestrian safety, as there will be underground parking, and students and parents will no longer have to park in lots across the street in order to attend school events.

I have looked at the plan on the Archer Forward website and I do not think what they are asking for is unreasonable. I hope you recognize what an asset this school is to the community and you support their plan.

Response to Comment No. 339-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 339-2

Thank you for your acknowledgement. If you would be so kind, please add my name to the mailing list at the following address:

1008 N. Heliotrope Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90029
**Response to Comment No. 339-2**

In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list.
Comment Letter No. 340

Dominique Miller  
350 Albany St., Apt. 10A  
New York, NY  10280

Comment No. 340-1

My name is Dominique Miller and I graduated from Archer in 2001, in the pioneer class. I am writing in support of Archer’s Campus Plan.

The Archer School for Girls changed my life. Archer’s environment of encouraging free thought, leadership and community allowed me to thrive, not only as a student, but as a future leader. The education and cultural experience that I enjoyed at Archer instilled within me courage, fearlessness and confidence. It is because of Archer that I consistently push myself outside of my comfort zone without fear. Without the confidence that I developed at Archer, I never would have traveled across the country to pursue my undergraduate degree at Boston College, nor would I have studied abroad in Japan and Italy, nor would I have had the courage to pursue my MBA at NYU Stern School of Business.

Thanks to Archer, I am an MBA graduate with global experience, working at a Fortune 500 Company. I feel comfortable challenging the status quo—all because of Archer.

While at Archer, I played on the volleyball, dance and soccer teams. I remember how difficult it was to practice due to lack of space. During dance practice, there was never enough space for us to rehearse at once, so we often had to break up into two groups to practice our routines. During soccer, we had to coordinate our practice time so as not to cut into another team’s practice due to the limited field space. We had to run laps in a small section of the field so as not to disrupt the other teams’ practices. We had to be careful so as not to kick our soccer balls into the basketball court, so as not to interrupt the other team’s game.

I support Archer’s Campus Plan because it is time that Archer had the same facilities that every other school enjoys and because girls deserve every opportunity to become fearless leaders. I hope that we can count on your support to give thousands of girls this opportunity to thrive.
Response to Comment No. 340-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 340-2

Thank you for your email. My mailing address is:

Dominique Miller
350 Albany Street, Apt 10A
New York, NY 10280

Response to Comment No. 340-2

In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list.
Comment Letter No. 341

Donna Mills
2346 Mandeville Canyon Rd.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 341-1

My daughter graduated from The Archer School for Girls in 2013. I am writing because I strongly support Archer’s plan for the future. I have first-hand experience with Archer’s commitment to being a good neighbor and creating a girl-centric environment to educate future leaders from throughout Los Angeles. I truly hope the city will help Archer by quickly moving this plan forward through the review process.

As a former parent, I know that Archer Forward is critical for the school to remain competitive among independent schools. Arts and athletics participation are a fundamental part of the middle school and high school experiences. However, the necessary space for these programs is not currently available to Archer girls. Archer deserves to have these facilities on onsite, especially since they are facilities other local schools already have. The proposed plan for the campus not only provides these facilities, but most importantly, it is respectful to the surrounding neighborhood.

I hope that the planning department, along with Councilmember Bonin, will support Archer and move this plan forward in the city review process. Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 341-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 341-2

My mailing address is -
2346 Mandeville Cyn Rd
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Response to Comment No. 341-2

In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list.
Comment Letter No. 342

Kathy and Dale Mitchell
kathymitchell20@gmail.com

Comment No. 342-1

Please see attached letter.

Response to Comment No. 342-1

This introductory comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 342-2

Since graduating from Archer in 2002, our daughter Korinne has gone on to finish college. She graduated from the University of Michigan in 2006. At the University of Michigan she met her now husband Victor, who also graduated that same year. They were married three years ago and are the proud parents of a newborn baby boy. Their son Caleb is two months old. Our daughter also has a wonderful career. She works for the company Bebe, as a Buyer and she loves her job. Her husband is a Project Manager for Catholic Charities.

In our opinion success is not only in obtaining a college degree but it is being successful in all aspects of your life. As parents we instilled certain values, good values, in our daughter and Archer not only reinforced those same values but they also gave her self confidence. That self confidence gained her a very much sought after position with the company Bebe which is a well known women’s retail clothier. Our daughter left Archer with not only useful skills, but with the belief that she could achieve anything she wanted to achieve. She was not limited because she was a girl. Korinne had no previous experience or training as a Buyer yet when she went on her interview, Bebe knew she had “something”. So they took a chance and hired her over many other candidates who had years of experience. Since that day Bebe has given Korinne several raises and they are very happy with her performance on the job. They have told her they see her going very far with the company. That “something” that Bebe saw in our daughter was what Archer gave her, self confidence and belief in herself.

Archer cares deeply about their students and the school is amazing. It has done wonders for our daughter. Archer is not asking for much, only for what is fair—for the girls to be able to have the faculties on campus that their peers have at their schools. Archer has worked
diligently with its neighbors throughout this process and they continue to do so. I hope that you recognize what a gem this school is in Brentwood and support Archer Forward.

**Response to Comment No. 342-2**

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 343

Halima Mohammed
502 12th St.
Santa Monica, CA 90402

Comment No. 343-1

I am an Archer parent writing in strong support of Archer Forward. I do this in the hopes that the Los Angeles Planning Department will move the project along quickly so that Archer can create the 21st century campus that its students deserve.

Most public and independent schools already have facilities like those proposed by the Archer Forward plan: modern gyms, playing fields, performing and visual arts facilities and a pool. These facilities are designed to have a limited impact on neighbors from light or noise, and the new buildings will be fully consistent with the residential feel of the community.

It’s important for the City to recognize the tremendous effort that Archer put into its community outreach for this plan. The School has been meeting with its neighbors and other community members for over two years, and has made significant modifications to its original plan to meet concerns. The modifications in the plan will make a quieter, greener campus, a benefit to both the School and the community.

While Archer has continued to work with the community on this plan, the school to keep this plan moving forward. I hope that you will help Archer move quickly through the City process so that Archer girls will soon have the facilities they need.

Response to Comment No. 343-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 344

Suleman Mohammed
502 12th St.
Santa Monica, CA  90402

Comment No. 344-1

Archer Forward is an important step in improving the quality of campus life and providing necessary facilities for the only secular girls’ school in West Los Angeles. I hope that you and Council member Bonin will support the project and help expedite the approval process.

Archer has gone beyond what was required in compliance with the City’s mandates, as shown by the excellent reports during its plan approvals. As a parent at the school, I can attest to the importance that the Archer leadership places on ensuring that we comply with the traffic management program—which is designed to reduce any burden on the neighbors.

The Archer Forward plan is simply critical for the School. The girls need to be able to enjoy the outdoors, learn in modern classrooms, and have access to basic facilities. The current campus has no gym, no regulation-sized playing fields and inadequate performing and visual arts spaces. Nearly all other independent and public schools have these, or have the ability to build them under their CUP’s. [sic] Archer is at a severe disadvantage without the ability to provide these things for its students.

I hope that the City and the Councilman will support this plan and move it quickly through the review process. Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 344-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 345

Catrice Monson  
Vice President, Labor Relations  
CBS  
4024 Radford Ave.  
Studio City, CA  91604

Comment No. 345-1

I proudly serve on the Board of Trustees at Archer and I am writing to you today to respectfully request your support for our Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan, Archer Forward. This plan has been reviewed by community leaders and proximate neighbors for many months, and we look forward to continuing the public process. We hope that through open and honest dialogue we will be able to secure the support of community leaders and stakeholders who share our commitment to excellent education.

I became a Board Member for Archer because I strongly support the school’s commitment to an all-girls education. The school is committed to educating and encouraging girls from diverse backgrounds to discover their passions and realize their true potential. It has been an honor to serve on the Board and watch the school and its girls evolve and excel despite its limited campus and facilities. The girls continue to bring home trophies and awards in academics, the arts and athletics. Imagine how much more they can achieve with the expanded facilities!

Archer has always been a respectful and considerate neighbor. In particular, the school is dedicated to ensuring that it does not pose any additional traffic burdens on the neighborhood. Last year, 80% of the student body used the school bus, a higher percentage than any other school in Los Angeles. Archer Forward is a necessary next step in the improvement of our campus, providing needed academic, arts and athletic facilities. We also plan to move parking to an underground garage to reduce noise and traffic in the neighborhood while maintaining an efficient traffic flow. We have sought the assistance of design and traffic experts in the formation of this plan, and will continue to actively pursue the approval and input of our neighbors and local community organizations now that the Draft EIR has been released for public comment. We hope to have your support for our plan.

Response to Comment No. 345-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 346

Enrique Montoya
6800 Corbin Ave., No. 208
Reseda, CA 91335

Comment No. 346-1

My name is Enrique Montoya and I work in IT at The Archer School for Girls. I have worked at Archer for many years in both Facilities and now in IT, working with 460 students daily. It has been a great feeling to contribute to the education of hundreds of students at this great school.

The school needs new facilities to support the IT infrastructure so that students can have access to the best educational tools available. Archer’s Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan will truly improve the school as well as the faculty and staff’s ability to serve the students.

I hope you and the city will support Archer and their campus plan.

Response to Comment No. 346-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 347

Katherine (Kemmy) Moran
Katherine.Moran@pepperdine.edu

Comment No. 347-1

Archer provides a wonderful environment for young women to explore who they are and push the boundaries of their potential, especially in extra-curricular activities such as theater, debate, and sports. The Archer Forward Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan will be critical in allowing Archer to continue to teach students to be the best they can be. I support this plan, and I hope the community will as well, keeping these young students’ dreams in mind.

Thank you for your time.

Response to Comment No. 347-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 348

Kari Morioka  
1725 Butler Ave., #104  
Los Angeles, CA  90025

Comment No. 348-1

I am a member of the Fitness and Wellness Department at The Archer School for Girls. I am the Human Development Specialist as well as 7th Grade Dean. The aspect of Archer that I find unique is our desire to build community both within our walls and with our greater surroundings. We teach our students about the importance of nurturing the relationships that we choose to build as well as those that are placed before us. Very characteristic of Archer’s commitment to relationships as it defines community is that our plan is responsive to the needs of our neighbors. The improvement plan consciously addresses noise, traffic and neighborhood aesthetics. The plan meets Archer’s core needs while limiting impacts to the greatest extent possible.

As a human development teacher and grade level dean, I place great value on having a physical place to gather. As of now, the school lacks a common space where all students, faculty and staff can congregate. Our ability to come together as a whole school is limited and we are constantly finding creative solutions to address this issue. Our solutions are effective, however, the plan will allow us to better serve our students by adding modern classrooms which would allow us to adjust the scale of the room to best suit our needs, a gymnasium, regulation-size athletic field, and spaces for swim and performing and visual arts. Not only will we have places to gather, we will be better able to create a sense of community by having students participate in activities on campus rather than bussing our student body to their interscholastic activities whether it be for practices, competition or for performances. We are not asking for anything more than the essentials that nearly every other independent and public school has in Los Angeles.

Archer believes that this is the most effective plan to meet the needs of the school and to offer a competitive array of opportunities for future students while maintaining a respectful relationship with the Brentwood community. We have been a responsible neighbor since 1999. Archer is an institution of empowerment; we teach our students how to be mindful leaders. This is an example of how organizations with different agendas can work together to move forward in a way that respects and serves the interests of both parties. I ask the city to support Archer’s plan.
Response to Comment No. 348-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 349

Alexandra Moritz
amoritz93@gmail.com

Comment No. 349-1

As an alumnae of the Archer School for Girls, I support the Archer Forward Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan. Archer has had a critical impact on my teenage years and without my Archer education I truly do not know where I would be today. This expansion will only better the experience of Archer students and I strongly encourage you to consider this expansion.

Response to Comment No. 349-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 350

Chris Mosier
4320 Corinth Ave.
Culver City, CA  90230

Comment No. 350-1

My name is Chris Mosier. I am the Director of Educational Technology at Archer School for Girls and I am writing to solicit your support for Archer’s proposed construction.

As a member of the staff, I see the impact Archer School has in empowering young women of Los Angeles both on campus and in the community. I serve as the advisor for Archer’s computer programing [sic] club. In the last two years, the club has conducted six workshops with the LA Public Library and the LA Makerspace to teach kids in Koreatown and Central LA to write code. Archer students lead the workshops, teaching kids as young as five to write their very first computer programs. The members of the club have also served on a panel of an MIT conference to share their experiences writing code and teaching others.

The Campus Plan provides an opportunity for us to enroll more students in our computer science courses (currently constricted by physical size of our computer classrooms) and place us on an equal footing compared to the facilities of our neighboring schools.

I support the Campus Plan and I urge you to support it as well. The opportunity to both teach other kids in LA to code and to engage in the national conversation with scientists from MIT has an incredibly empowering effect on these young women. Archer School was instrumental in creating those opportunities for both our students and kids from around LA who have attended these workshops at the LA Public Library.

Response to Comment No. 350-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 351

Sara Mottahedan
189 Granville Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 351-1

I am writing today in support of Archer’s campus improvement plan, Archer Forward. As a proud Archer alumna I know the value of an Archer education and I am hoping that you will support this essential plan as it moves through the city process.

Archer has always been an honored member of the Brentwood community and that relationship has just strengthened in the years that they have been at the current location on Sunset Blvd. I know that the school is committed to communicating with their neighbors about their plan to build facilities for the arts and athletics. I believe this plan is what future Archer girls need to continue to be successful and I know that there are many members of the Brentwood community who want to see Archer succeed.

I know that Archer has looked carefully at all aspects of the plan, and that over the past year, have made modifications to the project in order to ensure that it has the least impact on the neighbors.

In regards to traffic in the Brentwood area, Archer contributes very little to that problem. This is due in part to their strict traffic management program. The school requires all students to use carpools or the school bus to get to campus. I know Archer has and will continue to look at ways to ensure that its impact on traffic is minimal.

Thank you for your consideration. I hope the school can count on your support.

Response to Comment No. 351-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 352

Jenn Babin Moynihan
12412 Pacific Ave., #7
Los Angeles, CA  90066

Comment No. 352-1

I am an English teacher at the Archer School for Girls in Brentwood. Archer is an amazing institution that fosters confidence, curiosity, ambition, and joy in the future female leaders of America. However, as the school develops and adapts to the needs of twenty-first century education, our current school facilities present limitations that are keeping teachers from doing our best work and students from doing their best learning.

My English class is extremely student-centered and active. We incorporate group or partner work almost daily, and the girls are constantly moving about the room to create media, perform skits, present for their peers, read aloud, etc. My room, as well as the two other classrooms I’ve had in my time at Archer, is not large enough to accommodate the kind of collaboration that girls require in order to do their best learning. Even organizing the tables in my room in a way conducive to class discussion makes conveniently opening and closing the classroom door impossible. Students avoid sitting in the “door chair” because it requires standing up every time the door needs to be opened or closed.

Aside from the restraints of our small classrooms, the lack of climate control makes teaching in the summer almost unbearable. The faculty starts a Heat Wave sign up sheet in order to share the few rooms in the building that do have air conditioning. A student’s quality of education should not depend on the external temperature on any given day.

Space and temperature are two very basic elements of classroom environment that have a tremendous impact on student learning, but which teachers have no control over. It’s frustrating to know that I can’t do my job to the best of my ability because of the restraints of the space. Archer does such incredible service for the community and produces such accomplished, confident, determined young women. It’s a shame to deny these girls the facilities that every student deserves.

I sincerely ask you for your support of Archer Forward so that our facilities can continue to grow along with the needs and ambitions of our incredible school’s mission.
Response to Comment No. 352-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 353

Eurydice Mundy and James Mundy III
10400 S. Third Ave.
Inglewood, CA  90303

Comment No. 353-1

Please read the attached letter in support of Archer Forward. It is crucial that Archer’s campus improvement plan be approved.

Response to Comment No. 353-1

This introductory comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 353-2

I am an Archer parent writing in support of the Archer Forward plan.

As a parent, I have carefully followed the evolution of this plan and have been very impressed by Archer’s willingness to modify the project to ensure that it is the best plan not only for the School but for the surrounding community as well.

I know that Archer has looked carefully at all aspects of the plan. Archer has made modifications to the project in order to ensure that it has the least impact on its neighbors. The school has also proposed a schedule of hours and operations that will minimize disruption in the community. Because of the current level of traffic congestion in Brentwood, I understand that very few cars trigger an impact under the City’s analysis, but I know Archer has and continues to look at ways to ensure that its impact on traffic is minimal. The school already complies with the most extensive traffic management program of any independent school in Los Angeles, and it has gone beyond what is required by the City of Los Angeles to minimize its impact on local traffic.

My daughter truly loves Archer, but the school needs the facilities that are outlined in the Archer Forward Plan to stay competitive and to provide a top-notch education to girls who are destined to become our nation’s future leaders and innovators. The Archer School for Girls provides an environment and an education that is beautiful and unique in the city. I hope that you will help move this project forward so that future generations of girls in
Los Angeles can benefit from Archer’s high-quality curriculum, along with critical, 21st century facilities. Thank you.

**Response to Comment No. 353-2**

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 353-3**

Yes, The second letter is the intended final form.

**Response to Comment No. 353-3**

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 353-4**

My USPS address is:

James Mundy III  
10400 S. 3rd Avenue  
Inglewood, CA 90303

**Response to Comment No. 353-4**

In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list.
Comment Letter No. 354

Esmeralda Muñoz
16643 Citronia St.
Northridge, CA 91343

Comment No. 354-1

My name is Esmeralda Muñoz. I'm a math teacher at The Archer School for Girls. I'm writing this letter in support of the school plan. I've had the honor of working at the school for over 12 years. The school environment that we provide is unique and extremely beneficial to our students.

Archer provides a unique environment that supports and creates talented leaders and lifelong learners. My colleagues are some of the most creative and passionate teachers that I've had the pleasure of working with. We need bigger teaching spaces and air conditioning to be able to continue to do our best work. The lack of facilities makes it challenging to teach and learn on hot days.

I urge you to please support the school plan. The new facilities will positively impact us all now and in the future.

Response to Comment No. 354-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 355

Cara Natterson
341 S. Westgate Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 355-1

For over 15 years, The Archer School for Girls has offered a top-quality education for girls from all over LA and has contributed greatly to the Brentwood community. They offer millions of dollars in scholarships each year to ensure that girls of all backgrounds can attend the school. They also enroll young women from nearly 100 zip codes across LA County. The school is a vital part of the educational landscape in Los Angeles, offering the only non secular girls’ school option on the Westside.

It seems only fair that a school of this magnitude has the facilities that are up to the standards of other independent schools in our city. The suggested improvements in Archer Forward will bring athletics, performing arts, visual arts, and modern classroom facilities that will allow the school to continue to deliver on its mission to its students.

I support Archer and their campus plan. I hope the community of Brentwood can count on your support as well.

Response to Comment No. 355-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 356

Lisa Nesbitt
441 N. Cliffwood Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 356-1

I am writing to say that I am opposed to Archer's proposed project, Archer Forward: Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan. Archer’s project represents a substantial expansion in a quiet residential neighborhood that will result not only in an increase in use but in a significant impact on traffic. Specifically I am concerned about the following impacts as outlined in the DEIR.

- LADOT has identified six major intersections in the Brentwood area that will have significant impacts from Archer’s project that cannot be physically mitigated. Adding more cars to the already congested Sunset Boulevard is not acceptable.

- Traffic impacts are only reduced, as shown in the comparison of Alternatives in the DEIR, by reducing use (compare Alternative 2, analyzing use under the current Conditional Use Permit’s reasonable limits to the Proposed Project.) Yet Archer is proposing to substantially expand its physical plant from one building to a total of five large-scale buildings and to use these buildings seven days a week by increasing its hours and days of operations.

Response to Comment No. 356-1

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Refer to Section IV.A, Aesthetics/Visual Quality, Views, Light/Glare, and Shading, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project's consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood. As discussed therein, in response to comments, the Project’s net new floor area would be reduced.
As discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on School operations are proposed, including additional limitations on the hours of operation, reducing the number of proposed School Functions from 98 to 86 including eliminating Interscholastic Athletic Tournaments and two School Functions with up to 650 guests, and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses. As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding the compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

Comment No. 356-2

- The construction of four additional institutional buildings and their proposed use will result in substantial impacts on noise and aesthetics as well as traffic. Not only could the two gyms, performing arts center, aquatic center and visual arts center be used simultaneously after school from 3:30pm to 10:00pm and weekends, Archer proposes the following increases in use that will result in significant traffic impacts:
  - Doubling the number of special events to 98 from the currently allowed 47, bringing 24,000 visitors to the campus during the school year, an increase of 16,000 guests,
  - Allowing outside rental use of the facilities for weddings and private parties for up to 200 guests, 24 times a year, Monday through Saturday, 8:00am to 10:00pm, will bring 4,800 visitors that currently do not come to the campus, thus adding a new use that will contribute to traffic and noise;
  - Moving the majority of the athletic activities onto campus, thus increasing the number of games from 39 to 145, that will bring 6,800 visitors into the area during peak traffic periods (3:30pm to 7:00pm), an increase of over 5,000 visitors. Most private schools do not host all of their home games on campus. For example, Marlborough School, Crossroads School, and Marymount School play games off campus;
  - Expanding the size of events held on campus to include special events with attendance of 650 people as well as 10 Athletic Tournaments with 200 visitors in attendance will increase use on the weekends and add to traffic and noise.
Response to Comment No. 356-2

Refer to Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, for a description of the additional mitigation measures proposed in response to comments on the Draft EIR to reduce noise impacts associated with campus operations.

Also refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood.

Regarding traffic, refer to Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, for a description of the additional mitigation measures proposed in response to comments on the Draft EIR to reduce significant traffic impacts related to School Functions and Interscholastic Athletic Competitions to below a level of significance.

Lastly, as discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on School operations are proposed, including reducing the number of proposed School Functions from 98 to 86, eliminating Interscholastic Athletic Tournaments, and eliminating community use and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 356-3

- Archer’s proposed construction schedule of over six years will add to the unbearable congestion and gridlock on Sunset Boulevard as over 260,000 construction vehicle trips use Sunset Boulevard and smaller residential streets from 7:00am to 9:00pm, Monday through Friday, and Saturdays 8:00am to 6:00pm. Coming after five years of traffic from the 405-widening project and at the same time as the widening of Wilshire Boulevard near the VA for the Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit Project and the closure of PCH for the California Incline Replacement, construction in our area is never ending. Diverted traffic onto Sunset Boulevard as well as the thousands of slow moving trucks from Archer’s construction will significantly impact traffic and alter traffic patterns that will continue after the construction concludes.

- Over 10,000 large, double haul trucks will be required to excavate the property, which will slow traffic during non-peak hours and contribute to more congestion on Sunset Boulevard and significantly impact the intersection at Barrington Avenue at Sunset Boulevard.
Response to Comment No. 356-3

Refer to Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, regarding the impacts of construction activities and the proposal to reduce the overall construction timeframe for the Project from six years to five years. Refer to Topical Response No. 6, Overview of Construction Traffic and Parking, for a detailed discussion regarding construction traffic. As described in Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, traffic in the area of the Project has been improving in recent months as a result of construction on the I-405/Sepulveda Pass project nearing completion, the opening of the HOV lane on the northbound I-405 freeway, and substantial completion of the I-405/Sunset Boulevard interchange modifications. It should also be noted that the highest level of Archer truck generation and impacts would be for relatively short periods during Phase 1 construction activities (e.g., Phase 1 excavation and haul, which is anticipated to occur over the summer months when Archer and other schools are not in session). Impacts at other times would be lower. Further, as described on page II-38 in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Project is proposed to be developed in phases to facilitate continued School operations and minimize disruptions to neighbors with access for haul trucks and equipment/material delivery trucks varying between the different phases of construction. Refer to Table IV.K-30 and Table IV.K-31 in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR for a summary of the significant impacts during construction. The level of activity on the Project Site will vary throughout the construction periods. To be conservative, the analysis of the construction activities in the Draft EIR was conducted for the worst-case days within each construction phase. It is anticipated that impacts would be lower throughout much of each phase than the worst-case days identified in the Draft EIR.

As described in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, the Project would include implementation of Mitigation Measures K-4 through K-14 to address potential traffic and access issues during construction. The mitigation measures to reduce the potential impacts of Project construction include development and implementation of a worksite traffic control plan (Mitigation Measure K-4), a construction Traffic Management Plan (Mitigation Measure K-5), a construction Parking Management Plan (Mitigation Measure K-6), and a construction Pedestrian Routing Plan (Mitigation Measures K-7).

As discussed on page IV.K-82 in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, most, if not all, of the haul and equipment/material delivery trips on weekdays would be scheduled during the first eight hours of the permitted construction work period (7:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M.) Monday through Friday and during the permitted construction work period (8:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.) on Saturdays, to minimize impacts during the weekday P.M. commute peak period.
The Draft EIR considered the effects of related infrastructure improvements including traffic diversions due to the Wilshire Bus Rapid Transit Project. Refer to page IV.K-21 in Section IV.K. Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR. In regard to the pending California Incline reconstruction, since the California Incline primarily carries traffic destined to the downtown Santa Monica area, the primary effect of its temporary closure would be to divert traffic to Chautauqua/Channel and to Moomat Ahiko Way in Santa Monica, not to Sunset Boulevard in Brentwood. The traffic analysis also explicitly took into account traffic generated by known development projects in the Brentwood area and included a background growth factor to represent traffic generated by other growth outside of Brentwood but within the Westside. Refer to page IV.K-20 in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR.

Comment No. 356-4

- Archer proposes building a 212 car-parking garage (282 at capacity) that would be utilized during school hours at capacity for staff and students and then from 3:30pm to 10:00pm for visitors coming to campus for athletic events, special events, and performing art events. This represents more than a 100% increase in the number of cars currently exiting onto Sunset Boulevard during peak hours. Not only will this increase the number of vehicles on Sunset Boulevard, but the surrounding neighboring streets as well as cars cut through neighboring residential streets to avoid Sunset Boulevard.

Response to Comment No. 356-4

As described in Topical Response No. 3, Overview of Reduced Parking Spaces, Parking Demand, and Parking Enforcement, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the underground parking structure is proposed to be reduced. In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. Refer to Topical Response No. 7, Potential Traffic Impacts Associated with Proposed Campus Operations, for a discussion of vehicles exiting the campus and a discussion regarding cut-through traffic on Chaparal Street.

Comment No. 356-5

- The design of the proposed project creates significant and unavoidable impacts on noise, aesthetics, view, and neighborhood intrusion by placing large, non-residential buildings close to residences (20 foot setback for Multipurpose Facility and Performing Arts Center vs. the originally required 75 ft; the enclosed Aquatic Center would share a wall with a neighboring residence). Archer's proposed
project would double the size of the physical footprint of the school without considering the close proximity of the residences surrounding the school.

**Response to Comment No. 356-5**

Refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood. With regard to setbacks, the proposed School buildings would meet the residential front yard setback of 25 feet along Chaparal Street and Barrington Avenue. The new School buildings would be proportioned to modulate height and maintain the residential street scale and character when viewed from Chaparal Street and Barrington Avenue. In addition, the Performing Arts Center, Visual Arts Center, and Aquatics Center would also act as buffers to shield neighboring uses from internal campus activities and noise. The Performing Arts Center, Visual Arts Center, and Aquatics Center would have no operable windows that open on the sides directly adjacent to Chaparal Street and Barrington Avenue and adjacent residences. Each of the proposed new school facilities would be contained in a separately-articulated building, which would create scale and massing consistent with the surrounding area and avoids monolithic, unbroken building forms. In response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project’s net new floor area would be reduced from approximately 75,930 square feet to 68,989 square feet. The reduction would leave approximately 229,547 square feet of open space or approximately 72 percent of the campus. At full build out, the Project’s floor area would comprise approximately 22 percent of the total allowable floor area.

Regarding the Aquatics Center, as discussed in Topical Response No. 13, Use of Existing Residential Properties, three parcels border the Barrington Parcel to the north: the Chaparal Parcel, which is owned by Archer and part of the Project Site; 11718 Chaparal Street; and 11706 Chaparal Street. The rear yards of 11718 Chaparal Street and 11706 Chaparal Street are truncated by a retaining wall and property fencing located between 8 and 13 feet from the northern Barrington Parcel property line, increasing the actual distance between development on the Barrington Parcel and adjacent residential uses. Further, the Project would comply with side yard requirements with respect to the boundary between the Barrington Parcel and 11706 Chaparal Street, as the Project would not result in development within 20 feet of the 11706 Chaparal Street property line. The Aquatics Center would be located 24 feet 3 inches from the 11706 Chaparal Street property line.

Regarding noise, as discussed in Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional measures are proposed to reduce noise associated with campus operations.
Comment No. 356-6

The best way to mitigate the significant impacts on traffic as well as operational use is to reduce the size and number of buildings. A smaller, renovated campus will still allow Archer to meet its objectives, but significantly reduce the impacts to our community. Accordingly, I support the Residential Neighbors of Archer, who support a modified version of Alternative 4 Option B (Reduced Program within Existing Campus Boundary, No Aquatic Center). With the specified modifications this alternative better balances the needs of the school with the needs of the neighborhood by reducing the size and scope of the proposed project. This downsized alternative includes the following:

- Increase the current size of the school by adding two new building, not four, including one gym underground, and a Performing Arts Center that seats 300,
- Renovate the North Wing,
- Eliminate the Visual Arts Center,
- Expand and renovate the campus within the current footprint of the school, thus preserving the two residences and creating a needed buffer between the neighbors and the institutional use of the school,
- Continue to use the two residences adjacent to the school as residences,
- Add more landscaping on the northern and western property lines to provide an attractive buffer between the school and residences,
- Increase the set back of the building placed adjacent to Chaparal Street,
- Maintain the number of special events at the current level permitted in the Conditional Use Permit, which, as set forth in the DEIR’s analysis of Alternative 2, reduces impacts to traffic to a level less than significant after mitigation;
- Maintain the current condition of no lights on the athletic field,
- Allow no outside use for rental or lease, as required by the current Conditional Use Permit, which would eliminate and/or reduce noise, aesthetic, and traffic impacts;
- Improve the school’s facilities with only one phase of construction.

Alternative 4-B has reduced impacts over the proposed and the other alternatives in almost every area evaluated in the DEIR. With the modifications set forth above, the impacts are further reduced and Archer can meet nearly all of its objectives.
Response to Comment No. 356-6

Refer to Topical Response No. 14, Residential Neighbors’ Proposed Alternative, for a detailed response to the alternative proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer. In response to comments on the Draft EIR, several of the modifications proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer have been incorporated into the Project. Specifically, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, refinements are proposed to the Project, including reducing the square footage and massing, width, and length of some of the proposed buildings; reducing the number of parking spaces; and creating expanded landscape buffers. Overall, the Project’s net new floor area would be reduced from 75,930 square feet to 68,989 square feet.

Additionally, as described in detail in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project is incorporating additional operational mitigation measures to reduce significant operational traffic impacts related to School Functions and Interscholastic Athletic Competitions to below a level of significance. Further, as discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on school operations are proposed, including additional limitations on the hours of operation including hours of operation on Saturday, reducing the number of proposed School Functions from 98 to 86, and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses.
Comment Letter No. 357

Travis Nesbitt
2137 Benecia Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90025

Comment No. 357-1

As an Archer teacher, Saint Martin of Tours parishioner and Brentwood property owner, I value the Brentwood neighborhood and its residents. Archer contributes to this neighborhood and to the larger Los Angeles community by providing a uniquely enriching educational opportunity for girls. With improved facilities and the same resources afforded to other schools, Archer students, faculty and families will be able to ensure that ambitious, joyful learning continues for years to come.

I have taught in public and private schools, in high schools and universities and no educational community with which I have been affiliated has rivaled the caring, supportive, curious, creative and rigorous character of Archer’s faculty, staff, administration, students and families. Girls who come to Archer enjoy learning, pushing their limits, collaborating, exploring and sharing. With larger, modern classrooms, arts and athletic spaces that meet their needs, and new outdoor spaces that enhance the charm of our historic building, girls’ achievement will soar even higher at Archer.

Since I began teaching at Archer, it has been clear that one of the school’s priorities is to maintain amicable, respectful and mutually beneficial relationships with its neighbors. I also witnessed this when living in the neighborhood and still hear positive feedback from my fellow parishioners at Saint Martins. I am convinced that this will continue through construction and for years to come.

I encourage you to allow Archer’s plan to move forward and to contribute to the bright future of education in Los Angeles.

Response to Comment No. 357-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 358

Bethany Neubauer

Comment No. 358-1

I am writing to ask you to support the campus plan for the Archer School For Girls. I have taught at Archer for the past ten years, and I strongly believe that our school deserves to be allowed to grow so that we can provide the best possible education for our students.

Archer is an innovative place, and we strive to instill in our students a sense of lasting curiosity and a willingness to explore new ideas and aspects of themselves. While I think we do an outstanding job of that in the classroom, the restraints imposed by our current facilities place unfortunate limitations on our students, forcing them, for instance, to travel long distances to practice fields, and limiting the number of people who can attend performances in our very small theater. We desperately need a space in which the whole school can gather, whether it is to hear speakers, enjoy performances by our students, or simply build our sense of community. On a more mundane level, many of our classrooms are small and cramped, and almost none are air-conditioned; while larger, climate-controlled spaces may not seem especially exciting on paper, they would allow us to be more creative in our teaching and more effective on the sweltering days we often experience here. In other words, the changes proposed by Archer’s campus plan would allow us to fulfill our mission of teaching girls in a challenging and exciting environment and would allow us to add the kinds of facilities that are actually standard in most schools.

I am a graduate of a women’s college, and I am very proud to teach at a girls’ school that makes every effort to instill in girls the sense that they can accomplish almost anything they put their minds to. Your support of Archer’s campus plan would send a strong message that girls do, in fact, deserve equal opportunities in our society.

Response to Comment No. 358-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 359

Lynn and Larry Neuberg
2161 Queensborough Ln.
Los Angeles, CA  90077

Comment No. 359-1

My husband and I are parents of a graduate of The Archer School for Girls and I am writing to request that you support Archer Forward, the school’s campus improvement plan. As a valuable asset to the city, Archer requires the facilities that the students need to learn and be best prepared for their futures. Having intelligent and honorable students prepared for the future of this world is everyone’s first priority, as I am sure it is yours. This next generation will help make this a better world and the emphasis on strong, well-rounded education cannot be valued enough.

Our Daughter benefited immeasurably and thrived during her time at Archer. As parents we are thankful for what the school did to help educate and graduate strong, ethical, honorable, independent, self-advocating, community-minded young ladies. Although the school is top notch, it could be even better if the girls had the facilities they needed on campus. Right now, there is no space on campus where all the students and staff can gather together. Nor is there adequate space for performing arts and athletics.

Furthermore, I remember the girls having to take carpools and buses off campus for practices and performances as the school lacked facilities that almost every other independent school in the city already had. I know that the school has gone to great lengths to create a plan that will allow the school to work well with the neighborhood. Archer has shown good faith in its effort to work with the community, its neighbors and the city.

“This plan will provide the facilities that the school desperately needs and I hope that the city will agree and support Archer Forward.

Response to Comment No. 359-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 360

Dana Newman and Miles Feldman
danamnewman@gmail.com

Comment No. 360-1

I am the parent of a current student at The Archer School for Girls in Los Angeles. My daughter started at Archer in the 6th grade, and is currently in the 9th grade. During her years at the school, we have watched her thrive as both a student as well as a person, and are so proud to see her developing her intellectual curiosity, gaining confidence and becoming a capable young woman. We believe her experience as a student at Archer has been instrumental to her development.

In addition to her academic success, she has played cello in the orchestra all 4 years, participated in the theater program and is currently one of the stage managers for the middle school play. We’ve noticed the limitations of the current Archer facility for these important arts programs.

We feel strongly that the Archer Forward plan is essential for the future of Archer and girls’ education in Los Angeles, as it’s critical that Archer have the same level of classroom, sports and arts facilities that other independent and public schools in the area have. For these reasons, both my husband Miles Feldman and I strongly support the Archer Forward plan.

Response to Comment No. 360-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 361

Sofi Newmyer
sofi.newmyer@gmail.com

Comment No. 361-1

My name is Sofi Newmyer and I graduated from Archer in 2006. Please see the attached letter to express my support for the Archer Forward Plan.

Response to Comment No. 361-1

This introductory comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 361-2

As a proud graduate of The Archer School for Girls class of 2006, I am writing to you today to express my support for the Archer Forward Plan.

Archer has had a tremendous impact on my life and I hold the school responsible for making me the confident, self-sufficient and responsible young woman I am today.

I have many fond memories of my seven years at Archer. I made truly wonderful, life-long friends, many of whom I met taking the bus to school every day. I am glad to hear that Archer’s plans will continue to include a requirement of busing. I believe it is good for the students, and most importantly, the environment. I remember Archer did take the CUP restrictions very seriously and I know they have continued that commitment to the community. Additionally, I have an eleven-year old sister who will be in sixth grade at Archer in the fall and although my family lives only five minutes away from Archer (in 90049), my sister is looking forward to continuing the tradition of taking the bus as I did.

The underground parking structure they are proposing is essential and will be a good thing for the local community. I know the school does not want to impose an undue burden on neighbors with regards to traffic, and I believe this plan will continue to enforce traffic restrictions that the neighbors want. Additionally, I am happy that the plan does not mean more students. I believe that Archer continues to be the close-knit community that I experienced because it is still a small school where everyone feels like family.
I think this plan is the right thing to do for future Archer girls, and I sincerely hope you will support this plan.

**Response to Comment No. 361-2**

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 362

Dorothy Nichols
3120 Coolidge Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90066

Comment No. 362-1

My daughter is a current student at the Archer School for Girls, a school that is at the forefront of the girls’ educational movement in Los Angeles. I am writing this letter to show my strong support for the Archer Forward plan.

The plan will not increase enrollment and the school will continue to enforce its strict traffic management standards, which require all students to use carpools or the school bus to get to campus. Archer Forward will allow the school to continue to provide an excellent, research-based education that allows girls to succeed in the classroom and beyond.

Archer takes an active approach in its integration with the community. The school leadership has met frequently with stakeholder groups in the community in the development of Archer Forward, soliciting feedback and responding to concerns to ensure that it lives up to its commitment to be a responsible neighbor.

The School has worked diligently to create both an enriching educational environment and to comply with their restrictive CUP. Archer Forward, the result of several years of planning and compromise, will allow the school to deliver on its mission for generations of young female leaders for years to come. Archer is a true asset to the neighborhood and to the City of Los Angeles. I fully support this plan.

Response to Comment No. 362-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 363

Terry Nikkhoo
130 N. Westgate Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Comment No. 363-1

Attached please find my letter opposing the Archer Forward Plan as proposed.

Response to Comment No. 363-1

This introductory comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 363-2

My name is Terry Nikkhoo. I live at 130 N. Westgate Ave., LA 90049 with my husband and three children. Our house is located right behind Archer School's athletic field. We have lived here since 1995. We chose to live in this neighborhood because we love the Brentwood community and the quiet surroundings.

I am writing to say that both my husband and I are strongly opposed to Archer's proposed project, Archer Forward: Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan. The size of Archer’s proposed expansion in a residential neighborhood, the intensification of use of the school and its new facilities and the resulting increase in traffic from this use on an already overburdened area will adversely affect our local community as well as the community at large. Specifically, I am concerned about the following:

Response to Comment No. 363-2

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

As evaluated in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the proposed buildings would be designed to complement the historic Main Building and respond to and respect the residential scale and character of the surrounding area. As such, the Project would be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and the Brentwood–Pacific Palisades Community Plan regarding conservation of and compatibility with the
scale and character of the City’s residential neighborhoods. Also refer to Topical
Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the
Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and
character of the neighborhood.

As evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, and as
discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate
Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures
presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all operational Project traffic impacts would be
reduced to below a level of significance.

As discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in
response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on Archer’s operations are
proposed, including additional limitations on the hours of operation and additional
limitations on Saturdays, reducing the number of proposed School Functions from 98 to 86,
and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities
for non-School Uses.

**Comment No. 363-3**

**Traffic**

Living a 1/2 block north of Sunset and one block west of Barrington, many days the traffic
gets so bad on Sunset that it spills in to the surrounding streets such as Westgate and
Chaparal where it’s literally impossible to get out of your driveway because of the backup.
Adding more cars to the already congested Sunset Boulevard is not acceptable and traffic
will only get worse in an area where streets are gridlocked. LA Department of
Transportation (LADOT) states in the DEIR that the proposed project will generate
significant impacts at six intersections (including Barrington Avenue and Sunset Boulevard)
that cannot be physically mitigated. Even with the proposed mitigation measures, should
the Project be built out, the impact at these intersections during various every-day
scenarios will remain significant and unavoidable.

- How will LADOT’s recommendations alleviate traffic impacts when they state that
even with mitigation the impact will be significant and unavoidable?
- How can any new car trips be justified when LADOT concludes that the
  improvements proposed by Archer under Voluntary Improvements are not
  expected to mitigate the significant traffic impacts at any of the six impacted
  intersections mentioned in the report?
Response to Comment No. 363-3

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

The four “voluntary improvements” described as such in the LADOT traffic study assessment letter in Appendix P.2 of the Draft EIR (Project Design Features K-2, K-3, K-4, and K-5 in the Draft EIR) are not required to mitigate Project impacts.

Comment No. 363-4

- How will Archer prevent cars from turning right out of the parking garage onto neighboring side streets during peak hours when cars cannot go east on Sunset because of traffic?

Response to Comment No. 363-4

Refer to Topical Response No. 7, Potential Traffic Impacts Associated with Proposed Campus Operations, for a discussion regarding cut-through traffic on Chaparal Street and for a discussion of vehicles exiting the campus. As described therein, although the Draft EIR determined that Project operational impacts on neighborhood streets would be less than significant, pursuant to Project Design Feature K-5, the Project Applicant would coordinate with the City of Los Angeles and neighborhood residents to provide up to $15,000 toward the development and implementation of a traffic calming plan for Chaparal Street between Saltair Avenue and Barrington Avenue to minimize cut-through traffic on this street.

Comment No. 363-5

- How will Archer insure that cars ONLY a set number of cars will arrive during 3:00pm to 4:00pm if three simultaneous events are taking place that will have 150 spectators? (three volleyball games and an art show for example).
Response to Comment No. 363-5

As evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. For example, regarding weekdays between 3 P.M. and 4 P.M., Mitigation Measure K-2 has been modified to limit the number of vehicles to no more than 44. Refer to Section II, Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR for revised Mitigation Measure K-2.

Project Design Feature K-7 included in Section I.V.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR requires that Archer develop an Event Parking and Transportation Management Plan. The Event Parking and Traffic Management Plan will include measures potentially including a parking reservation system to manage vehicle trips and parking demands. Also refer to Mitigation Measure K-2. Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, includes a discussion of enforcement.

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding the compatibility of the School's operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

Comment No. 363-6

- Why hasn’t Archer looked at another site to build a dedicated athletic facility like Crossroads?

Response to Comment No. 363-6

An alternative site location for the Project was discussed in Section V, Alternatives of the Draft EIR. Refer to Topical Response No. 15, Alternative Locations, for a detailed discussion of the analysis of alternative locations for the Project. As described therein, an alternative location would not meet many of the basic Project objectives, particularly those related to improving the existing Archer campus and ensuring the continued preservation of the historic Main Building. Further, as described therein, splitting the School onto two separate sites would fail to meet Project objectives.
Regarding off-site athletic facilities, refer to Section II.3 of Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, which describes the Project objectives. As described therein, “[t]he underlying purpose of the Project is to modernize the facilities and provide Archer with a campus that can maximize the fulfillment of its educational mission now and in the future.” As specified more completely therein, particular objectives include Athletics Objectives. As shown in Appendix B-1 of the Draft EIR, by constructing a Multipurpose Facility and an Aquatics Center and enhancing its existing softball and soccer fields, Archer would be able to conduct more of its practices and host additional Interscholastic Athletic Competitions on campus. Archer would continue to host certain athletic team practices and competitions off-site. In particular, Middle School and Upper School equestrian, tennis, beach volleyball, cross-country, and track practices and/or competitions would remain off-site.

Comment No. 363-7

- Why can’t Archer use Barrington Park for more athletic activities the way Windward School uses Mar Vista Park for games such as soccer?

Response to Comment No. 363-7

As described in Appendix B-1 of the Draft EIR, by constructing a Multipurpose Facility and an Aquatics Center and enhancing its existing softball and soccer fields, Archer would be able to conduct more of its practices and host additional Interscholastic Athletic Competitions on campus. Archer would still host certain athletic team practices and competitions off-site. In particular, Middle School and Upper School equestrian, tennis, beach volleyball, cross-country, and track practices and/or competitions would remain off-site. With respect to the Barrington Recreation Center, Archer does not have access to facilities other than the tennis courts.

Comment No. 363-8

Intensification of Use

Because of Archer’s current CUP, which the neighbors painstakingly negotiated, Archer is allowed to have a very limited number of events on weekends and after 5pm weekdays, which gives the neighbors the peace and quiet they deserve in the evening and on the weekends. If they were to implement the proposed plan, we will be asked to endure long hours of noise and traffic. Archer moved into a residential neighborhood and not the other way around and for Archer to again ask the neighbors to endure the huge improvements they are proposing is simply not acceptable.
Archer proposes doubling the number of special events (or school functions) allowed in its current Conditional Use Permit to 98, which will bring over 24,000 visitors to the campus during the school year. This increase of 16,000 guests will contribute to a significant increase in noise from operations and in traffic on Sunset Boulevard as well as the neighboring side streets. In addition, allowing outside rental use of the facilities for weddings and private parties for up to 200 guests, 24 times a year, Monday through Saturday, 8:00 am to 10:00 pm, will bring 4,800 visitors that currently do not come to the campus, thus adding a new use that will contribute to traffic and noise.

Archer should continue to host some athletic events off-site like other schools do—Marlborough School, Crossroads School, and Marymount School—as well many of the teams Archer plays in soccer. Schools like New Roads, Santa Clarita Christian, New Community Jewish School and Sierra Canyon all play girls’ soccer offsite. They do not play home games on campus.

Moving the majority of the athletic activities, onto campus will not only increase the number of games held on campus from 39 to 145, but will also bring 6,800 visitors (or over 4,000 new car trips) into our area during peak traffic periods. For the last 15 years Archer has been able to meet its athletic objectives by conducting certain athletic events off campus. Archer should continue this when the DEIR shows that moving most of their athletic events onto campus creates a significant impact on traffic that cannot be mitigated.

- Why should the neighbors bear the burden for Archer to increase revenue by renting out their facilities?
- How is outside use for weddings and private parties essential to the operations of the school?

Response to Comment No. 363-8

Regarding campus operations, as discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on School operations are proposed, including reducing the number of proposed School Functions from 98 to 86 and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses.

As discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional operational mitigation measures are proposed to reduce significant operational traffic impacts related to School Functions and Interscholastic Athletic Competitions to below a level of significance.
Regarding noise, refer to Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, for a description of the additional measures proposed in response to comments on the Draft EIR to reduce noise associated with campus operations.

As discussed in Appendix B-1 of the Draft EIR, by constructing a Multipurpose Facility and an Aquatics Center and enhancing its existing softball and soccer fields, Archer would be able to conduct more of its practices and host additional Interscholastic Athletic Competitions on campus. Archer would still host certain athletic team practices and competitions off-site. In particular, Middle School and Upper School equestrian, tennis, beach volleyball, cross-country, and track practices and/or competitions would remain off-site.

**Comment No. 363-9**

**Noise and Aesthetic Impacts**

The current CUP under which Archer operates sets forth specific conditions to mitigate the impact of noise on the surrounding neighborhood. Yet Archer proposes tearing down two residences to place over 80,000 square feet of buildings for institutional use right next to residential houses which will not only contribute to noise, but impact the view and change the aesthetics of the neighborhood (which has no sidewalks and feels more rural than urban). The design of the project plan creates significant and unavoidable impacts placing large, non-residential buildings close to residences (20 foot setback for Multipurpose Facility and Performing Arts Center vs. the originally required 75 ft; the Aquatics Center would share a wall with a neighboring residence,). The sizes of the buildings are more in keeping with a community college than a middle school and high school.

- What will the aesthetics impact be to now have over 200 lineal feet of boxy buildings next to a six foot fence and a narrow row of trees?

- Why should residential requirements for height apply to buildings that are used for institutional use and do not look like a house? A building that is over 20,000 square feet with a 36 foot height will look much different than a 5,000 square foot house with the same height restriction.

**Response to Comment No. 363-9**

Refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood. With regard to setbacks, the proposed School buildings would meet residential front yard setback requirements along Chaparal Street and Barrington Avenue. In addition, the buildings would have a stepped
profile and would be located behind 8-foot walls covered in vines and continuous landscaping to effectively screen the massing of the buildings along Chaparal Street with only portions of the buildings being visible along breaks in the landscaping. The height of the Multipurpose Facility would measure and would visually appear as approximately 28 feet in height from public ways along Chaparal Street. This height would be generally consistent with the heights of adjacent residences along Chaparal Street, which, as described above, range in height up to approximately 33.9 feet. Additionally, the Project, as refined in response to comments, would maintain approximately 457 feet, or 64 percent, of the frontage along Chaparal Street as open space. On an overall basis, the Project would not obstruct an existing valued view, and view impacts would be less than significant. In response to comments, the Project’s net new floor area would be reduced from approximately 75,930 square feet to 68,989 square feet. The reduction would leave approximately 229,547 square feet of open space or approximately 72 percent of the campus. At full build out, the Project’s floor area would comprise approximately 22 percent of the total allowable floor area.

As discussed in Topical Response No. 13, Use of Existing Residential Properties, three parcels border the Barrington Parcel to the north: the Chaparal Parcel, which is owned by Archer and part of the Project Site; 11718 Chaparal Street; and 11706 Chaparal Street. The rear yards of 11718 Chaparal Street and 11706 Chaparal Street are truncated by a retaining wall and property fencing located between 8 and 13 feet from the northern Barrington Parcel property line, increasing the actual distance between development on the Barrington Parcel and adjacent residential uses. Further, the Project would comply with side yard requirements with respect to the boundary between the Barrington Parcel and 11706 Chaparal Street, as the Project would not result in development within 20 feet of the 11706 Chaparal Street property line. The Aquatics Center would be located 24 feet 3 inches from the 11706 Chaparal Street property line. The Performing Arts Center, Visual Arts Center, and Aquatics Center would have no operable windows that open on the sides directly adjacent to Chaparal Street and Barrington Avenue and adjacent residences. In addition, the Performing Arts Center, Visual Arts Center, and Aquatics Center would also act as buffers to shield neighboring uses from internal campus activities and noise.

Regarding noise, as discussed in Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional measures are proposed to reduce noise associated with campus operations.
Comment No. 363-10

Lights and Dangerous Precedents

As mentioned before, our back yard is next to the Archer sports field. Adding lights and increasing the time of usage of the sports field until late night will be taking away from our peace and quiet at night when we are home. In addition, adding lights to the field will set a precedent for other private schools in the Brentwood Community Plan area and contribute to more noise and glare to the neighboring residents.

Response to Comment No. 363-10

Regarding lighting, as discussed in Topical Response No. 2, Removal of Athletic Field Lighting and Refinements to Lighting, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the athletic field lighting would be removed from the Project.

Regarding use of the athletic field, as discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on Archer operations are proposed, including additional limitations on the use of the athletic field. With these limitations, use of the athletic field would not be permitted later than 6:00 P.M., except for hours to provide flexibility for overtime for Interscholastic Athletics Competitions.

Comment No. 363-11

Parking and Construction

Having gone through the Sunset/405 construction for the past four years, it’s not acceptable to ask the neighbors to endure another six years of construction and its impacts. Building its project in three phases of construction means over six years of large trucks entering and exiting onto Sunset and smaller residential streets from 7:00am to 9:00pm Monday through Friday and Saturdays 8:00am to 6:00pm. This will result in significant impacts over a longer period of time from noise pollution, air pollution, and traffic.

Response to Comment No. 363-11

As detailed in Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been refined to reduce the construction period from six years to five years. In addition, as described on page II-38 of Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Project is proposed to be developed in phases to facilitate continued School operations and minimize disruptions to neighbors with
access for haul trucks and equipment/material delivery trucks varying between the different phases of construction. Refer to Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, for additional information regarding potential noise, air quality and traffic impacts during construction.

As described in Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, traffic in the area of the Project has been improving since spring of 2014 as a result of construction on the I-405/Sepulveda Pass project nearing completion, the opening of the HOV lane on the northbound I-405 freeway, and substantial completion of the I-405/Sunset Boulevard interchange modifications. It should also be noted that the highest level of Archer truck generation and impacts would be during Phase 1 construction activities (e.g., Phase 1 excavation and haul, which is anticipated to occur over the summer months when Archer and other schools are not in session). Impacts at other times would be lower.

The referenced construction hours are the permitted construction hours set forth by the Los Angeles Municipal Code. Construction activities for the Project would occur during the permitted construction hours between 7:00 A.M. to 9:00 P.M. Monday through Friday and 8:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. on Saturdays and holidays. Furthermore, as described on page II-39 of Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, most, if not all, haul and equipment/material delivery trips would be scheduled during the first eight hours of the permitted construction work period (7:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M.), Monday through Friday, and during the permitted construction work period (8:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.) on Saturdays, to minimize generating truck trips during the weekday P.M. peak hours.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 363-12**

Included is construction of a 96,000 square foot underground parking garage to hold, at capacity, 282 cars, from its current 109 parking spaces. This will add to the traffic as over 200 cars enter and exit throughout the day.

**Response to Comment No. 363-12**

As described in Topical Response No. 3, Overview of Reduced Parking Spaces, Parking Demand and Supply, and Parking Enforcement, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the underground parking structure is proposed to be reduced. As evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts,
with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

**Comment No. 363-13**

Exhaust from the parking garage will be vented toward residential properties from 7:00am to 10:00pm Monday through Friday and on weekends.

**Response to Comment No. 363-13**

Several comments on the Draft EIR raise concerns regarding vehicle emissions from the open parking structure. Based on these comments, an additional analysis, which is included in Topical Response No. 8, Summary of Impacts from Parking Structure, has been conducted regarding potential air quality impacts from the underground parking structure.

**Comment No. 363-14**

- How will trucks carrying thousands of cubic feet of dirt exit onto Chaparal and Sunset without creating more traffic by slowing the flow of cars?

- What will happen if the number of truck trips estimated for hauling the dirt is delayed because of traffic on Sunset Boulevard? Will more trips be done on weekends and early in the morning? Does this mean we will have to endure traffic seven days a week along with the effects of construction? What protections do we have that the project won't last another year because of unforeseen circumstances?

**Response to Comment No. 363-14**

As described in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, the Project would include implementation of Mitigation Measures K-4 through K-14 to address potential traffic and access issues during construction. The Draft EIR includes numerous mitigation measures to reduce the potential impacts of Project construction. These include development and implementation of a worksite traffic control plan (Mitigation Measure K-4), a construction Traffic Management Plan (Mitigation Measure K-5), a construction Parking Management Plan (Mitigation Measure K-6), and a construction Pedestrian Routing Plan (Mitigation Measures K-7).

As discussed on pages IV.K-83 through IV.K-84 of Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR the preferred truck route for construction vehicles is Sunset Boulevard to the I-405 Freeway (Haul Route Option A). However, to provide for a contingency in the case of congestion, if necessary, additional truck routes could be used...
temporarily. These additional truck routes include: along Wilshire Boulevard to the I-405 Freeway via Barrington Avenue—one with and one without using San Vicente Boulevard (Haul Route Option B and Haul Route Option C, respectively) and accessing I-405 from Wilshire Boulevard, via westbound Sunset Boulevard to Kenter Avenue, Bundy Drive, and San Vicente Boulevard (Haul Route Option D).

Construction activities would also be scheduled to avoid peak traffic times. The Phase 1 excavation activities are anticipated to occur over the summer months when Archer and other schools are not in session. In addition, as described on page IV.K-82 in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, most, if not all, haul and equipment/material delivery trips would be scheduled during the first eight hours of the permitted construction work period (7:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M.), Monday through Friday, and during the permitted construction work period (8:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.) on Saturdays, to minimize generating truck trips during the weekday P.M. peak hours. Contingencies have been included in the construction schedule to account for typical environmental conditions that may halt or slow the excavation activities, such as traffic, rain, or excessive windy conditions.

Comment No. 363-15

- How will Archer compensate the residents for potential damage to their residences due to months of excavation? Dirt in our homes, cracks in our walls?

Response to Comment No. 363-15

In accordance with City of Los Angeles, Department of Building and Safety Information Bulletin Document No. P/BC 2011-034 requirements, shoring installation would be performed during continuous observation of a representative of the geotechnical engineer. The shoring installation would be designed to account for the loads imposed by adjacent structures and site improvements, including buildings, pools, and property line walls.

With regard to vibration impacts from excavation activities, refer to pages IV.I-62 and IV.I-64 of Section IV.I, Noise, of the Draft EIR, for a discussion of on-site construction vibration impacts associated with potential building damage. As noted therein, with implementation of Project Design Feature I-1, which provides that pile drivers and vibratory rollers shall not be used during construction and requires that the use of large bulldozers and hoe rams occur a minimum of 15 feet from the nearest off-site building, vibration impacts associated with potential building damage during on-site construction activities would be less than significant.
In response to the comment regarding fugitive dust, in accordance with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403 as set forth in Regulatory Compliance Measure B-1 on page IV.B-32 of Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, the Project shall incorporate measures to control fugitive dust, which may include watering, street sweeping, installation of wheel washers, covering of haul trucks, suspending earthmoving operations if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour, and installing an information sign at the entrance of the construction site that provides a telephone number to report complaints regarding excessive fugitive dust generation.

**Comment No. 363-16**

- Will large construction trucks even be able to turn onto Sunset without causing a major traffic jam?

**Response to Comment No. 363-16**

Construction trucks will be able to turn onto Sunset Boulevard. As described in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, the Project would include implementation of Mitigation Measures K-4 through K-14 to address potential traffic and access issues during construction. Mitigation Measure K-5 requires development and implementation of a construction Traffic Management Plan. Among other things, the mitigation measure requires that flaggers be used to control trucks moving into and out of the Project Site. Exiting trucks would be able to utilize the existing center left-turn lane that is present on Sunset Boulevard in front of the Archer campus while westbound flows on Sunset Boulevard are stopped by the upstream traffic signal at the Sunset Boulevard/Barrington Avenue intersection. As described on page IV.K-82 in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, most, if not all, of the haul and equipment/material delivery trips on weekdays would be scheduled during the first eight hours of the permitted construction work period (7:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M.) Monday through Friday and during the permitted construction work period (8:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.) on Saturdays, to minimize impacts during the weekday P.M. commute peak period and facilitate turning movements into and out of the Project site at the Sunset Boulevard driveways. Also refer to Topical Response No. 6, Overview of Construction Traffic and Parking.

**Comment No. 363-17**

I support a downsized alternative that would reduce the physical size of the project by eliminating the Aquatic Center and building only one gym not two. This reduced size would help mitigate major impacts—fewer buildings means less use which means less traffic.
Response to Comment No. 363-17

Refer to Topical Response No. 14, Residential Neighbors’ Proposed Alternative, for a detailed response to the alternative proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer. In response to comments on the Draft EIR, several of the modifications proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer have been incorporated into the Project. Specifically, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, refinements are proposed to the Project, including reducing the square footage and massing, width, and length of some of the proposed buildings; reducing the number of parking spaces; and creating expanded landscape buffers. Overall, the Project's net new floor area would be reduced from 75,930 square feet to 68,989 square feet.

Additionally, as described in detail in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project is incorporating additional operational mitigation measures to reduce significant operational traffic impacts related to School Functions and Interscholastic Athletic Competitions to below a level of significance. Further, as discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project proposes additional restrictions on its operations including additional limitations on the hours of operation including hours of operation on Saturday, reducing the number of proposed School Functions from 98 to 86, and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses.
Comment Letter No. 364

Jennifer Northrup
2160 S. Beverly Glen Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Comment No. 364-1

My name is Jenny Northrup, and I'm a Latin and history teacher at the Archer School for Girls. I have spent many years in private schools, both as a student and as an educator, and Archer is one of the most special and valuable schools of which I have ever been a part. I have never before encountered a school that has a more joyful and excited approach to learning. The relationships of trust and camaraderie that are fostered here, both among students and faculty, are unparalleled in most other schools. Providing a place for girls that is their own, and in which they can learn, explore, and find their voices, is of paramount importance in this society. Archer is that place.

The space, however, is the one issue that Archer has. Despite its beautiful exterior, its classrooms and common areas do not give its students the room they need to fully embrace the joyful and ambitious learning that Archer embodies. The rooms are small and cramped, which prevents the girls from engaging in the hands on learning that their teachers are capable of, and want to provide. During the summer, the students and teachers suffer through the heat, and in the winter they shiver through the cold that the outdated and ineffective heating system cannot fight off. And perhaps most importantly, there is not a space for the whole school to come together to share, to learn from one another, and rejoice in being a part of this amazing community.

My students are the most thoughtful, hardworking and delightful group of girls and young women that I have ever taught, and it is a wonder that they can be so joyful in such unjoyful [sic] conditions (but I believe that this speaks to the specialness of this school). They deserve new facilities in which their passion and love of learning can thrive.

Response to Comment No. 364-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 365

John Ohanesian  
johanesian54@gmail.com

Comment No. 365-1

I have served on the Board of Trustees at Archer for nearly seven years and I know that Archer is a committed and conscientious member of the community. I am writing to ask for your support during the public review process for the Archer Forward Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan—a plan that will truly pave the way for the school to provide a 21st century education for the next generation of female leaders.

Archer is a true asset to both the Brentwood community and greater Los Angeles. The school has made a significant, positive impact through its diversity and scholarship programs, commitment to educating girls, and stewardship of an important historic building in Brentwood. The school should be commended for delivering these real, tangible benefits to the Los Angeles community.

The Archer Forward plan encompasses many of the values that are dear to the school: a commitment to sustainability and preservation of our historic building, along with new facilities tailored to the performing arts and athletics. We believe that this is the most effective plan to meet the needs of our school and to offer a competitive array of opportunities for future students. Throughout the formation of the plan, we have sought the input of our neighbors and have made modifications in order to meet their concerns. Now that the Draft Environmental Impact Report has been released, we intend to continue this practice throughout the upcoming public review process.

I am proud to be a trustee of this school and what it stands for: excellent education and a heart for service and community. Both of my daughters graduated from Archer. As an active 25 year resident of Los Angeles I hope the Archer School as well as my family will be able to count on your support for the Archer Forward Plan.

Response to Comment No. 365-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 366

Jay T. Ornellas
967 Casiano Rd.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 366-1

Please accept the attached letter regarding the subject project. Thanks for your consideration.

I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the Archer Forward Plan as currently proposed.

I have no doubt that, by this time, you have received many letters from other concerned citizens describing in great detail the negative impact of this project on the surrounding neighborhoods. I don’t feel the need to repeat these other than to emphasize two points:

1. As bad as the gridlock on Sunset Boulevard is at this time, this project would make it substantially worse. This means more fuel burned, more emissions in the air and more time wasted in traffic.

Response to Comment No. 366-1

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Refer to Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR for the analysis of Project air quality impacts. As discussed therein, air quality impacts from Project operational emissions would be less than significant.
Comment No. 366-2

2. This is a residential neighborhood. The Archer Forward Plan as currently conceived is incompatible with that definition. The alternate plan suggested by the Residential Neighbors of Archer is much preferable and one that I support.

My wife and I have lived at our current address for nearly 16 years. We make several trips a week through the impacted area (e.g., post office, shops and restaurants in Brentwood, etc.), so this project would affect us directly.

Response to Comment No. 366-2

As evaluated in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the proposed buildings would be designed to complement the historic Main Building and respond to and respect the residential scale and character of the surrounding area. As such, the Project would be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and the Brentwood–Pacific Palisades Community Plan regarding conservation of and compatibility with the scale and character of the City’s residential neighborhoods. Additionally, as the Project represents a continuation of an existing private school use, the Project would not substantially and adversely change the existing land use relationships between the Project Site and existing off-site uses. Also refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood.

Refer to Topical Response No. 14, Residential Neighbors’ Proposed Alternative, for a detailed response to the alternative proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer. In response to comments on the Draft EIR, several of the modifications proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer have been incorporated into the Project.
Comment Letter No. 367

Nancy Ortenberg  
848 S. Sycamore Ave.  
Los Angeles, CA 90036  

Comment No. 367-1  

I am an Archer parent writing because I strongly support Archer’s plan for the future, Archer Forward: Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan. I have seen first-hand Archer’s commitment to being a good neighbor and creating a beautiful new environment to educate the girls of Los Angeles. I hope that the City will help Archer by moving this plan forward through the review process.  

I know that Archer has looked carefully at all aspects of the plan. They have made modifications to the site plan to ensure the least impacts on neighbors, and has proposed a schedule of hours and operations that will minimize disruption in the community. Because of the current level of traffic congestion in Brentwood, I understand that very few cars trigger an impact under the City’s analysis, but I know Archer has and continues to look at ways to ensure that its impact on traffic is minimal. The School not only complies with the most extensive traffic management program of any independent school in Los Angeles; it has gone beyond what his [sic] required by the City of Los Angeles to minimize its impact on local traffic.  

While my daughter is thriving at Archer, the School needs the facilities in the Archer Forward plan to stay competitive. The Archer School for Girls provides an environment and an education that is beautiful and unique in the City. I hope that you will help move this project forward so that future generations of girls in Los Angeles can benefit from Archer’s high-quality curriculum, along with critical, 21st century facilities.  

Thank you.  

Response to Comment No. 367-1  

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 368

Laura Owens
13055 Evanston St.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 368-1

As a Council District 11 resident and the parent of an Archer graduate, I believe in the importance of Archer and the Archer Forward Plan.

I have seen for myself the school’s efforts to reach out to its neighbors and be a responsible and responsive member of the community. The school has kept its neighbors updated throughout this entire process. Many meetings have been held so that neighbors could ask questions about the project.

At Archer, girls are taught the importance of being a good neighbor and supporting your community. This value of responsible stewardship is translated into a real spirit of life-long community service.

My daughter was in the very first graduating class in 2001. My husband, Jack Bender, and I are founding parents. We have seen the school grow over the years, increasing not only its academic, artistic and athletic programs, but its commitment to the community.

I live in Brentwood and have for almost twenty years. The school is a good neighbor and its students have given back so much to this community. It is only fair that Archer be allowed to build the facilities that every other school in this area already has.

I strongly support this plan. It is a good plan for both the school and the community. I ask for your support in helping it move quickly through the city’s process. Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 368-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 369

Felicia Paik  
136 Esparta Way  
Santa Monica, CA  90402

Comment No. 369-1

My name is Felicia Paik, and I am the Director of Admissions at The Archer School for Girls.

The Archer Forward plan will provide critical new facilities that will allow the school to continue to provide the 21st century education that its students deserve. I support this plan because it is time that Archer has the same facilities that our peer schools have. As the Director of Admissions, I am asked why Archer does not have a gym, regulation-size athletic fields, a pool or auditorium. Archer needs this campus plan in order to remain competitive and to enhance the education of current and future Archer girls.

I am a girls’ school graduate myself, so I understand the value of an Archer education. At Archer, we are literally educating the future female leaders of our city and country by asking our students to strive for academic excellence while pursuing an ethical and balanced life. In order to achieve these goals to the best of their abilities, current and future Archer girls deserve the best in campus facilities.

I have a nine-year-old daughter who I am planning to enroll at Archer in two years, so I have a personal as well as a professional stake in the success of the Archer Forward plan. The Archer Forward plan will enable the school to advance and sustain its mission not only for my daughter but for everyone’s daughters.

Response to Comment No. 369-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 370

Rose D. Paik

Comment No. 370-1

I am writing to you to express my support for Archer’s Campus Plan. I am a first year Math and Chinese teacher at Archer. I feel so privileged to work at Archer and to have been welcomed into this learning community.

Archer Forward will benefit the life of an Archer girl in many ways. Updated classrooms will help teachers accommodate different learning styles. A space where all students, faculty, and staff can congregate can build community and school spirit. Archer girls enjoy physical activity; nearly 50% of the student body participates in school sports. As of now, Archer has no gym, no regulation-sized athletic fields, and no pool. Such athletic facilities would allow girls to be strong in both mind and body. I know that improved facilities would improve the quality of every girls’ [sic] education.

Please support the Archer Forward plan so that Archer can pursue its mission to education the future leaders of tomorrow.

Response to Comment No. 370-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 371

Mitch Paradise
11848 Dorothy St., No. 8
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 371-1

It’s difficult to know where to begin in opposing this project. Just yesterday, returning from teaching in the Valley, I attempted to go to the Post Office on Barrington, just south of Sunset, a mere block south of the Archer school project. I could barely get into the Post Office, due to traffic backed up on Barrington South of Sunset at 3:15PM, getting out required some creative, and frankly illegal, maneuvering.

I live further South—on Dorothy, just west of Barrington and South of San Vicente. By 3:30/4PM, this entire neighborhood is gridlocked daily. Barrington is backed up from Sunset, down through Montana, San Vicente and on down to Wilshire. Westbound Montana is backed up from Barrington through San Vicente. Intersections are blocked by cars that enter the intersections when they are not clear, and are sitting over the words, “KEEP CLEAR” when the light changes.

By 5PM, you cannot get anywhere. Wilshire is a nightmare (partly because of the light sequencing at Sepulveda, but efforts to redress that have only produced the comment that, “everything is working as it’s supposed to.”). Eastbound Sunset is backed up down past Bundy, and feeder streets like Westgate have huge lines of cars sitting and waiting at a stop sign for one car to get out onto Sunset every few minutes—if someone lets them in.

Response to Comment No. 371-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to decision-makers for review and consideration.

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.
Comment No. 371-2

This is not just a traffic congestion calamity. All these cars sitting and spewing exhaust is a health hazard of unmeasured consequences. Sooner or later there will be a class-action suit against the city’s unconscionable inability or refusal to redress its gridlock problems.

As a resident of this neighborhood, I have to leave hours in advance of events I wish to attend and bring a book or something, because the alternative is sitting in there with everyone, exposing myself to the stress and health hazard. It’s a travesty that the Archer project will only exacerbate.

I urge the planning commission to stop this in its crib.

Response to Comment No. 371-2

In terms of background air quality within the Los Angeles air basin, the SCAQMD’s 2012 Air Quality Management Plan estimates that attainment with the 24-hour PM$_{2.5}$ standard will be reached by 2019 and the 1-hour ozone standard by 2023. 30,31 In addition, the Air Basin recently reached attainment for PM$_{10}$. Table IV.B-2, Summary of Air Quality in the Project Vicinity, on page IV.B-18 of the Draft EIR, also shows that air quality in the Project vicinity is steadily improving over the 2009 to 2011 period.

Regarding potential air quality impacts related to traffic, the SCAQMD recommends an evaluation of potential localized CO impacts when a project causes the level of service at a study intersection to worsen from C to D, or if a project increases the volume-to-capacity ratio at any intersection rated D or worse by 2 percent or more. An analysis of potential impacted intersections was evaluated for both construction and operation and the results of the analyses are presented in Table IV.B-6 on page IV.B-39 and Table IV.B-11 on page IV.B-48 of the Draft EIR, respectively. As shown therein, Project-generated traffic volumes were forecasted to have a negligible effect on the projected 1-hour and 8-hour CO concentrations at each of the intersection locations analyzed. Thus, it was concluded in the Draft EIR that the Project would not cause any new or exacerbate any existing CO hotspots, and, as a result, impacts related to localized mobile-source CO emissions during construction and operation would be less than significant.

As discussed in Section IV.B.3.b of Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, the localized effects from the on-site portion of Project emissions to sensitive land uses in close proximity...
proximity to the Project Site (i.e., adjacent residences) and potential impacts to Archer students were evaluated according to the SCAQMD’s localized significance threshold (LST) methodology. LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard, and are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each source receptor area and distance to the nearest sensitive receptor. These ambient air quality standards provide public health protection, including protecting the health of “sensitive” populations, such as asthmatics, children, and the elderly.

As discussed on page IV.B-61 in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, the Project would result in less than significant localized (NO\textsubscript{X}, CO, PM\textsubscript{10}, and PM\textsubscript{2.5}) construction impacts with incorporation of mitigation measures. The Project would also result in less than significant localized operational impacts. Since impacts would not occur at the closest receptors, further analysis was not warranted at more distant locations. Thus, no changes to the air quality analyses or additional mitigation measures to protect at-risk populations are warranted based on this comment.

As provided in Section II, Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, Mitigation Measure B-4 has been supplemented to further reduce construction emissions by reducing regional construction NO\textsubscript{X} emissions to less than significant. As shown in Section II, Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, regional and localized Project construction emissions would be reduced compared to what was presented in the Draft EIR. As a result, the Project would result in less than significant air quality impacts with incorporation of mitigation measures.

Regarding traffic, refer to Topical Response No. 7, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts. As discussed therein, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project is incorporating additional operational mitigation measures to reduce operational significant traffic impacts related to School Functions and Interscholastic Athletic Competitions to below a level of significance. In addition, refer to Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, regarding proposed campus operations. As discussed therein, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional refinements to campus operations have been proposed including additional limitations on the hours of operation, reducing the number of proposed School Functions, and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses.

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment No. 371-3

11848 Dorothy St., No. 8
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Response to Comment No. 371-3

In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list.
Comment Letter No. 372

Sherrie Pastron
551 Amalfi Dr.
Pacific Palisades, CA  90272

Comment No. 372-1

My daughter is enrolled at the Archer School for Girls, and I am an active member of the Archer Parent Association. As such, I am writing in support of the Archer Forward Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan. This project will allow the school to continue providing an excellent education for girls from all kinds of backgrounds and neighborhoods in our city.

Even from my first days involved with the school, I saw Archer’s commitment to abide by its promises to its neighbors and the City as defined in its CUP. With regards to traffic and parking, all parents are clearly instructed each year on the restrictions that we have to abide by when we drop and pick up our girls from school. Most parents elect to send their children by the bus, even those who live in the neighborhood. This is fully due to the school administration’s efforts to reduce its traffic burden in the area and be a responsible neighbor.

Throughout the introduction of the Archer Forward Plan, the School has continued its commitment to being a good neighbor and has held many community and stakeholder meetings specifically about the plan in the last year. These meetings have included community groups and individuals from around the immediate area, and have resulted in a productive dialogue to ultimately create a plan that is good for Archer and the community.

This project will promise a bright future for the School and for generations of young women who will walk through its doors. I fully support this plan and look forward to the City’s approval.

Response to Comment No. 372-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 373

Nilusha Patel
1451 26th St.
Santa Monica, CA  90045

Comment No. 373-1

Archer has been my home away from home for the last fourteen years, most of them spent working with our wonderful counselors in the College Guidance office. As the department's administrative assistant, my door is always open to help our students with researching schools, signing up for college representative visits, and completing application materials. I love to interact with the Archer girls each day; they are inquisitive, polite, and eager to share the knowledge they have acquired.

I also work in the front office answering phones and meet and greet visitors, and parents, who are always taken by surprise by Archer's beautiful Historic building. I know first-hand how frustrating it can be for Archer parents to have to park across the street and walk to campus. Our parking on campus is woefully inadequate and I believe that it is a serious safety hazard for students and visitors who have to walk across Sunset.

The Archer Forward plan will allow the proposed parking plan which will reduce noise from the surface parking lot at the school, and will provide adequate space so that visitors will not have to park in a lot across the street. I also think that our students deserve new facilities so that they can learn in classrooms that are designed for learning and not just old dormitory rooms.

I support this plan because it is time that Archer has the same facilities that every other school has. I hope that you and the city of Los Angeles will support the plan. Thank you for your consideration.

Response to Comment No. 373-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 374

Jenny Petersson
Jenny@maratone.se

Comment No. 374-1

Please see attached letter in support of Archer Forward.

Response to Comment No. 374-1

This introductory comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 374-2

My daughter is a student at Archer School for Girls, and I am writing to let you know that I support Archer’s Campus Preservation and Improvement plan, Archer Forward.

The Archer Forward plan will allow the school to provide an even better education for Archer students, by adding modern classrooms, a regulation-size athletic field, a gymnasium and spaces for swim, performing and visual arts. Archer students are actively involved in the community: they volunteer at Brentwood Green, tutor students at Brentwood Science Magnet School, participate in local recycling and conservation efforts, volunteer at Daybreak Women’s Shelter and more.

Archer has a great track record as a responsible neighbor in the community. For example, much time and energy has been poured into the school’s traffic control system. Every parent is well versed in parking and driving restrictions in the area during school hours, and we know that if we do not follow the rules there will be consequences. This is done out of Archer’s high level of consideration and respect for its neighbors, who don’t like sitting in traffic any more than I do.

I believe that the Archer School for Girls is a valuable and upstanding member of the local community, and has done everything in its power to ensure that this plan presents every benefit possible to its neighbors. I hope you’ll help move this project quickly through the city’s process.
Response to Comment No. 374-2

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 375

Jeanne Phares
11515 W. Pico Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA  90064

Comment No. 375-1

I am writing in support of the redevelopment plan for The Archer School for Girls. I have a dear friend that attends Archer School and am a huge supporter of all-girls education. The benefits of all-girls’ schools on not only the students but on our society are well studied and supported—

“Self-perception and self-confidence are significant indicators of success in college and in life. We also know that girls tend to lose self-confidence in their adolescent years. Sax’s study shows girls’ schools reversing this trend. Most important, this study shows all-girls’ school graduates rating themselves as more successful and engaged in areas in which male students have historically excelled—mathematics, computers, engineering, and politics.” Cited—Linda J. Sax at the UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information Studies.

Archer does a great job of instilling strong educational and civic values into its students and I have seen a remarkable growth in my friend since she started attending Archer.

The Greater LA area should be a leader in offering exemplary girls education and supporting Archer in its plan to expand the athletic, educational and performing arts will ensure that they are able to continue that tradition.

Response to Comment No. 375-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 375-2

11515 W. Pico Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA  90064

Response to Comment No. 375-2

In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list.
Comment Letter No. 376

Thomas and Mary Pilla
207 N. Saltair Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 376-1

My wife and I are opposed to the Archer Forward improvement plan as it is currently proposed. When the Archer School determined it would insert itself in a residential neighborhood, there were meetings with neighbors to negotiate a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). These negotiations were held in good faith and conditions acceptable to the neighbors and School were proposed and discussed prior to a final agreement including provisions in the CUP for future limited renovation and construction on the existing facility site. We view the negotiated CUP as a contract between the Archer School and the Neighbors. Now, the Archer School plans to void the contract.

Response to Comment No. 376-1

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 376-2

In lieu of the Archer School expansion plans, the residential neighbors support a reasonable alternative that is in keeping with the original CUP and adheres to the contract nature of that agreement. My wife and I agree with the alternatives supported by the neighbors, including:

- Only increasing the current site of the school by adding two new buildings, not four as proposed;
• Only expanding and renovating the campus within the current footprint of the school thus preserving the two residences that were not part of the original footprint and that Archer plans to demolish;

• Increasing the set-back of the proposed building to be placed adjacent to Chaparral [sic] Street;

• Adding more landscaping to provide an attractive buffer between the school and residences;

• Maintaining the number of special events and athletic events at the current level;

• Maintaining the existing condition of no lights on the athletic field;

• Continuing to follow the guidelines of the current Conditional Use Permit regarding hours of operation and limits on the use of the facilities at night, on weekends and for outside use; and,

• Improving the school’s facilities with only one phase of construction thereby limiting the impact on the neighborhood and adjacent streets including Sunset.

Response to Comment No. 376-2

Refer to Topical Response No. 14, Residential Neighbors’ Proposed Alternative, for a detailed response to the alternative proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer. In response to comments on the Draft EIR, several of the modifications proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer have been incorporated into the Project.

Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

Comment No. 376-3

It is important that the Archer School realize the initial CUP provided protection for the neighbors and facilitated Archer’s ability to locate its educational facility within a residential neighborhood. The negotiated protections were important to the neighbors at the time and have remained important. Archer made promises to the neighbors and now plans to ignore those promises.
Response to Comment No. 376-3

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the school’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 376-4

There are acceptable elements within the initial CUP for Archer to expand without adding significant and oversized buildings within a limited space and demolishing two residential houses.

Response to Comment No. 376-4

As evaluated in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the proposed buildings would be designed to complement the historic Main Building and respond to and respect the residential scale and character of the surrounding area. As such, the Project would be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and the Brentwood–Pacific Palisades Community Plan regarding conservation of and compatibility with the scale and character of the City’s residential neighborhoods. Also refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood. Refer to Topical Response No. 13, Use of Existing Residential Properties, regarding use of existing residential properties.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 376-5

Also, in a residential area that continues to face extreme traffic conditions, it is inconceivable that proposals to increase the size, scope and use of the School would be presented.
Response to Comment No. 376-5

This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to decision-makers for review and consideration.

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Comment No. 376-6

We remain opposed to the Archer Forward plan. Thank you for your consideration.

Response to Comment No. 376-6

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 377

Vivian A. Pine
3440 Mandeville Canyon Rd.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 377-1

I am a homeowner in Mandeville Canyon in Brentwood for coming up on seven years. I also used to live in Brentwood as an apartment dweller.

Response to Comment No. 377-1

This introductory comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 377-2

I am Against Archer Forward because The Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) has found that impacts at six major intersections CANNOT be physically mitigated. Sunset Boulevard is already gridlocked. Adding more cars will mean even longer driving times and diminished response times for emergency vehicles.

Response to Comment No. 377-2

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Refer to Section IV.J.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, and Section IV.J.2, Public Services—Police Protection, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response No. 9, Emergency Vehicle Access, regarding emergency vehicle access.
Comment No. 377-3

Since I live in a fire hazard area with only one access and egress, Mandeville Canyon, this extra traffic and diminished emergency response time is of especial importance to myself and my neighbors. *It could mean loss of lives during a fire or other emergency.*

Response to Comment No. 377-3

As discussed in Topical Response No. 9, Emergency Vehicle Access, and evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, during operation, the Project would not result in a significant impact on the 10 nearby neighborhood street segments analyzed in the Draft EIR. As such, operation of the Project would not significantly interfere with emergency access along the surrounding streets. With regard to the study intersections analyzed, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, with implementation of the mitigation measures provided in the Draft EIR, all Project traffic impacts on non-event days would be reduced to below a level of significance. The mitigation measures provided in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR would also reduce the Project traffic impacts during the weekday 3:00–4:00 P.M. and Saturday 1:00–2:00 P.M. hours associated with events to below a level of significance. The Draft EIR determined that significant impacts would still remain, however, during the 5:00–6:00 P.M. and 6:00–7:00 P.M. hours associated with events. As discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional operational mitigation measures are proposed to fully eliminate the significant traffic impacts of the Project. With implementation of the additional mitigation measures discussed therein, and listed in Section II, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR, all operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. Therefore, it is not expected that the Project would consistently increase interference with existing emergency response capacity to the Project area.

As detailed in Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been refined to reduce the construction period from six years to five years. Also refer to Topical Response No. 6, Overview of Construction Traffic and Parking. Further, as described in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, additional restrictions on School operations are also proposed, including additional limits on the hours of operation, reducing the number of proposed School Functions, and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses. With these refinements, potential traffic impacts and associated potential impacts to emergency vehicle access would be further reduced.
Comment No. 377-4

In addition, it now takes One Full Hour for me to even access the on-ramp to the 405 from my house during afternoon rush hour, from 3pm to 6pm. ONE FULL HOUR. And this project will make not only that time more of a nightmare, but probably add morning times that will take an hour or more, just for this private school project that will benefit few people. This is unnecessary and unacceptable.

We must stand by the school’s original Conditional Use of Permit and not allow this traffic nightmare to happen.

Response to Comment No. 377-4

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding the compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

Comment No. 377-5

I support the following alternative:

Residential Neighbors of Archer support a reasonable alternative that would:

- Increase the current size of the school by adding two new buildings, not four, which includes one gym, and one multi-use building,

- Expand and renovate the campus within the current footprint of the school, thus preserving the two residences and creating a needed buffer between the neighbors and the institutional use of the school,
• Add more landscaping to provide an attractive buffer between the school and residences,

• Increase the set back of the buildings placed adjacent to Chaparal Street,

• Maintain the number of special events and athletic events at the current level,

• Maintain the current condition of no lights on the athletic field,

• Follow the guidelines of the current Conditional Use Permit regarding hours of operation and limits on the use of the facilities at night, on the weekends and for outside use,

• Improve the school’s facilities with only one phase of construction.

**Response to Comment No. 377-5**

Refer to Topical Response No. 14, Residential Neighbors’ Proposed Alternative, for a detailed response to the alternative proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer. In response to comments on the Draft EIR, several of the modifications proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer have been incorporated into the Project.
Comment Letter No. 378

Loretta Pinkett
5811 Bowcroft, No. 4
Los Angeles, CA  90016

Comment No. 378-1

As a member of the Archer Parent Association, I am writing in support of the Archer School for Girls in West LA and their campus improvement project known as Archer Forward. Given that the school has dutifully complied with every request and condition from the City and its neighbors over the years, I believe that they have demonstrated their commitment to Brentwood and should be allowed to improve their campus with this good and well-thought-out plan.

In forming this project, I know that the school has taken every step to consider the needs and concerns of the community and their neighbors—they are constantly holding community meetings and sending out newsletters to inform them of campus events and updates. Our daughters volunteer all over the neighborhood, from Brentwood Green to tutoring younger students to working at a local women’s shelter.

Archer Forward will create the facilities that the school desperately needs—a playing field, a theater, visual arts facilities, new parking spaces underground and a common gathering area. All of this was designed with the concerns of the community in mind. I believe that this plan is the best compromise between the needs of the school and the community, and is the result of many months of negotiation and collaboration.

Archer truly needs the facilities it is requesting in this plan, and I hope the City will join us in support of one of the finest schools in Los Angeles.

Response to Comment No. 378-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 379

Lucy Pinkwater
343 N. Citrus Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90036

Comment No. 379-1

My name is Lucy Pinkwater and I am the history department chair at The Archer School for Girls. I am writing to urge you to help our school to move into the 21st century! This is my third year at Archer and I previously taught at a charter school in South Los Angeles. Archer is an incredible school where the learning is ambitious and joyful. However, the current structure of our school does not make for a 21st century learning environment. The first 3 months of school we are beaten down day after day with extreme heat and no air conditioning. With summer temperatures now extending into November, it has become increasingly difficult to maintain focus, hydration, and a love of learning. We lose a lot of valuable instructional time trying to find respite for students in the heat.

In addition, there are many opportunities lost to host events on campus due to a lack of space. We cannot hold multiple sporting events, the annual dance show, or an entire middle school audience for one of the student plays. One of the most wonderful things about working in a school is supporting students in and out of the classroom. I feel as though Archer needs a multi-purpose facility so that we can gather as a community—no matter the weather conditions—and support our students.

Finally, as a school we are already leading the way in 21st century skills. Our early adaptation of the one-to-one laptop program in connection with a faculty that is eager to learn and incorporate best practices into their classroom—makes us pioneers in education. However we NEED a 21st century facility to meet the needs of our students and faculty. An all-girl’s education is something I believe in passionately. Teaching and empowering young girls to break barriers and have confidence is a real game changer in education. Please help us show our young women that they too deserve a 21st century environment.

I really appreciate your time and effort. I hope that the city will help our school acquire the facilities and improvements that are considered the norm at most Los Angeles schools.

Response to Comment No. 379-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 380

Catherine Polisoto
cpolisoto@msn.com

Comment No. 380-1

Please exercise wisdom, discernment, and common sense and deny the Project for the following reasons:

1. It is anti-utilitarian. If Utilitarianism is decision making that results in the greatest good for the greatest number of people, the Project would benefit a few privileged girls at the expense of the surrounding community and the hordes of people who travel past 11725 Sunset Boulevard.

Response to Comment No. 380-1

This comment does not raise an issue specific to the Draft EIR and the environmental impacts addressed therein. This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 380-2

2. The Project would result in an extended period of significant noise, pollution (air and water), and traffic congestion, which the community cannot tolerate at this time. Residents and daily travelers are already maxed out on “construction fatigue” from years of nearby freeway construction and ramp closures, which appear to be nowhere near completion. Residents and drivers are out of patience and coping skills and this results in excessive honking and incivility on Sunset.

3. As I write, a large apartment building on Granville just across the street from the Archer School on Sunset Boulevard is starting to be demolished. That project will also result in an extended period of significant noise, pollution (air and water), and traffic congestion.

Response to Comment No. 380-2

With regard to the comment on construction duration, as detailed in Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been refined to reduce the construction period from six years to five years. In addition, as described on page II-38 of Section II, Project Description, of the
Draft EIR, the Project is proposed to be developed in phases to facilitate continued School operations and minimize disruptions to neighbors with access for haul trucks and equipment/material delivery trucks varying between the different phases of construction.

As described in Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, traffic in the area of the Project has been improving since spring of 2014 as a result of construction on the I-405/Sepulveda Pass project nearing completion, the opening of the HOV lane on the northbound I-405 freeway, and substantial completion of the I-405/Sunset Boulevard interchange modifications. It should also be noted that the highest level of Archer truck generation and impacts would be during Phase 1 construction activities (e.g., Phase 1 excavation and haul, which is anticipated to occur over the summer months when Archer and other schools are not in session). Impacts at other times would be lower. Refer to Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, for additional information regarding potential noise, air quality, and traffic impacts during construction. In addition, see pages IV.G-39 through IV.G-43, in Section IV.G. Hydrology, Surface Water Quality, and Groundwater, of the Draft EIR, as discussed therein, the Project would have less than significant impacts on hydrology, surface water quality, and groundwater during construction.

As discussed on pages III-4 through III-7 in Section III, Environmental Setting, of the Draft EIR, the Draft EIR analyzed the cumulative impacts of the Project. The related projects analyzed as part of the cumulative impacts analysis included proposed development projects in the area that could affect conditions in the Project area and was prepared based on information obtained primarily from the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation and the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning. A total of 11 potential related development projects were identified within the vicinity of the Project Site and were included in the cumulative impact analysis for the Draft EIR. In addition, the traffic analysis included a background growth rate and an analysis of related development projects in the area to capture the effect of growth and additional projects. See page IV.K-20 of Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR.

The project at Sunset Boulevard and Granville Avenue referenced by the commenter is a “by-right” development, meaning the site is being developed within the development parameters set forth in the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code for that site. In this case, the City’s role is ministerial and is to determine whether the minimum requirements of the zoning and building code are being met. Accordingly, as the project at Sunset Boulevard and Granville Avenue is being developed in accordance with the Los Angeles Municipal Code, this development was not identified by the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation or the City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning as a related project. However, such development would need to apply for a building permit and would be required to comply with the construction hours and associated noise limits set
forth in the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code. The development at Sunset Boulevard and Granville Avenue would also need to comply with applicable dust-control requirements set forth by the South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403 and City standards regarding erosion from construction sites. Further, if import or export is required as part of the project at Sunset Boulevard and Granville Avenue, the proposed haul route would be reviewed by the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety and the City may impose certain conditions as set forth in Section 91.7006.7.2 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to minimize potential traffic and access impacts.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 380-3

At a minimum, please do not approve any extended construction hours.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Response to Comment No. 380-3

As discussed on page II-39 in Section II, Project Description of the Draft EIR, the Project would comply with the LAMC, which provides that construction activities be limited to the hours of 7:00 A.M. to 9:00 P.M., Monday through Friday, and 8:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. on Saturdays and holidays. Pursuant to the LAMC, no construction activities are permitted on Sundays. Construction hours may be extended with approval from the Executive Director of the Board of Police Commissioners. Archer may seek approval from the Executive Director to extend the construction hours for the Project to Sunday from 8:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. With extended construction hours, the estimated duration of the haul could be significantly reduced.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 381

Stefan and Karen Pollack
10520 Seabury Ln.
Los Angeles, CA 90077

Comment No. 381-1

Please see the attached letter of support for The Archer School for Girls.

Response to Comment No. 381-1

This introductory comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 381-2

We are writing today to express our full support for both the Archer Forward plan and The Archer School for Girls. Our daughters are looking forward to their first day of school this fall and we are looking forward to the amazing opportunities they will have thanks to this incredible institution. We are also excited about the possibility of the school building the additional facilities we have seen at other local schools. The facilities and upgrades that make up this plan will be vital to continuing the school’s mission to provide a 21st century education for girls.

As new members of the Archer community we have been impressed by the school’s tremendous efforts to be a good neighbor. From an extensive traffic management plan to community service and outreach, it seems to be a significant part of the school’s culture and commitment to its neighbors.

We strongly support Archer Forward and hope that you will agree that it is a good plan for the school and the community.

Response to Comment No. 381-2

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 382

Tracy Poverstein

Comment No. 382-1

As the Arts Department Chair at The Archer School for Girls, I feel passionately about the absolute need for approval of Archer’s Campus Plan. At The Archer School for Girls, I oversee all aspects of the arts department including, but not limited to studio art, photography, sculpture, theater, dance, film and music. Some of my responsibilities include directing both an upper and middle play as well as teaching all levels of acting classes. The most important part of my job is assuring success for my department and the students who benefit from it. In my 14 years at Archer, I have seen immense talent and dedication in our students. With the supportive environment that Archer gives to girls, they are able to experiment, develop and learn skills that will carry them throughout their lives. The arts are a part of everyone’s lives whether as a career or a part of their humanity. When someone listens to the radio during their commute or sees a movie poster while walking down a street, they are experiencing the arts. This expansion is necessary to see our students grow, learn and succeed now and throughout their lives.

Archer’s plan to expand does not ask for anything that most other Los Angeles area schools already have. With some of the best students in Los Angeles, this plan simply gives our students what they deserve. In order to give our students the opportunities to learn and grow in our modern society, we must offer improved facilities. By improving facilities, we improve learning and development, giving us all a brighter future. This expansion will provide the facilities to offer more classes, give back to the community and provide the best education possible for our students.

Currently, our facilities for performance are sparse. We have one black box theater that is a converted basement room. Due to this space restriction, we can only hold 75 audience members. In addition, we continually come across issues of staging, choreography, musical accompaniment and much more. For example, in a recent production, students had to run through hallways, in costumes, to make entrances. Many other schools have large auditoriums with ample backstage areas, adequate seating and sophisticated lighting and sound systems. Our small theatre does not allow us to even perform for our entire student body. Our students work extremely hard to produce wonderful plays and musicals yet cannot share them with all that they would like.

My years at Archer have been wonderful and I can only imagine how great the next 20 years of my career will be when we have improved facilities. It is what our magnificent students deserve. Please support Archer students by supporting our plan.
Response to Comment No. 382-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 383

Liza Price
242 Bronwood Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 383-1

My daughter is a current student at The Archer School for Girls, a school that is at the forefront of the girls’ educational movement in Los Angeles. I am writing this letter to show my strong support for the Archer Forward plan. I should also mention that I am a CD 11 resident.

The plan will not increase enrollment and the school will continue to enforce its strict traffic management standards, which require all students to use carpools or the school bus to get to campus. Archer Forward will allow the school to continue to provide an excellent, research-based education that allows girls to succeed in the classroom and beyond.

Archer takes an active approach in its integration with the community. The school leadership has met frequently with stakeholder groups in the community in the development of Archer Forward, soliciting feedback and responding to concerns to ensure that it lives up to its commitment to be a responsible neighbor.

The School has worked diligently to create both an enriching educational environment and to comply with their restrictive CUP. Archer Forward, the result of several years of planning and compromise, will allow the school to deliver on its mission for generations of young female leaders for years to come. Archer is a true asset to the neighborhood and to the City of Los Angeles. I fully support this plan.

Response to Comment No. 383-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 384

Lee Ramer
lj.ramer@verizon.net

Comment No. 384-1

This is to express my extreme distress over any construction that would increase traffic between the 405 and Brentwood, and points west on Sunset Boulevard.

Response to Comment No. 384-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to decision-makers for review and consideration.

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. Refer to Topical Response No. 6, Overview of Construction Traffic and Parking, for a detailed discussion regarding construction traffic.

Comment No. 384-2

We (Brentwood residents) approved the initial expansion of the Eastern Star property, having been promised it would expand no further. It would be a travesty to allow the traffic situation on Sunset Boulevard in that area to become even worse.

I am counting on you as my representative.

Response to Comment No. 384-2

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other
concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding the compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

As evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 384-3**

Regarding the mailing address you requested, I’m curious as to who has access to this list and who will be using it other than you.

**Response to Comment No. 384-3**

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 385

Evelyn Ramirez-Schultz
5865 W. 78th St.
Los Angeles, CA  90045

Comment No. 385-1

I am the Associate Director of Advancement at The Archer School for Girls. In this role, I support the school in developing and maintaining relationships with its parent and alumnae constituencies, and I work closely with these groups to raise funds for financial aid and school programs. As a staff member, and hopefully one day an Archer parent, I firmly believe that the school plays a critical role in preparing girls to be the future leaders of our country. It is also my belief that education is an investment in our future, and holds a priceless value in our society.

With that said, I am writing you in support of Archer’s campus plan. Every detail of this plan was carefully thought out and created in close collaboration with the school’s neighbors, incorporating their concerns into the campus design. These expanded facilities are not ostentatious and flamboyant [sic] in design, but rather smart, energy saving and efficient, and most of all, critically important for the teaching and learning that takes place at Archer. At Archer, girls will discover their passions and begin to form their lifelong dreams and gain the confidence and emotional strength to pursue them. Archer has the skilled faculty who will teach and guide them, but what is unquestionably lacking is the facilities and equipment needed to help support the girls’ success.

This is where I believe you play an significant role in making this happen. Mr. Villani, I hope you will join the efforts of Archer supporters and give your approval to move the campus plan project forward. Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 385-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 386

Jennifer Ranlo
4210 Woodcliff Rd.
Sherman Oaks, CA  91403

Comment No. 386-1

As the only non-secular girl’s school in West Los Angeles, Archer School for Girls meets a critical need for education in Los Angeles. The School has developed Archer Forward, a plan that will give them the facilities they need. Facilities that most other schools in the area already have. I am writing in support of this plan and to urge the Planning Department to move this project forward quickly.

As an Archer parent, I know firsthand the commitment that the school has to being a good neighbor. The School’s strict compliance with the most stringent Conditional Use Permit in the City and its extensive public outreach for the proposed Archer Forward plan, among other measures, shows that Archer is a leader and valuable asset to the community. The School has made numerous alterations to the plan in consequence of conversations with the community. Archer has been willing to make significant changes in order to ensure that the project has the least impact on its neighbors.

I understand that these conversations will continue, but as a parent at the school, I hope that you will help Archer move this project quickly through the City process so that we can begin to build the school that our girls deserve.

Response to Comment No. 386-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 387

Irving Reifman
Attorney at Law
18181 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1350
Los Angeles, CA  90026

Comment No. 387-1

Please see attached letter regarding the above reference matter.

Response to Comment No. 387-1

This introductory comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 387-2

I have been a resident of Mandeville Canyon since 1967 and wish to note my observations about the Archer plan. I have seen very significant changes in traffic patterns along Sunset Boulevard, particularly over the last seven years. Every weekday morning, often until 10:00, eastbound Sunset can be congested and/or gridlocked. In the afternoon, the gridlock begins sometimes as early as 3:00 p.m. and typically between 3:30 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. is very serious. Northbound Barrington beginning at or south of Wilshire is gridlocked to Sunset almost every weekday from 3:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. until after 7:00 p.m. My office is near Wilshire and Barrington so I regularly observe each of the above conditions.

Automobile trips in this area that take five minutes when there is no traffic, now can take thirty to forty minutes. Thus, the concept of the Archer School expanding its facilities and use of its current facilities, was shocking to me.

Response to Comment No. 387-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to decision-makers for review and consideration.

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.
In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

**Comment No. 387-3**

I have some particular experience involving the subject issues. I am an attorney who has specialized in real estate and real estate development for over forty years, but for the last twenty years, limit my practice to the appraisal of real property for federal estate and gift tax purposes, charitable contributions and property tax appeals. I have been the appraiser for most of the commercial buildings immediately across from the Archer School south of Sunset on both sides of Barrington and along Barrington Place. At the time Archer acquired the residential properties on the west side of Barrington, I was asked by certain Archer parents to render opinions about value, prospective use and liability to neighbors.

**Response to Comment No. 387-3**

This comment does not raise an issue specific to the Draft EIR and the environmental impacts addressed therein. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 387-4**

Unfortunately, over the last seven years, traffic on Sunset is not merely gridlocked, but has become dangerous. On numerous occasions I have seen emergency vehicles unable to move on Sunset and I would hope that you have asked for opinions from the fire department and police department regarding this issue.

The expansion of the Brentwood School, both on its original campus and on its western campus, west of the Archer School and the freeway construction, have all contributed to the current critical traffic situation. It seems to me that if Archer is allowed to go forward with its expansion plan, it will perhaps permanently turn Sunset Boulevard into a parking lot during commuter hours.

There are no traffic alternatives for residents who live north of Sunset, between Barrington, and Allenford, on the west side of Paul Revere Junior High School. On Monday, April 14, 2014, my wife and relatives from the east were traveling from our home in Mandeville Canyon to my wife’s sister’s home just off the intersection of Sunset and Thurston Circle. From Mandeville and Sunset, to my sister-in-law’s home usually takes between eight and
ten minutes. They were on Sunset for 37 minutes in totally gridlocked traffic. The “overflow” from Sunset impacts San Vicente to the south.

**Response to Comment No. 387-4**

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Refer to Section IV.J.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, and Section IV.J.2, Public Services—Police Protection, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response No. 9, Emergency Vehicle Access, regarding emergency vehicle access.

**Comment No. 387-5**

I have appraised five or six of these homes on Chapparal [sic] and the other streets surrounding the Archer School. These are some of the most magnificent homes in the area, on large, level lots, with classic architecture. The ambience of those homes should be considered. As schools expand, home values depreciate. At the premium locations of the Harvard-Westlake Middle School in Bel-Air, and Marlbourgh [sic] School in Hancock Park, neighbors were “forced out” and the schools acquired the neighboring sites.

**Response to Comment No. 387-5**

As evaluated in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the proposed buildings would be designed to complement the historic Main Building and respond to and respect the residential scale and character of the surrounding area. As such, the Project would be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and the Brentwood–Pacific Palisades Community Plan regarding conservation of and compatibility with the scale and character of the City’s residential neighborhoods. Also refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood. Also refer to Topical Response No. 13, Use of Existing Residential Properties, for a discussion of the use of residential properties for school uses.
This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 387-6**

When Archer began to seek community cooperation and approval for its taking over the Eastern Star home, it made many appropriate promises. The Archer Forward Plan blatantly violates those promises. They promised to carefully control parking and access to the school so there would be a minimum of impact on Sunset Boulevard, on Barrington, and on the residential neighbors. It seems to me absurd that a school which came on the scene promising low density and low impact, now seeks permission to hold commercial events, i.e. weddings and private parties 24 times a year. I do not understand why the school should be allowed to hold any outside rental “activities” and their activities should be limited to school related programs involving the students, parents, and faculty.

**Response to Comment No. 387-6**

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

As discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on School operations are proposed, including eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 387-7**

Allowing expansion, or construction, for athletic activities on campus, is another questionable request. Most of the private schools on the west side have had to deal with the fact that their campuses did not have athletic facilities and all have managed to achieve appropriate athletic programs, using “off site” locales. Wildwood School, Crossroads School, and even the nearby Brentwood School have used off campus athletic facilities and there is no reason why Archer should not do the same. While Brentwood has outstanding
on site facilities, it also uses off campus facilities. This request is an even more bold request, because Crossroads and Wildwood schools were in commercial or industrial areas and Archer is surrounded by outstanding residential areas. Adding outdoor lights to the campus is just another overreaching request that will do tremendous damage to the residential ambience of its neighbors.

I do not know if any of the current Archer board members were initial founders of the school, but I would be shocked if they were. The requests of the Archer Forward Plan are so contradictory to what the Archer Founders promised, that I can’t believe that the original founders would be participants in this plan.

I strongly urge you to adopt a plan that the residential neighbors of Archer support.

**Response to Comment No. 387-7**

Regarding athletics, refer to Appendix B-1 of the Draft EIR. As discussed therein, by constructing a Multipurpose Facility and an Aquatics Center and enhancing its existing softball and soccer fields, Archer would be able to conduct more of its practices and host additional Interscholastic Athletic Competitions on campus. Archer would still host certain athletic team practices and competitions off-site. In particular, Middle School and Upper School equestrian, tennis, beach volleyball, cross-country, and track practices and/or competitions would remain off-site. In response to comments on the Draft EIR, refinements to the Project as described in the Draft EIR are proposed. Refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood. Also refer to Topical Response No. 2, Removal of Athletic Field Lighting and Refinements to Lighting, regarding the Project’s refinement to remove the athletic field lighting.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 388

Mia Rille
218 25th St.
Santa Monica, CA 90402

Comment No. 388-1

I am the Director of Advancement for The Archer School for Girls and a member of the Senior Administration. I have proudly served Archer in this capacity for five years.

I am writing today in strong support of Archer’s master plan which I believe has the students and community in mind. Our goal is to provide facilities that match our current program which teaches girls the way they learn best. The Archer Forward plan will provide larger classroom space, along with more green space, and athletic and performing art facilities.

The School is committed to remaining a good neighbor to the community. Our relationship with the community is very important to us. We believe that these new facilities will allow for a quieter neighborhood with less traffic on Sunset Boulevard.

Currently, parking on campus is woefully inadequate and parking off site poses a serious safety hazard for students and visitors who have to walk across Sunset. Additionally, Archer students currently spend hours traveling to different locations to participate in athletic and performing arts activities, generating increased traffic and environmental impacts.

This plan thoughtfully addresses these concerns. I strongly support Archer’s plan and respectfully ask you to do the same.

Response to Comment No. 388-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 389

Norman Rille
218 25th St.
Santa Monica, CA 90402

Comment No. 389-1

I am writing in support of the “Archer Forward” Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan—a plan that I believe will greatly assist Archer to provide top notch education for the next generation of female leaders.

As the only independent girls’ school on the Westside, Archer has proven itself to be an asset to both the Brentwood community and the surrounding area. The school has made a significant impact through its diversity and scholarship programs, its commitment to educating young women, and maintaining its important historic building in Brentwood—all clear and valuable benefits to Los Angeles.

Archer has consistently demonstrated its commitment to balancing the needs of its students with the needs of the community. Because of this commitment, Archer has gone on to contribute to the community, including creating transportation and community outreach programs that are models for other public and private schools across Los Angeles.

In closing, Archer is a committed and conscientious member of the community. I strongly support “Archer Forward” and I urge you and the entire City Planning Department to do the same.

Response to Comment No. 389-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 390

Marcia Roberts
marcialroberts@sbcglobal.net

Comment No. 390-1

I am a PROUD grandparent of a graduating senior and an incoming 7th grader to the Archer School for Girls. I have my granddaughter grow into a beautiful, confident young woman at the Archer School for girls. She has learned to stand up for what she believes in and that she can make a difference in her community. I have attended the Grandparents Day on campus every year and have been extremely impressed by the school’s philosophy and proud of the work my granddaughter has contributed to her community. Brentwood is lucky to have a school like Archer in its neighborhood.

The campus improvement plan not only will benefit the students of Archer, but will also enhance the community in which it resides. The plan will allow for their students to have the modern facilities that the Archer girls not only deserve, but they NEED. Air conditioned rooms, ample parking, and better athletic facilities will allow provide a better environment to learn, host other schools, and provide better security for the students and visitors to the campus.

PLEASE APPROVE THIS CAMPUS PRESERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT PLAN!

Response to Comment No. 390-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 391

Mel Roberts
melroberts@sbcglobal.net

Comment No. 391-1

I am a PROUD grandparent of a graduating senior and an incoming 7th grader to the Archer School for Girls. I have my granddaughter grow into a beautiful, confident young woman at the Archer School for girls. She has learned to stand up for what she believes in and that she can make a difference in her community. I have attended the Grandparents Day on campus every year and have been extremely impressed by the school's philosophy and proud of the work my granddaughter has contributed to her community. Brentwood is lucky to have a school like Archer in its neighborhood. The campus improvement plan not only will benefit the students of Archer, but will also enhance the community in which it resides in. The plan will allow for their students to have the modern facilities that the Archer girls not only deserve, but they NEED. Air conditioned rooms, ample parking, and better athletic facilities will allow provide a better environment to learn, host other schools, and provide better security for the students and visitors to the campus.

PLEASE APPROVE THIS CAMPUS PRESERVATION AND IMPROVEMENT PLAN!

Response to Comment No. 391-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 392

Amy Salko Robertson and John Robertson  
1700 Ocean Park Blvd.  
Santa Monica, CA  90405

Comment No. 392-1

We are writing in support of the above-mentioned Archer Forward Campus Plan and are hoping you will help Archer move through the City process.

We are the parents of a daughter that spent Elementary and Middle school in the public school system. Although the experience was positive, for the most part, she decided she wanted a more in depth learning experience for High School and set out on her own, to investigate where she might find that for 9th grade. After much research, she came back and told us of her choice; it was unequivocally The Archer School for Girls.

We knew very little about the private school options. As our daughter educated us, we did our own research on the different types of educations available in that world. As we did we were very impressed by her instinct and desire for an education strictly dedicated to young women. It is a unique educational experience and not one easily found in Los Angeles, particularly if one is looking for a secular experience: one not dedicated to a specific religious experience. Archer is currently doing all they can to fulfill their mission to create an “ambitious joyful learning experience” for all young women, and are limited only by their current building and campus plan. Archer has taken great care to considered [sic] not only their needs in the new plans for improvement, but the needs and desires of the neighborhood. In an effort to fully meet the Archer Mission we are hoping the City will support the proposed improvement plan so that Archer can continue to do what they do best; educating outstanding women for the future, women that will undoubtedly continue to be active in the very community in which they learn. Young women, that due to this very specific education, will proudly influence and be the future of Los Angeles, the state of California and possibly the entire Country.

To this end, Archer cannot achieve its full mission without the much needed improvements as noted in their plan.

Thank you so much for taking the time to consider our impassioned plea. ☺
Response to Comment No. 392-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 393

Luke Robertson
11747 W. Sunset, Apt. 103
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Comment No. 393-1

I live directly adjacent to The Archer School for Girls in CD 11 (I reside in 11747 W. Sunset, Apt. 103), and I am writing to show my support for the Archer Forward Campus Preservation & Improvement Project. I fully support the school in its effort to modernize their campus in a way that serves their immediate community as well as our neighborhood community.

This project represents an important step forward for the school and I strongly believe that this plan should be approved, as it will allow Archer to build the facilities necessary to continue to provide an excellent education for young girls from around the city—meeting an important need on the Westside and all of Los Angeles.

Over the past few months, I have witnessed Archer make a concentrated effort to welcome and inform its neighbors regarding its plans, its intentions, and any changes to either as they develop a comprehensive plan that meets our collective needs. Archer has been nothing but transparent and willing to work with neighbors like myself, which plays a large part in earning my support (I also believe in their school mission). As Archer duly articulated on numerous occasions, every other school in this area, independent or public, has the facilities it needs for their students. I believe that Archer not only deserves the same, but so do the students they so effectively dedicate themselves to serving.

I hope you will join me in supporting their plan.

Response to Comment No. 393-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 394

Alain and Sandra Rogier  
539 Hanley Pl.  
Los Angeles, CA 90049  

Comment No. 394-1

As long time residents of Kenter canyon for more than 30 years, we are extremely familiar with the traffic conditions around Sunset and Barrington and all traffic intersecting those streets as well as the traffic to and from the 405 fwy. We are also familiar used to use Sunset Blvd. going east towards the 405 FRW on a daily basis.

When the Archer school come aboard, were promised that there would be no further requests for additional traffic nor construction of additional space. The promises were made in writings, published and distributed to the community. It was with these limitations that the community permitted their acquiring and using the facilities as a school. It now appears that these pledges and promises were never intended to be honored. On the contrary, one gets the decided impression that those promises were a ruse to get their foot into the area and then do what they always intended and knew would be future issues.

Needless to say, we are very assertively expressing our request that the proposed development be denied. Doubling the currently authorized 48 events, annually, to 96 events, the addition a 210 car parking garage to the 110 cars now parked on the campus and adding proposed improvements of a new, 80,000 sq. ft., (approximate) to accommodate 300 to 600 people at some events will render Sunset Blvd. into a parking lot. As it is, it often takes us an hour to get to the 405 from Kenter Blvd.!

I hope that before your department commit to this development proposal, you will take the time to drive down here one day, between the hours of 7-10AM westward, and 3-8PM eastward on Sunset between Kenter and the 405 FRW!

We are strongly opposed this development!!

Thank you for anticipated sensitivity to the community on this issue. The benefits of the proposed project will not accrue to the community.

Response to Comment No. 394-1

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which
was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

As discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on School operations are proposed, including reducing the number of proposed School Functions from 98 to 86.

Additionally, as described in Topical Response No. 3, Overview of Reduced Parking Spaces, Parking Demand and Supply, and Parking Enforcement, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has further been refined to reduce the size of the parking structure. With this reduction, the number of parking spaces would be reduced from 212 spaces to 185 spaces, expandable to 251 spaces with the use of attendant assisted parking.

As described in Section II, Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project would be refined to reduce the square footage of some of the proposed buildings. Overall, the Project's net new floor area would be reduced from approximately 75,930 square feet to 68,989 square feet.

Lastly, as described in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, the Project is incorporating additional operational mitigation measures to reduce operational significant traffic impacts related to School Functions and Interscholastic Athletic Competitions to below a level of significance.

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 394-2

thank you. alain rogier
539 hanley place, los angeles, ca. 90049.

Response to Comment No. 394-2

In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list.
Comment Letter No. 395

Gilly Rojany
226 N. Saltair Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 395-1

I am a neighbor of the Archer School and have lived here since before the school was even here. I am not against having the school, but they made promises that they want to change now.

Response to Comment No. 395-1

This comment does not raise an issue specific to the Draft EIR and the environmental impacts addressed therein. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 395-2

I am a real estate developer and I have guidelines that I must follow especially in a residential area. I am opposed to any side yard and height modifications.

Response to Comment No. 395-2

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 395-3

I am also opposed to the amount of dirt they plan to remove and use Chaparal [sic] st as there [sic] exit route.

Response to Comment No. 395-3

This comment expressing opposition to the Project excavation is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

As discussed on pages IV.K-82 through IV.K-83 in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR the use of Chaparal Street would occur upon occasion during construction activities. With the exception of during Phase 2, use of Chaparal Street would be limited. Specifically, during the North Wing Renovation, use of Chaparal Street for
access by haul trucks and equipment/material delivery vehicles would be limited to 5 percent of these vehicles. During the Overlap between the North Wing Renovation and Excavation and Hauling for Phase 1, use of Chaparal Street would also be limited to 5 percent of construction vehicles. For the Remainder of Phase 1, haul and delivery ingress and egress would be similar, except that up to 20 percent of haul trucks and equipment/material delivery vehicles may use the Chaparal Street or Barrington Avenue driveways. During Phase 2 all haul trucks and equipment/material delivery vehicles would enter and exit the Project Site via the Barrington Avenue driveway or the Chaparal Street driveway.
Comment Letter No. 396

Maria Rojas
7933 Alverstone Ave., No. 7
Los Angeles, CA  90045

Comment No. 396-1

As a proud Archer graduate I am writing to you today to voice my support for Archer’s campus plan, “Archer Forward.”

I am the self-assured woman that I am today thanks in large part to Archer. Not only did Archer instill in me passion, drive, and confidence, the school also gave me the skills to be leader. I believe in the power of single-sex education and I believe that L.A. school should invest in making education for girls excellent.

I loved attending Archer, but I think the campus lacked basic facilities that every other public and private school near it had. Now is the time for Archer for pave the way for the future of the school and the future of all the young women who will receive an Archer education.

I hope you will support the students of this city by supporting Archer’s plan.

Response to Comment No. 396-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 397

Jose Ernesto Rojas-Torres  
ernesto@csun.edu

Comment No. 397-1

I am the parent of a class of 2011 Archer graduate, and from my experience with the school, it is fully committed to its responsibilities to its students, community and the city of Los Angeles as a whole. Archer students train and perform in award-winning arts programs including photography, painting and drawing, ceramics, sculpture, dance, theater, choir and orchestra. While at Archer, my daughter was in the volleyball team/club. Not only was it [sic] She also participated in a number of league sports with other local independent schools. Unfortunately, she and her teammates had to spend a great deal of resources renting off-site avenues for practices, games and performances frustrating for students and parents, but I bet some community members were also frustrated that we all had to park off-site in order to attend the games. If Archer Forward was approved those cars could be on the campus instead. I believe Archer Forward is a good and thoughtful step forward for the school and I look forward to it passing quickly through the city review process.

Response to Comment No. 397-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 398

Hillary Rollins
1219 Ashland Ave.
Santa Monica, CA  90405

Comment No. 398-1

As a current Archer parent, I support of [sic] Archers Campus Preservation and Improvement plan, Archer Forward.

The Archer Forward plan will allow the school to provide an even better education for Archer students, by adding modern classrooms, a regulation-size athletic field, a gymnasium and spaces for swim and performing and visual arts. In case you weren't aware, Archer students are actively involved in the community: they volunteer at Brentwood Green, tutor students at Brentwood Science Magnet School, participate in local recycling and conservation efforts, volunteer at Daybreak Women’s Shelter and more.

Archer has an excellent track record as a responsible neighbor in the community. For example, much time and energy has been poured into the school’s traffic control system. Every parent is well versed in parking and driving restrictions in the area during school hours, and we know that if we do not follow the rules there will be swift consequences. This is done out of Archer's high level of consideration and respect for its neighbors, who don't like sitting in traffic any more than I do.

The Archer School for Girls is a valuable and upstanding member of the local community, and has done everything in its power to ensure that this plan presents every benefit possible to its neighbors. I hope you'll help move this project quickly through the city's process.

Response to Comment No. 398-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 399

Eden Romick
eden_romick@yahoo.com

Comment No. 399-1

I live 1,000 steps from my front door to Belwood Bakery in Brentwood Village. I know this because my little girls and I make that walk a lot and we’ve counted those steps hundreds of times. We love our once peaceful neighborhood where we have lived for over 20 years.

Over time, we have watched more and more cars make their short cut right through our neighborhood to avoid eastbound Sunset Blvd., blasting down Saltair and Barrington and Chaparral [sic]. Every year I have been able to mark the passage of time not only by which of my four daughters I have walked in a stroller around my neighborhood, but sadly, by dodging the multiplying cars and avoiding the drivers barreling down our streets with less and less care.

As if that’s not bad enough, what was once an 11 minute drive to get my daughter to soccer practice became 75 minutes one year at the height of the 405 construction, resulting in missed practices. We are, on one hand, fortunate to live in such a nice neighborhood, but maddened by our inability to move freely. One can argue at least the 405 work is for the community good, benefiting hundreds of thousands of commuters a day.

We had hoped that after enduring the last four years of gridlock and traffic due to the 405 construction, that we would finally able to return to some measure of peace in our community.

Archer’s plans are unacceptable. They do not benefit the community. It is a self-serving plan that will further congest our neighborhood.

Therefore, we DO NOT WANT:
Archer to have operational hours past the end of a traditional school day.
Archer to have weekend operational hours.
Archer to have additional parking spaces.
Our streets to be clogged with construction vehicles.

We cannot freely get in and out of our neighborhood as it is. Too many cars with careless drivers sharing the road with families who lack a sidewalk is a recipe for disaster.
Response to Comment No. 399-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to decision-makers for review and consideration.

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. Refer to Topical Response No. 7, Potential Traffic Impacts Associated with Proposed Campus Operations, for a discussion regarding cut-through traffic on Chaparal Street. As discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on School operations are proposed, including additional limitations on the hours of operation, reducing the number of proposed School Functions from 98 to 86, including eliminating Interscholastic Athletic Tournaments and two School Functions with up to 650 guests, and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses. As discussed in Topical Response No. 3, Overview of Reduced Parking Spaces, Parking Demand, and Parking Enforcement, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the underground parking structure is proposed to be reduced. Refer to Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, regarding the impacts of construction activities and the proposal to reduce the overall construction timeframe for the Project from six years to five years. Refer to Topical Response No. 6, Overview of Construction Traffic and Parking, for a detailed discussion regarding construction traffic.

Comment No. 399-2

We have a right to the quiet, peaceful enjoyment of our home and our environs. While we do not support any part of Archer Forward, we will respect the right to peacefully coexist.

Response to Comment No. 399-2

This comment does not raise an issue specific to the Draft EIR and the environmental impacts addressed therein. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment No. 399-3

We are thankful for The Residential Neighbors of Archers, and stand by their alternative as a compromise. We would otherwise accept none of Archer's proposals.

Response to Comment No. 399-3

Refer to Topical Response No. 14, Residential Neighbors’ Proposed Alternative, for a detailed response to the alternative proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer. In response to comments on the Draft EIR, several of the modifications proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer have been incorporated into the Project.

Comment No. 399-4

With enormous appreciation for your efforts to honor the compromise put forth by The Residential Neighbors and no more,

Response to Comment No. 399-4

Refer to Topical Response No. 14, Residential Neighbors’ Proposed Alternative, for a detailed response to the alternative proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 400

Steven Romick
355 N. Saltair Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Comment No. 400-1

I am virulently opposed to Archer School’s expansion plans. Our community acquiescence allowed their inception. To gain our trust, they made promises, many of which have been broken along the way, and even more are to be broken now should they have their way with this latest proposal. We gave. They took. But, it wasn’t enough and now, they want more. I, for one, oppose further concessions.

Response to Comment No. 400-1

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the school’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 400-2

Our neighborhood is small, yet the traffic flowing through it is that of a much larger community. Drivers don’t like the eastbound Sunset traffic so they cut up and through the north/south arteries of Barrington and Saltair and then make their way on the east/west roads of Crescenda and Chapparel [sic]. Heading south on Barrington at the wrong time, can leave [sic] take a half an hour at the Barrington/Sunset intersection. That’s untenable as is, and yet it is illogically proposed that somehow additional traffic flow can be supported.

Response to Comment No. 400-2

Refer to Topical Response No. 7, Potential Traffic Impacts Associated with Proposed Campus Operations, for a discussion regarding cut-through traffic on Chaparal Street. Although the Draft EIR determined that Project operational impacts on
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neighborhood streets would be less than significant, pursuant to Project Design Feature K-5, the Project Applicant would coordinate with the City of Los Angeles and neighborhood residents to provide up to $15,000 toward the development and implementation of a traffic calming plan for Chaparal Street between Saltair Avenue and Barrington Avenue to minimize cut-through traffic on this street.

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

**Comment No. 400-3**

Please understand that our neighborhood lacks sidewalks and when I walk with my little girls we share the road with cars, too many driven by distracted drivers dangerously looking down at their smartphones. Statistically, there is no question that the more cars you put on the road, the greater the odds of incident.

I am already forced to spend more time in my car thanks to increasing traffic in the two decades I have lived in the neighborhood. Please don’t allow that to be worse.

One of the reasons we moved here was so that could safely walk into Brentwood Village. Please do not let Archer take that away from us.

**Response to Comment No. 400-3**

Refer to Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, for analysis concluding that Project impacts to bicycle and pedestrian access and facilities would be less than significant. The Draft EIR concluded that temporary construction impacts would be addressed by the pedestrian routing plan required by Mitigation Measure K-8, and that operational impacts would be less than significant.

Refer to Topical Response No. 7, Potential Traffic Impacts Associated with Proposed Campus Operations, for a discussion regarding cut-through traffic on Chaparal Street. Although the Draft EIR determined that Project operational impacts on neighborhood streets would be less than significant, pursuant to Project Design Feature K-5, the Project Applicant would coordinate with the City of Los Angeles and neighborhood...
residents to provide up to $15,000 toward the development and implementation of a traffic calming plan for Chaparal Street between Saltair Avenue and Barrington Avenue to minimize cut-through traffic on this street.
Comment Letter No. 401

Rena Ronson
9336 Civic Center Dr.
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Comment No. 401-1

Archer is the only non-secular girl’s school on the Westside, and meets a critical need for education in Los Angeles. The School has developed an appropriate new plan, Archer Forward, that will give them the facilities they deserve, and that most other schools in the area already have. I am writing to support this plan and urge the Planning Department to approve the plan and move it forward without hesitation.

My daughter is an Archer girl, and I have seen firsthand the commitment that the school has to being a good neighbor and living harmoniously with its neighbors in Brentwood. From its strict compliance with the most stringent Conditional Use Permit in the City to its extensive public outreach for the proposed Archer Forward plan, Archer has shown that it is a leader and valuable asset to the community. This plan continues that thoughtfulness and leadership. Archer has been amenable in altering the plans and addressing the concerns from the neighbors, which include adding landscaping and moving the locations of some structures. These changes are not insignificant, but Archer has been willing to do these things in order to ensure that the project has the least impact on its neighbors.

I know that these conversations will continue, but as a parent of the school, I hope that you will support Archer in moving this project forward, so that Archer can begin to build the school that our girls so very much deserve.

Response to Comment No. 401-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 402

David L. Rosenbaum, M.D.
215 N. Saltair Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Comment No. 402-1

Below and attached are letters I sent to Mr. Mike Bonin, this year and in 2012 respectively. I would appreciate it if you would add these to the protests regarding the Archer School expansion. Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 402-1

This introductory comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 402-2

I sent you a letter in Nov. 2012 which summarized my opposition to the Archer expansion as it had been described at that time. I have attached this letter for reference.

However, during the nearly year and a half between then and now I have modified my thinking about this situation. I look at the Archer expansion through the eyes of a doctor (now retired), and also as an individual who has had serious personal medical problems.

Response to Comment No. 402-2

This introductory comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 402-3

Many of the senior citizens as well as younger individuals who live in this neighborhood of one hundred or so homes north of Sunset between Barrington and Saltair, think about their personal safety while living here. We worry about what might happen during a medical emergency, or a fire in the hills just beyond us. How could a first responder get through Sunset, for example, when it is impossible for vehicles to pull over going east or west, to allow passage of any kind of emergency vehicle from 7:30 to 9:30 AM and 3 to 6:30 PM?
There is no street shoulder on Sunset, nor is there one on Chaparral, a very narrow street parallel to Sunset bounding the northern aspect of the Archer School.

That's the way it is now. What happens when Archer starts building? We add to this scenario construction trucks for the building of two gyms, and performing arts, aquatic, and visual arts centers; and 20,000 additional visitors to the campus during the school year related to on-campus events and sports. Also, we will have the pleasure of navigating around thousands of dump trucks entering and exiting into the gridlock on Sunset with tons of soil.

Mr. Bonin, I submit to you that during these peak traffic hours there is limited or no access to our neighborhood for medical and fire emergencies. If the Archer project is allowed to proceed as is, this already critical situation will worsen.

The enormity of the Archer proposed development, simply put, is not appropriate for our neighborhood and risks the safety of the one hundred or so families living here.

I remember your campaign motto: “Putting Neighborhoods First”. This is the time to implement your slogan and put an end to Archer’s outrageous plans.

Response to Comment No. 402-3

As discussed in Topical Response No. 9, Emergency Vehicle Access, while construction activities could increase response times for emergency vehicles traveling to the Project Site and nearby uses along surrounding streets, as set forth in Mitigation Measure K-4 through Mitigation Measure K-7 included in the Draft EIR, during construction of the Project, a Worksite Traffic Control Plan, Traffic Management Plan, Parking Plan, and Pedestrian Routing Plan would be implemented to ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and surrounding the Project Site during construction activities. As further discussed in Topical Response No. 9, Emergency Vehicle Access, and evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, during operation, the Project would not result in a significant impact on the 10 nearby neighborhood street segments analyzed in the Draft EIR. As such, operation of the Project would not significantly interfere with emergency access along the surrounding streets. With regard to the study intersections analyzed, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, with implementation of the mitigation measures provided in the Draft EIR, all Project traffic impacts on non-event days would be reduced to below a level of significance. The mitigation measures provided in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR would also reduce the Project traffic impacts during the weekday 3:00–4:00 P.M. and Saturday 1:00–2:00 P.M. hours associated with events to below a level of significance. The Draft EIR determined that significant impacts would still remain, however, during the
5:00–6:00 P.M. and 6:00–7:00 P.M. hours associated with events. As discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional operational mitigation measures are proposed to fully eliminate the significant traffic impacts of the Project. With implementation of the additional mitigation measures discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, and listed in Section II, Corrections and Additions, of this Final EIR, the Project’s significant operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. Therefore, it is not expected that the Project would consistently increase interference with existing emergency response capacity to the Project area.

As detailed in Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been refined to reduce the construction period from six years to five years. As described in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, additional restrictions on School operations are also proposed, including additional limits on the hours of operation, reducing the number of proposed School Functions, and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses. With these refinements, potential traffic impacts and associated potential impacts to emergency vehicle access would be further reduced.
Comment Letter No. 403

Sandra L. Rosenbaum
215 N. Saltair Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Comment No. 403-1

That west L.A. has serious problems with traffic congestion has become a standard joke and an excuse for being late to everything. There are already questions about the success of the major project on the 405 to ease that congestion before the project is finished. Because entrance to the school—including during construction—is restricted to Sunset Blvd., the proposed Archer Forward project will require the people who traverse the area (as well as the residents of the neighborhood) to endure another 6 years of trucks entering and exiting a major construction site on a daily basis.

Response to Comment No. 403-1

Refer to Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, regarding the impacts of construction activities and the proposal to reduce the overall construction timeframe for the Project from six years to five years. Refer to Topical Response No. 6, Overview of Construction Traffic and Parking, for a detailed discussion regarding construction traffic. Further, as described in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, the Project would include implementation of Mitigation Measures K-4 through K-14 to address potential traffic and access issues during construction.

Comment No. 403-2

When the Archer project is finished, even a superficial reading of the DEIR outlining the proposal makes very clear the additional adverse effects on the surrounding neighborhood: the mega-scale of the new facilities proposed indicate events that will bring an additional 20,000 people, with resulting traffic, and congestion into the immediate area not only during the usual school/work week, but evenings and weekends as well. The already heavily impacted neighborhood will have no quiet, no “down” time. This letter is to encourage the agencies reviewing the project to carefully consider the impact of the Archer plan on an already over-stressed area of the city.

Response to Comment No. 403-2

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.
In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

As discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on School operations are proposed, including additional limitations on the hours of operation, reducing the number of proposed School Functions from 98 to 86 including eliminating Interscholastic Athletic Tournaments and two School Functions with up to 650 guests, and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses. With regard to noise, refer to Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, for a description of additional mitigation measures proposed to be implemented to reduce noise associated with campus operations.

Comment No. 403-3

Additionally, one has to question how thoroughly the planned expansion has been thought through by the Archer administration. The proposed 80,000 square feet of buildings will cover so much of the current available open ground that there will be little space for the students to move other than from one structure to another.

Response to Comment No. 403-3

As described in Section II, Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, refinements to the Project are proposed, including a reduction in the square footage of some of the proposed buildings. Overall, the Project’s net new floor area would be reduced from approximately 75,930 square feet to 68,989 square feet, leaving approximately 229,547 square feet of open space. In addition, as discussed on page II-32 of Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, as part of the Project, on-site pedestrian circulation would be improved by providing an all-pedestrian campus at grade level and eliminating the pedestrian-vehicular conflicts associated with students crossing the existing surface parking lots to access the athletic field. Furthermore, the Project would include new landscaping and landscaped gardens, courtyards, plazas, and walkways throughout the Project Site. Through the creation of such open space areas, the buildings and the landscape within the campus would be integrated to provide for clearly defined pathways and seating areas and an improved campus experience.
Comment No. 403-4

More immediately, how will the school be able to function during the construction period? How will the girls be able to concentrate with the noise rumbling by their classroom for 6 of their 8 years as a student at the school? Where will they be able to go for physical education class, during lunch break, etc.? What about the safety of the students? Ingress and egress is on and off Sunset .... The heavy equipment will be sharing the same access routes as the students.

Response to Comment No. 403-4

As described on page II-38 of Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Project would be developed as the North Wing Renovation, Phase 1, and Phase 2, each designed and timed to facilitate continued School operations on-site and minimize disruption to neighbors. In addition, during the North Wing Renovation, the Project proposes the installation of a Temporary Classroom Village on the athletic field that would be comprised of temporary modular buildings to accommodate classrooms, a dance studio, offices, and changing rooms to be used for classroom functions. Once the new North Wing is complete, the Temporary Classroom Village would be removed and these activities would return to the North Wing. As part of the Traffic Management Plan to be prepared for the Project (see Mitigation Measure K-5), a plan for coordinating access for construction workers, school employees, students, and bus access when School and construction are concurrent would be developed. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure K-13 would require that barriers and/or fencing be installed around construction sites to secure construction equipment and Mitigation Measure K-14 would require that security patrols around construction sites be provided. Archer may utilize interior courtyards and open space during Project construction.

Comment No. 403-5

Finally, I have a more personal issue that the proposed revision of the Archer School CUP brings into focus: the value of one’s word in an agreement. With full knowledge of the pre-existing schools in the immediate area, and with attendant issues of noise and traffic density in the neighborhood, the Archer School administrators chose the former Eastern Star Home property, and worked out a CUP that would respect the needs of the community in which the school would be imbedded, while providing an adequate facility for the school. Additionally, there was provision to modify and add structures to it at a later date in order to maximize use of the site.

The current decision of the administration to flout the agreed-upon terms and conditions not only poses a major change in the habitability of the neighborhood, but it sends a clear
moral message to the student body: a promise, even a legally binding agreement, need only be kept until they decide they want something else!

**Response to Comment No. 403-5**

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the School's operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 404

Brad Rosenberg
15461 Mildale Dr.
Los Angeles, CA  90077

Comment No. 404-1

I am a parent of a sixth grade student at Archer. Archer provides a unique opportunity for a diverse population of young women (30% are on scholarships) to become strong future leaders with well honed skills in solving problems.

While I'm sure there will be some inconvenience to our neighbors during parts of construction, the future campus will be a pride to our community, educating the same number of women it does today, but providing a facility that meets all of the needs of a complete education in today's world.

Archer agreed to a number of unprecedented restrictions when they were granted a conditional use permit.... and to the best I can tell, they have worked hard to honor those commitments to mitigate the concerns of the neighbors. The promise of Improving this facility without further increasing enrollment should be honored.

Thank you for your consideration to approving this project.

Response to Comment No. 404-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 405

Nancy Rosenberg  
15461 Milldale Dr.  
Los Angeles, CA 90077

Comment No. 405-1

I am the Mother of a 6th Grade student at Archer. Our daughter, Nicki, chose Archer before my husband and I had even considered any of the private schools in West LA. Nicki intuitively knew that this was the right place for her. Once we did take a close look at Archer, we realized that it wasn't necessary to look further.

Archer embodies the philosophy that “Girls learn differently than boys”, and that to be in an environment that is engaging, empowering and edifying is exactly what young women need in today’s world. They are teaching girls to become leaders of the 21st Century.

My husband and I completely support the plan of Preservation and Improvement that Archer has presented.

This effort will continue to support the growth and development of our girls. It will enable them to have the same educational and athletic opportunities that many other schools in the area provide.

The foundation for Archer’s mission is solidly in place. We now need the ability to provide the optimal environment to continue this Mission.

Response to Comment No. 405-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 405-2

Thank you.

My address is 15461 Milldale Dr  
LA 90077
Response to Comment No. 405-2

In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list.
Comment Letter No. 406

Fariba Rouzroch
1781 Kelton Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90024

Comment No. 406-1

I am a parent of a student at the Archer School for Girls, writing to request that you support the school’s campus enhancement plan—Archer Forward.

Students have to take carpools and buses off campus for practices and performances as the school lacks facilities that almost every other independent school in the city already has. I know that the school has gone to great lengths to create a plan that will allow the school to work well with the neighborhood—already, parents, teachers and students must abide by a strict traffic control plan to ensure that Archer doesn’t add too many more cars to the congested Sunset corridor.

Archer is a valuable asset to the City and should have the facilities that the students need to learn and be best prepared for their futures. This plan will provide those facilities. I believe that Archer has shown good faith in its effort to work with the community, its neighbors and the city. I hope that the City will agree and support Archer Forward.

Response to Comment No. 406-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 407

Elisa Rubin
elisajrubin@gmail.com

Comment No. 407-1

I am a Brentwood resident, living about 1.2 miles north of Archer. My daughter graduated from Archer this past June. She has excelled this year as a freshman at Emory University in Atlanta, receiving a 4.0 and being named to Phi Eta Sigma, Emory’s honor society, and she credits much of her success to the preparatory education and empowerment she received at Archer.

My daughter loved her time at Archer, and actually looked forward to returning after each break, which is atypical for most teens. She developed a cadre of intelligent, poised, involved, compassionate, supportive and friendly young women, who she considers sisters. She is the prime example of what Archer strives to develop—a young woman who is prepared to contribute to society in many meaningful ways. In my daughter’s case, she entered as a reserved, tentative young woman, and graduated as the confident head of the dance troupe, ready to take on all that college had to offer. And she has done that, having taken on several leadership roles at Emory.

The one drawback from her Archer experience was the lack of space, especially a performing arts facility. As a member and leader of the Dance Troupe for all six years it was tremendously difficult to find rehearsal and performance space, as well as dressing rooms. Students in sports and music had similar difficulties. With the Archer Forward Campus Improvement Plan that will all be changed. Archer is asking to add facilities that they do not currently have and nearly every other school does. The new facilities would significantly enhance the students’ education and experience, as well as benefit the neighborhood by improving pedestrian safety, as there will be underground parking, and students and parents will no longer have to park in lots across the street in order to attend school events.

I hope you can see that this plan is great for the school, the community, and even my fellow neighbors. I hope you will support this plan and move it through the city process quickly.

Response to Comment No. 407-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 408

Timothy Rule
214 N. Bowling Green Way
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 408-1

As a resident of Brentwood, I am writing to support Archer’s plan to improve its campus, including the development of the residential properties that Archer owns immediately adjacent to the existing campus.

In short, exceptional neighborhoods need to have exceptional schools, and our neighborhood is fortunate to have both Brentwood School and The Archer School for Girls. However, while Brentwood School has been allowed to develop its two campuses so as to provide its students with modern facilities, Archer operates without basic facilities like a gymnasium.

As such, Archer simply intends to improve the former Eastern Star Home into a campus that befits its excellent academics, and it intends to do so within the scale of the Brentwood Village neighborhood. And if Archer is allowed to improve its campus, our neighborhood of Brentwood gets improved as well.

Response to Comment No. 408-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
III.D Comment Letters

Comment Letter No. 409

Robin Russell
217 Westgate Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 409-1

I am a 20 year resident of Brentwood; My home is 217 Westgate Ave., just south of what we now call it, the “Sunset Parking Lot”.  I understand development, population growth, infrastructure requirements and general problems in a city that is becoming unmanageably dense.  However, I cannot understand that our local government would even consider the requests of Archer to expand their school and property.  It is a private institution, well funded and perfectly capable of relocating to a non-residential area.  The battle against their initial creation was hard fought and fully based on a long term commitment by Archer to stay small and reasonable and a partner to its neighbors.

Response to Comment No. 409-1

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements.  A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the school’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

Refer to Topical Response No. 15, Alternative Locations, for a detailed discussion of the analysis of alternative locations for the Project.

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 409-2

The increased traffic on both Sunset Blvd. and San Vicente have virtually made Brentwood residents prisoners after 4pm each weekday afternoon.  It has become impossible to travel anywhere in an easterly direction at that time.  Our local officials are blaming most of this gridlock on the 405 Project.  We all know, even once the Project is completed (and will that ever happen?) the traffic nightmare will remain.  I have an additional problem, which is that commuters are using Westgate as a “shortcut”, being a thru street from San Vicente to
Response to Comment No. 409-2

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Comment No. 409-3

How can a municipality even consider allowing a private concern to renege on the commitment upon which its existence was based. It is bad faith and shocking for an institution of education to behave in this manner. I implore you to do the right thing and hold Archer to its promise.

Response to Comment No. 409-3

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the school’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 409-4

Sunset will never be able to handle this additional load and Brentwood residents should not be forced to live through 6 years of a PRIVATE construction project.
Response to Comment No. 409-4

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

Refer to Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, regarding the impacts of construction activities and the proposal to reduce the overall construction timeframe for the Project from six years to five years. Refer to Topical Response No. 6, Overview of Construction Traffic and Parking, for a detailed discussion regarding construction traffic.
Comment Letter No. 410

David Russo and Ann Hallin
russomusic@me.com

Comment No. 410-1

We are the parents of an 8th grader at the Archer School for Girls. We are writing in support of the Archer plan. The school has been a huge part of our lives for 2 years now and we couldn’t be more inspired by the commitment to education demonstrated by the teachers and administration and the quality of the education our daughter has received. We are looking forward to the next four years and are also eager to see Archer bring their facilities up to the [sic] level of the other independent and private schools in the city. Please join us and support the Archer Plan as it moves through the Draft EIR phase.

Response to Comment No. 410-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 411

James Russo
2220 Overland Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90064

Comment No. 411-1

I have been a secondary educator for almost ten years now. For the last four years, I have had the honor of teaching English at The Archer School for Girls, and it has easily been the most rewarding experience of my professional career. Archer nearly has it all: a brilliant faculty, an intellectually curious and empathetic student body, and an assured sense that what we do here is important. When students graduate, they are not only academically prepared for college, but also committed to becoming impactful global citizens.

What’s missing, of course, is a 21st century campus.

I truly feel that Archer’s preservation and improvement plan will have an incredible impact on both teacher and student. I will no longer have to worry about the sweltering Southern California heat and how it affects the students’ attention spans. I will not have to teach within a cramped and confined space; in fact, my classroom will be much larger, enabling me to adapt to multiple learning styles. Most importantly, the plan will give new meaning to the phrase “home field advantage.” The facilities that will be built are not excessive grandiosities meant to impress but rather essential elements that every school should have: a gymnasium, a regulation-size athletic field, a performing arts center, and modern classrooms in which the pathways of engagement are free from potential impediments.

I implore you to wholeheartedly support this plan. Consider what Archer students have accomplished so far, and imagine what they will be able to do with the benefit of a fully equipped campus.

Response to Comment No. 411-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 412

Karen Richards Sachs
819 N. Roxbury Dr.
Beverly Hills, CA  90210

Comment No. 412-1

I serve as a Trustee at The Archer School for Girls in Brentwood, which is currently proposing a Campus Preservation and Improvement project to expand its campus. I hope that we will have your support for this project, which I believe is a good and thoughtful plan for our school and our community.

Every day, the school models good citizenship to its student body and families. We offer millions of dollars in scholarships every year to ensure that girls of all backgrounds are able to attend Archer. Students are expected to complete regular service projects and are a frequent presence in most local community institutions and organizations. From campaigns to save historic trees to beach cleanups to helping the homeless, Archer girls are an asset to Brentwood and the entire city.

Our commitment to the community is demonstrated through our strict compliance with the transportation management program in our CUP. This program strictly forbids parents, students, faculty, and visitors from parking in the neighborhood, and requires that our students either bus or carpool to campus. Roughly 80% of our students use the bus to travel to school, vastly exceeding our CUP obligations. We have the strictest requirements of any independent school in Los Angeles, and since moving into the building in 1999, have met or exceeded all of these requirements.

Archer Forward is the next step to ensuring that Archer continues to be one of the leading independent schools in the city and one of the finest girls’ schools in the country. We are proud of the plan and the extensive outreach we have conducted thus far, and hope to have your support as we move into the next stage of the review process.

I am no longer a parent at The Archer School, my daughter who graduated is currently an extremely successful junior at Northwestern University and I have twin sons, one in private and the other in public school. But I am most active at Archer because I truly believe that I am helping to nurture an important community resource. I also firmly believe that Archer girls deserve to have facilities that are close to being on par with my sons’ schools. Don’t these girls deserve facilities to facilitate their education? Our girls are future leaders of the community and I am committed to seeing that they get what they need to support their hopes and dreams to be successful and productive members of our society.
Thank you for your kind consideration.

**Response to Comment No. 412-1**

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 412-2**

Thanks so much.

Karen Richards Sachs  
819 N Roxbury Dr  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

**Response to Comment No. 412-2**

In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list.
Comment Letter No. 413

Meredith Salenger
mercidawn@aol.com

Comment No. 413-1

PLEASE HELP! My family LIVES on Saltair!!! It took 1 hour to move 3 blocks!!!! It is so dangerous already. PLEASE PLEASE help the traffic in the sunset barrington area!

Response to Comment No. 413-1

This comment does not raise an issue specific to the Draft EIR and the environmental impacts addressed therein. As evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all operational Project traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 413-2

I oppose the Archer School for Girls’ Archer Forward Plan as currently proposed. The size of this expansion in a residential neighborhood, the intensification of use of the school and its new facilities and the resulting increase in traffic from this use on an already over burdened area will adversely affect our local community as well the community at large. Please do not support a plan that will have significant impacts that cannot be mitigated on six key intersections in Brentwood. Please support a downsized alternative that reduces the impacts on the neighborhood.

Response to Comment No. 413-2

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts
would be reduced to below a level of significance. Refer to Topical Response No. 7, Potential Traffic Impacts Associated with Proposed Campus Operations, for a detailed discussion of potential traffic impacts associated with proposed campus operations.

**Comment No. 413-3**

I would LOVE to invite you both to my house for tea any day between 3–6pm... It unfortunately would take you over an hour on either side to actually be able to reach my house if you drive. The best idea is to park 6–8 blocks away and walk.

**Response to Comment No. 413-3**

This comment does not raise an issue specific to the Draft EIR and the environmental impacts addressed therein. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 414

Mikael and Nancy Salomon
1665 Summitridge Dr.
Beverly Hills, CA  90210

Comment No. 414-1

We are proud to say that next year we will be Archer parents.  We are writing you today to show our support for the school’s campus improvement plan, Archer Forward.

We could have picked any school for our child to go to, but we felt Archer was the right choice.  Not only will our daughter be able to attend a school that reflects the diversity that exists in Los Angeles, but most importantly, she will receive an exemplary education.

With Archer Forward, the school will be able to build facilities that they need.  This will provide its students with the experience every other middle and high school students are afforded at other schools.  We sincerely hope that our child will get the opportunity to use these amazing, new facilities.

We hope you will support Archer’s plan and give these girls the facilities they deserve.  Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 414-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 415

Peter Samuelson  
Co-Founder  
Starlight Children’s Foundation  
9412 Kirkside Rd.  
Los Angeles CA  90035

Comment No. 415-1

My name is Peter Samuelson and I am the father of Rebecca Samuelson, a graduate of the Archer School for Girls, Class of 2013. My experience as a parent of an Archer student is fresh in my mind since it culminated not yet a year ago, and it is amplified by my daughter’s participation as a new member of the Archer Alumni Association Board.

I support the Archer Forward Plan for many reasons!

- As soon as Rebecca began her undergraduate career at UCLA this fall, I could immediately see how Archer impacted her life. She was suddenly one of the girls to raise her hand in large lecture halls at UCLA with hundreds of other students, was quick to join clubs in subjects that she was passionate about, effortlessly adapted her strong foundation of study skills to an intensive college setting, and confidently introduced myself to her new peers and made lots of friends easily. These are abilities I believe she would not have had without her Archer years. Rebecca began at Archer in 6th grade as an awkward, academics-only type of girl. By the end of her 7 years at Archer, she had become an ebullient, confident, ambitious, and involved member of the Archer community and beyond. That is why I support Archer Forward.

- What Archer does is unique; Archer transforms the lives of its students by both encouraging and preparing them to become our next CEOs, Olympians, politicians, authors, professors, peace-makers, and everything in between. Archer does so by opening up opportunities for leadership in the arts, in athletics, in community service endeavors, and within the curriculum. With the warmest group of faculty and students, the school embraces its graduates in two ways: First, it gives us the tools to enter the “real world” and make an impact. Secondly, it establishes Archer as our home even after they leave. That is why I support Archer Forward.

- I can already imagine how much these new campus additions will magnify Archer’s impact in breadth and depth. A new athletic field, a new performing arts center, and new classroom designs will undoubtedly improve the entire experience for future Archer girls and better allow the school to teach the core
Archer values of honesty, respect, and responsibility. That is why I support Archer Forward.

- Most of all, I support this plan because Archer deserves the best campus possible to carry out its mission of shaping joyful, ambitious women. We need them in our world!

Thank you for your time.

**Response to Comment No. 415-1**

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 416

Rebecca Samuelson
Dykstra 0243
330 De Neve Dr.
Los Angeles, CA  90024

Comment No. 416-1

My name is Rebecca Samuelson and I am a graduate of the Archer School for Girls class of 2013. My experience at Archer is fresh in my mind since it culminated not yet a year ago, and it is amplified by my participation as a new member of the Archer Alumni Association Board.

I support the Archer Forward Plan for many reasons.

As soon as I began my undergraduate career at UCLA this fall, I could immediately see how Archer impacted my life. I was one of the only girls to raise my hand in large lecture halls with hundreds of other students, I was quick to join clubs in subjects that I was passionate about, I effortlessly adapted my strong foundation of study skills to an intensive college setting, and I confidently introduced myself to my new peers and made lots of friends easily. These are abilities I would not have had without Archer. I began in 6th grade as an awkward academics-only type of girl. By the end of my 7 years at Archer, I was an ebullient, confident, ambitious, and involved member of the Archer community and beyond. That is why I support Archer Forward.

What Archer does is unique; Archer transforms the lives of its students by both encouraging and preparing us to become the next CEOs, Olympians, politicians, authors, professors, peace-makers, and everything in between. Archer does so by opening up opportunities for leadership in the arts, in athletics, in community service endeavors, and within the curriculum. With the warmest group of faculty and students, the school embraces its graduates in two ways. First, it gives us the tools to enter the “real world” and make an impact. Secondly, it establishes Archer as our home even after we leave. That is why I support Archer Forward.

I can already imagine how much these new campus additions would magnify Archer’s impact in breadth and depth. A new athletic field, a new performing arts center, and new classroom designs will undoubtedly improve the entire experience for future Archer girls and better allow the school to teach our core values of honesty, respect, and responsibility. That is why I support Archer Forward.
Most of all, I support this plan because Archer deserves the best campus possible to carry out its mission of shaping joyful, ambitious women.

Thank you for your time.

**Response to Comment No. 416-1**

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 416-2**

My address is

Rebecca Samuelson  
330 De Neve Drive  
Dykstra 0243  
Los Angeles, CA  90024

**Response to Comment No. 416-2**

In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list.
Comment Letter No. 417

Kristin and Michael Sant
831 Marco Pl.
Venice, CA  90291

Comment No. 417-1

We are writing in support of Archer Forward, the proposed campus preservation and improvement plan for the Archer School for Girls. Our daughter Ingrid is in ninth grade, and she has loved everything about her experience at Archer: the nurturing academic environment tailored specifically to the way girls learn; the amazing community of girls who hail from all over LA county (thanks to the requirement that students travel to and from school via bus); and the fact that Archer teaches in a context that honors the individual and fosters the emergence and growth of each girl as a grounded, confident, compassionate and self-guiding person.

Archer’s campus is beautiful, but despite the amazing educational experience that Archer offers its students, the school is sorely lacking in some basic facilities which would enhance its programs greatly. For example, many of the classrooms are cramped and do not have up-to-date technology integration or air conditioning. There is no gym and only a limited playing field. And there is no performing arts center that will accommodate more than 75 people, which is completely inadequate in serving theater, choral and orchestral rehearsals and performances.

Implementation of the Archer Forward plan would greatly enhance the school's ability serve its student community, with very little impact to the surrounding environment. Archer will retail its historic building and sweeping lawn facing Sunset Boulevard, and has taken enormous care in design to ensure that the surrounding neighborhoods will be not be affected negatively. In addition, Archer strives to maintain its sustainably responsible practice of minimizing its contribution to the appalling traffic on Sunset Boulevard and throughout Brentwood.

We wholeheartedly support the Archer Forward plan, knowing that it will be implemented with great care and sensitivity to the community, and that it will enhance the educational experience it offers Archer students in countless ways.

Response to Comment No. 417-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 418

Annie Santana-Grush
100 Driftwood St.
Marina del Rey, CA  90292

Comment No. 418-1

This is my third year as a Spanish teacher at Archer. I have taught for 14 years at many different schools and have fallen in love with Archer. I truly wish that I could have attended a school like this one, that prides itself in understanding how girls learn best and uses that knowledge to develop empowering and thought provoking curriculum. Here, at Archer, students have the opportunity to find or create their niche, to develop their passions, and to be the best that they can be.

As a language teacher, my goal is to immerse the students in the language. I work hard to create “authentic” experiences where the language can be used in context. I have been unable to carry out many of my lessons because of the facilities at Archer. For example, when teaching the students about Spain, the students were unable to play “Jai Alai,” a popular Basque sport, because we do not have a gym. Also, the small size of my classroom does not permit desk configurations conducive to classroom discussions and debates. My creativity as a teacher is limited by the facilities and many kinesthetic lessons are reduced to a more passive style of learning.

I ask the City to support Archer’s Forward plan so that our students can receive the best education possible.

Response to Comment No. 418-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 419

Philicia Saunders
P.O. Box 83688
Los Angeles, CA  90083

Comment No. 419-1

I am an Archer advocate and I am writing because I strongly support Archer’s plan for the future. As an Archer alum, I know Archer’s commitment to being a good neighbor while creating an environment that is specifically designed to educate girls the way they learn best. Archer doesn’t just educate students who live on the Westside, the school educates young women from across Los Angeles.

The Archer Forward Plan is critical for current Archer students. Participating in the arts and athletics are a fundamental part of the school experience. However, right now Archer girls are at a disadvantage when it comes to their access to arts and athletic facilities. The new plan will provide much-needed facilities onsite. The plan is appropriate and the architecture is beautiful. I believe Archer has designed a wonderful plan for a campus that is both respectful to the neighbors and functional for the students.

I hope that the city will help Archer by moving this plan forward through the review process.

Response to Comment No. 419-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 420

Tamar Saunders

Comment No. 420-1

I am a graduate of Archer and I am writing to request your support for the school’s campus plan.

Archer is an amazing school and I had an incredible experience there. I believe that every teacher played an important role in helping me become the person I am today. I am grateful for my education and I hope that many more girls get the opportunity to attend a school that is so focused on empowering women.

While I loved attending Archer, I was often disappointed in the lack of space. Whenever we traveled to other schools for competitions or performances, it became very apparent just what facilities Archer lacked. Changing for fitness in the bathroom every day also enforced that disparity.

I personally don’t think it is right to deny Archer the basic facilities they need when most of their peer schools along Sunset already have them. I really hope you recognize the importance of fairness and what an asset Archer is for the community.

Response to Comment No. 420-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 421

Andrew Schmoller
360 N. Saltair Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 421-1

Beyond simply voicing my opposition to the Archer Forward Plan as currently proposed (ENV-20112689-EIR), the larger issue is Traffic.

Response to Comment No. 421-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 421-2

Not only will this project last too many years in various phases, it's against the original binding contract and is out of scale for the neighborhood.

Response to Comment No. 421-2

As described on page II-38 of Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Project is proposed to be developed in phases to facilitate continued School operations and minimize disruptions to neighbors. As detailed in Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been refined to reduce the construction period from six years to five years.

Regarding the scale of development, as evaluated in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the proposed buildings would be designed to complement the historic Main Building and respond to and respect the residential scale and character of the surrounding area. The Project would also include the use of architectural features that add visual interest and reduce massing to maintain the residential street character when viewed from Chaparal Street and Barrington Avenue. Also refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project's consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood.
As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding the compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 421-3**

Most importantly, the Traffic in the area is already gridlocked most of the day and stretches into nearby residential neighborhoods regularly. This project will make Traffic matters worse during years of construction as well as with increased usage in general. Quite honestly, not sure how people will come and go (or would want to), given already gridlock Traffic.

Making a super congested area into a higher density situation will not mitigate the gridlocked Traffic and ultimately this becomes a Public Safety issue.

**Response to Comment No. 421-3**

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Refer to Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, regarding the impacts of construction activities and the proposal to reduce the overall construction timeframe for the Project from six years to five years. Refer to Topical Response No. 6, Overview of Construction Traffic and Parking, for a detailed discussion regarding construction traffic.
Regarding public safety, refer to Section IV.J.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, and Section IV.J.2, Public Services—Police Protection, of the Draft EIR. Also refer to Topical Response No. 9, Emergency Vehicle Access, regarding emergency vehicle access.

**Comment No. 421-4**

I appreciate your consideration of my comments and urge you to oppose the proposed plan.

Let me know if you have any questions.

**Response to Comment No. 421-4**

This closing comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 422

Brittany Schoof  
7545 Hampton Ave. #214  
West Hollywood, CA  90046

Comment No. 422-1

I am writing to you as an employee of The Archer School for Girls. I have worked in Advancement and Admissions here for almost three years now. As both an admissions officer and someone who raises money for the programs we need, I can truly speak to how essential this plan is for the future of the School, as well as for the community.

Archer offers a top-notch education for girls. The teaching and curriculum is unparalleled, with programs that both challenge traditional ways of learning and thinking, as well as traditional ideas of a girl's education. Archer is a special place not only because it helps girls become the strong young women they are meant to be, but also because it is an incredibly diverse community with 36% students of color from 92 different zip codes throughout the city.

The school spends significant resources renting offsite facilities for practices, games, and performances. These are resources that could better serve toward programs or financial assistance. Off site facilities also mean that Archer girls spend hours travelling to practices or games and the school has to rent facilities all over town. It is a sad reality that there is literally no facility on campus where all parents can watch a performance. Our current “theater” has a mere seating capacity of 75 people.

This wonderful Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan is mindful of both Archer's neighbors as well as its mission and history. It is a beautiful plan, which finally offers the facilities these girls so desperately need and deserve. This plan is actually beneficial to all of Archer’s neighbors. Moving the parking underground frees up space for more green fields and gardens for a “greener” campus. The planting of mature trees actually helps insulate the school further from surrounding neighbors on Chaparral [sic] and Barrington, and all while preserving the beautiful, historic landmark that was once the Eastern Star Home for Women.

It is my hope that the Planning Department, along with Councilmember Bonin recognizes the importance and effectiveness of this plan and will work with Archer to move this plan forward in the City review process. Thank you.
Response to Comment No. 422-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 423

Joan Schrier
13307 Westcove Dr.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 423-1

I HAVE LIVED IN MY HOME FOR NEARLY 50 YEARS. I CAN STILL DEAL WITH THE 16 STEPS LEADING FROM THE STREET TO THE HOUSE. I CAN STILL MANAGE THE INTERIOR OF THE HOUSE AND THE LANDSCAPE. WHAT IS INCREASINGLY HARD TO BEAR IS BEING FORCED TO LEAVE MY HOUSE BEFORE 3:00 P.M. MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY FOR ANY KIND OF AN EVENING ENGAGEMENT. POLITICAL AND DEVELOPER GREED AND CORRUPTION HAVE MADE THE WESTSIDE INTO AN AREA OF BUMPER TO BUMPER TRAFFIC. THIS HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE EXPANSION OF THE 405. SUNSET BOULEVARD, MY CLOSEST EAST WEST CORRIDOR, CANNOT DEAL WITH THE OVERWHELMING TRAFFIC COMING FROM SANTA MONICA AND UP BARRINGTON, BARRINGTON PLACE AND OTHER NORTH SOUTH STREETS. IT IS OBVIOUS THAT THE AREA HAS BEEN OVERBUILT FOR YEARS, YET GOVERNMENT CONTINUES TO ALLOW NEW BUILDING. FOR THESE REASONS, I OPPOSE ANY MODIFICATION TO THE COMMUNITY USE PERMITS THAT HAVE BEEN IN FORCE SINCE THE BEGINNING OF THE ARCHER SCHOOL. IT IS GOING TO BE HARD FOR ANY ELECTED OFFICIALS TO REMAIN IN OFFICE WHEN THEY DISRESPECT THE WISHES OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

Response to Comment No. 423-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to decision-makers for review and consideration.

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding the compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.
Comment Letter No. 424

Joel Schrier
joel.schrier@verizon.net

Comment No. 424-1

We live just off Sunset and 3 miles west of the 405. We have been enduring an untenable traffic condition any time we need to travel east between 3 and 7pm M-F for many years. The completion of the ramps at Sunset and Wilshire has not alleviated this condition and the completion of the 405 roadwork will not improve the situation. For this reason it is incumbent that the expansion plans of the Archer School not be approved unless it can be shown that the related activities will not add to the traffic during these hours.

Response to Comment No. 424-1

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.
Comment Letter No. 425

Barbara Seinfeld
Realtor
Keller Williams Realty
2701 Ocean Park Blvd., Ste. 140
Santa Monica, CA  90405

Comment No. 425-1

What kind of nightmare is the Archer School attempting to create? Why should this beautiful Brentwood neighborhood be disrupted and degraded? Isn’t there a Tenant’s Right to Quiet Enjoyment?

I moved into the luxury apartment building at 11747 Sunset Blvd. in 1988, when there were two ladies residing at the Eastern Star Home, and all was quiet and peaceful in the neighborhood. Today, when I look out of my window, I see an unsightly junkyard in a parking lot, as well as an unattractive sports equipment trailer disrupting my view.

Here is the first of the photos from my balcony.
I called Archer School many times complaining about a motorcycle parked under my window, in which the driver revs up the motor for 15 minutes before he leaves the area, creating smoke, fumes, dust and noise in the evenings. (Photo enclosed)

Response to Comment No. 425-1

This comment does not raise a CEQA issue specific to the Draft EIR and the environmental impacts addressed therein. However, this comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their review and consideration.

With respect to aesthetic issues related to waste and equipment storage, as described on page II-26 of the Draft EIR, as part of the Project, a trash compactor is proposed in order to reduce the number of trash truck visits and the associated noise to the surrounding uses. The trash compactor is proposed to be located within the Barrington Parcel. The trash compactor would be enclosed on three sides by walls and on the east side by a roll-down door providing access to the trash compactor. In addition, the Project would provide sufficient indoor storage for all sports equipment so that outdoor storage bins would no longer be necessary.

With respect to the motorcycle, the Project would provide parking in a new underground parking structure. With completion of the underground parking structure, no above-ground motorcycle parking would occur.
Comment No. 425-2

Needless to say, I am forced to listen to athletic field noise all afternoon, girls and parents screaming in uproarious competition (parents yelling on the bleachers). Then, late in the evening, there is the din of automobile motors, people slamming car doors, engaged in conversations, after meetings at the Archer School, with no concern for others. It is extremely loud and incredibly close, to say the least.

The following photo is a girl’s league baseball game played right under my window. I have video of the same, including the screaming and cheering of fans.

Please note in the subsequent photo how close Chaparal Street is to my location.

Response to Comment No. 425-2

Section IV.I, Noise, of the Draft ER includes a detailed analysis of the potential noise impacts associated with the Project. As set forth in Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been refined to include additional measures to reduce noise associated with campus operations. With the incorporation of additional mitigation measures all operational noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant Monday through Friday. With the
implementation of additional mitigation, Saturday significant impacts would be reduced to 10 days a year within a 4-hour time frame between 10:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.

Refer to Topical Response No. 8, Summary of Impacts from Parking Structure. As described therein, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, refinements have been included in the Project to reduce the size of the parking structure, increase the distance of the parking structure from off-site uses, and reduce noise levels associated with the parking structure. As demonstrated in Topical Response No. 8, Summary of Impacts from Parking Structure, the use of the underground parking structure would have less than significant noise impacts and noise associated with the parking structure would be lower than existing conditions.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 425-3

I speak for all tenants at Sunset West, especially at the rear of this building. We are concerned that if you allow the CUP’s to be approved at all, we, the tenants at Sunset West, will be miserable beyond words. **We are not moving out!**

1 **Aesthetics:** We had a beautiful quiet view to the next block, which is Chaparal Street, and the hills to the North. We all enjoy the view, and pay high rentals for the privilege. I cannot imagine the excavation of a 300 automobile underground parking garage in our backyard that would be appreciated by all. **Would you like this in your backyard?**

Response to Comment No. 425-3

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Refer to Section IV.A, Aesthetics/Visual Quality, Views, Light/Glare, and Shading, of the Draft EIR for a description of the view impacts relating to construction. Regarding views from the upper floor balconies of residences to the south and west of Archer campus, refer to Response to Comment No. 27-49. As described therein, with the exception of the added landscaping, views to the north toward Chaparal Street and the distant hillside would remain similar in character.

Comment No. 425-4

2 **Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Hazardous Materials:** I am sensitively allergic to smoke, allergens and dust that will certainly be created by this six-year project. I have experienced two sinus surgeries in the past several years.
Need I endure more pain? All of the tenants have similar concerns. Does the DEIR address this issue of my health? NO!

Response to Comment No. 425-4

The Draft EIR evaluates health risks related to the Project and evaluates the potential for the Project to result in significant emissions of pollutant, which can contribute to health risks. As provided in Section II, Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, with the incorporation of the enhanced mitigation measures, the Project would not result in a significant impact to air quality nor cause an exceedance of health risks standards during construction or operations.

Dust-related impacts are addressed in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR and the Project would not result in a significant impact related to fugitive dust emissions. As set forth in Regulatory Compliance Measure B-1 included in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, the Project shall incorporate fugitive dust control measures in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 403. Specifically, the Project shall incorporate measures to control fugitive dust, which may include watering, street sweeping, installation of wheel washers, covering of haul trucks, suspending earthmoving operations if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour, and installing an information sign at the entrance of the construction site that provides a telephone number to report complaints regarding excessive fugitive dust generation.

As discussed in the Draft EIR, Section IV.B.3.b, the localized effects from the on-site portion of Project emissions to sensitive land uses in close proximity to the Project Site (i.e., adjacent residences) and potential impacts to Archer students were evaluated according to the SCAQMD’s localized significance threshold (LST) methodology. LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard, and are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each source receptor area and distance to the nearest sensitive receptor. These ambient air quality standards provide public health protection, including protecting the health of “sensitive” populations, such as asthmatics, children, and the elderly.

As discussed on page IV.B-61 in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, the Project would result in less than significant localized (NOX, CO, PM10, and PM2.5) construction impacts with incorporation of mitigation measures. The Project would also result in less than significant localized operational impacts. Since impacts would not occur at the closest receptors, further analysis was not warranted at more distant locations. Thus, no changes to the air quality analyses or additional mitigation measures to protect at-risk populations are warranted based on this comment. It is noted that in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the construction period has been reduced from six years to
five years. As with the proposed six-year schedule, under a five-year construction schedule, the maximum daily impacts would occur during the mass excavation and export phase. In addition, when compared with the six-year schedule, the five-year construction schedule would not increase the use of on-site equipment or number of trips on a daily basis during this phase of construction. As a result, the maximum daily construction impacts presented in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, would also represent peak construction impacts under the five-year construction schedule. Refer to Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements.

This comment is noted for the administrative record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 425-5

3 **Noise:** Most of the neighbors on the third level of this building use their loft/office for business during the day. Can you imagine concentrating on a telephone call with the demolition and construction commotion that will occur? Furthermore, can a large clamorous concrete truck, which moves in and out of the location all day long, do it silently? Presently, there are garbage trucks on Tuesday at 5:30 a.m. and Saturday morning, which grind their trash over and over again. Additionally, it has become quite boisterous and rowdy in the afternoons, during baseball games, right under my window. As I previously mentioned, when Archer conducts evening parents meetings, I hear conversations and slamming car doors, when I am trying to fall asleep. What a pleasure “Spring Break” has been for the tenants at 11747 Sunset Boulevard! When the next Archer baseball game is scheduled, YOU are invited to come over to my apartment and listen for yourself.

Response to Comment No. 425-5

Refer to Section IV.I, Noise, of the Draft EIR regarding the Project’s potential noise related construction impacts. Also refer to Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, regarding the impacts of construction activities and the proposal to reduce the overall construction timeframe for the Project from six years to five years. In addition, refer Response to Comment No. 425-3 and Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, regarding the additional measures proposed to reduce noise associated with campus operations. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment No. 425-6

4. **Evening Lights**: The playing field supposedly will be lit up in the evenings. How uncomfortable for tenants who are elderly, and wish to retire to bed early, with bright lights in their bedrooms, besides the noise of players and observers!

**Response to Comment No. 425-6**

Regarding athletic field lighting, as discussed in Section IV.A, Aesthetics/Visual Quality, Views, Light/Glare, and Shading, of the Draft EIR, impacts associated with the athletic field lighting would be less than significant. However, as discussed in Topical Response No. 2, Removal of Athletic Field Lighting and Refinements to Lighting, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has removed the athletic field lighting. With the removal of the athletic field lighting, light and glare impacts from the Project would be reduced.

Comment No. 425-7

5. **Weekend events and Summer School**: In addition to the daily noise, disturbances and pollution, should we be expected to endure weekend sports events and six weeks of summer school, as well as wedding, private parties and special events?

**Response to Comment No. 425-7**

As discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on School operations are proposed, including additional limitations on the hours of operation for weekend athletic events and camp programs, and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses. With respect to summer academic and camp programs, also refer to Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, which provides additional information regarding the summer programs.

Also, as discussed in Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been refined to include additional measures to reduce noise associated with campus operations.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 425-8

6. **Traffic on Sunset**: Have you attempted to get out of my driveway between 7:30 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. or 3:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.? The Archer busses are pulling
out of their driveway, and they take up a huge space to fold into traffic! As tenants here, we are forced to wait in line, at the center lane (which is dangerous due to oncoming cars from the East) to incorporate into traffic until someone kindly lets us in. Then at night, between 3:00 p.m. and 7:30 p.m., try to drive east on Sunset and arrive anywhere on time! If I am at my office on Ocean Park in Santa Monica, I travel north on Barrington (heavy traffic there too) in the evening hours to get home. I never attempt to turn right on Sunset from Bundy to my address at 11747 Sunset. That mistake can cost me an extra half-hour in traffic!

Response to Comment No. 425-8

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

Refer to Topical Response No. 7, Potential Traffic Impacts Associated with Proposed Campus Operations, for a discussion of vehicles exiting the campus, including field observations at the Project Site indicate that exiting vehicles are generally able to make the left-hand turn from the Archer driveway onto Sunset Boulevard, oftentimes utilizing the center left-turn lane that is present on Sunset Boulevard in front of the Project Site. These turns are usually made while westbound flows on Sunset Boulevard are stopped by the traffic signal at the Sunset Boulevard and Barrington Avenue intersection.

Comment No. 425-9

The Archer School has obviously outgrown its present location. We are all delighted that Archer has been successful in gaining a student population interested in an Aquatic Center,
Performing Arts Center, and a Visual Arts Center, including any and all forms of sports activities. **Now is the time** for Archer to begin looking for another open space to build; perhaps in Calabasas or surrounding area. As a California Realtor®, I will be happy to help them find the perfect new location. **Please don’t let Archer build ANYTHING here. We are imploring you!!!!**

**Response to Comment No. 425-9**

Refer to Topical Response No. 15, Alternative Locations, for a detailed discussion of the analysis of alternative locations for the Project. As described therein, an alternative location would not meet many of the basic Project objectives, particularly those related to improving the existing Archer campus and ensuring the continued preservation of the historic Main Building. Further, moving the School to Calabasas or other outlying areas would likely result in additional environmental impacts associated with longer commuting distances for students.

The comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 426

Crystal Sengstaken
1259 N. June St.
Los Angeles, CA 90038

Comment No. 426-1

I am an Upper School Biology Teacher at the Archer School for Girls and I am writing this letter in support of the Archer Forward Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan. I ask for your support because I teach at an incredibly special place with an important mission. At Archer we encourage our students to discover their passions, promote challenge seeking and encourage girls to take risks. We are a collaborative teaching and learning environment that explores and refines the ways girls learn best. There is no other school for girls in the city of Los Angeles quite like Archer and I am proud to say I work at this unique place.

Last weekend I had the pleasure of attending the annual performance of the Archer Dance Program. I was blown away by the caliber of the dancers and the level of dedication of the faculty, staff and students involved in the production. I was especially impressed because the current Archer campus lacks the adequate facilities where students can practice for and perform these incredible shows. As a result, we spend significant resources renting offsite facilities for practices, games and performances. Specifically, for the Dance Show, volunteers transported equipment and students to an off-site location every day for rehearsal and performances for weeks.

Moreover, we lack a common space where all students, faculty and staff can congregate. The Archer Forward plan will allow the school to provide an even better education for students, by adding modern classrooms, a regulation-size athletic field, a gymnasium and spaces for swim and performing and visual arts.

Please support the Archer Forward Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan.

Response to Comment No. 426-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 427

Ana Serrano
luis55@mac.com

Comment No. 427-1

I am writing to ask for your support for the Archer Forward Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan. I am the parent of an Archer alumnae and have served on the Board of Trustees of The Archer School for Girls in Brentwood for six years. When Archer moved to the Brentwood site, our daughters were utilizing neighboring sports facilities and were cramped into small rooms for theater and music productions. My daughter who was in the second graduating class at Archer spent a substantive amount of time walking or being transported to and from varied facilities for practice and games. This situation was part of their daily routine during Archer’s early years and, sadly, it is still the case today. Because the time spent traveling is not productive, we need to give future Archer girls a place where they can learn, participate in sports and perform in the arts on campus. This is why the Archer Forward Plan is so important. The Archer Forward Plan will provide the essential facilities we need so that the school can continue to provide an excellent 21st century education for every student.

One of the hallmarks of Archer, from which my family directly benefitted, is the generous financial aid packet it provides to students. Archer is committed to its diversity and scholarship programs; providing more than $3 million in financial aid this year, making Archer accessible to girls from all backgrounds. Archer currently has students from 92 different zip codes and 146 different schools. I firmly believe that Archer is a true asset to both the Brentwood community and the greater Los Angeles area.

The Archer Forward Plan encompasses the values of our school, ensuring sustainability and preserving our historic building. This plan will meet the needs of our students by providing new arts and athletic facilities. The proposed plans ask for nothing more than what other schools already have.

Although I no longer have a daughter who attends Archer, I am committed to the mission of the school and to its commitment to diversity. I am proud to be a Trustee of this school and I hope we’ll be able to count on your support for the Archer Forward Plan.

Response to Comment No. 427-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 428

Maria Servello
Executive Assistant to the Head of School
The Archer School for Girls
11725 W. Sunset Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Comment No. 428-1

I have worked at The Archer School for Girls since 1998 as the Assistant to the Head of School. I spent two school years working in the Pacific Palisades (Archer’s original location), moving from building to building along with my colleagues, never having a permanent office. Though we rented four different locations in the Palisades, the school community was strong, and anyone who got involved believed in Archer’s passion and mission to provide girls the opportunity to have an excellent education in an inclusive and diverse environment.

As the Head’s Assistant, I was involved in Archer’s request (and fight) to move into The Eastern Star Home. The school needed a bigger space and the students needed a permanent home. I spent several months attending meetings, talking with neighbors, and meeting city officials and news affiliates. I was proudly sitting in the audience when then Zoning Administrator Dan Green approved our Conditional Use Permit and granted us the ability to move into our current site on Sunset Boulevard. It was clear that Mr. Green, Cindy Miscikowski, and other city officials understood what a unique and special school Archer was. Their decision granted the school the chance to have the necessary space that would allow our community to grow and eventually become the nationally recognized institution we are today.

Since occupying our current location in 1999, I have served as Archer’s Transportation Coordinator and Neighbor Liaison. I have an important job at Archer; one which I take very seriously. I work hard to ensure that Archer remains in compliance with our CUP, maintain positive relationships with our immediate and surrounding neighbors, and enforce our very robust Transportation Management Program which requires us to bus 50% of our students each day. I am extremely proud that Archer has surpassed its current requirement and routinely buses 80% of our students. Our families understand, and actually appreciate, our busing requirement. I often hear from parents that their other kids’ schools do not bus students as efficiently as we do at Archer.

I think most people would wholeheartedly agree that Archer has been a good neighbor. The school has operated in its current building for 15 years and Archer has honored and
abided by the restrictions of its current CUP. Archer families abide by the school’s requirement to park across the street in order to meet with their daughter’s teacher during the school day, or attend her music performance after school. Furthermore, instead of parents picking their daughters up directly after school to go to appointments, they pick them up after they have been dropped off at their bus stop. Archer parents respect the school’s restrictions on which days events are allowed and they understand that only four members of their family can attend a Middle School play because the building can’t accommodate our seating needs.

I am proud that the original mission of “strengthening girls’ voices in a diverse and culturally rich environment” still rings true 18 years later. Our families come from 92 different zip codes, and because of this, several girls take public transportation starting at 5:30 a.m. just to get to their Archer bus stop on time.

Archer Forward is a comprehensive plan to renovate our current building and add additional facilities that every other independent school already has. As someone who fully understands the space restrictions of our current building, I urge you to support this thoughtful and much-needed project.

As Archer’s Transportation Coordinator, I can guarantee that the school will continue to maintain its aggressive Transportation Program and will work to urge other schools to join us in this commitment. Thank you for your consideration.

Response to Comment No. 428-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 429

Jasmine Shackelford  
550 W. Regent St. #205  
Inglewood, CA  90301

Comment No. 429-1

I am a proud graduate of Archer and I am writing to request that you support Archer Forward, the school’s campus improvement plan.

I thoroughly enjoyed my time at Archer and am thankful for what the school did to boost my confidence. At Archer, girls are taught that their voices matter and that they can be anything they want to be. Although I loved my years at the school, I think it could have been better if we had the facilities we needed on campus. Not having a gym was a hassle and we had to bus all over the city to play at other facilities. It would have been nice to have home games at home, but that was impossible. The new facilities Archer is proposing would provide student athletes with the basic facilities that other schools have. Furthermore, there would finally be space for the performing arts.

Simply put, this plan will provide the school with facilities that it needs. I hope that you will choose to support it.

Response to Comment No. 429-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 430

Shireen Shafai
240 E. 79th Street., Apt 28
New York, NY 10075

Comment No. 430-1

My name is Shireen Shafai and I graduated from The Archer School for Girls in 2001. I am writing in support of Archer’s Campus Plan.

If there is one thing that most people know about me, it’s how proud I am to have attended Archer. Although I feel a strong connection with each school I attended during the different levels of my continuing education; I have a much deeper bond with Archer than with the other schools. I come from a long line of active, vocal women, but Archer is where I learned to use my voice. I come from a family where education is taken very seriously, but Archer is where I learned the great depth to which I could truly understand what was being taught. At Archer I went from being a shy girl who was afraid of giving the wrong answer to a confident woman who is excited for the journey that comes with learning the right one. At Archer I learned that the best competitions are the ones we have with ourselves. I learned how important it is to push myself and be in my own corner, while at the same time I learned how to be a support to the people around me. These are all intangible qualities that Archer taught me, in addition to the great education that was given to me from day one.

I was an active Archer girl. I was involved in theater, sports, and I was a member of several clubs. This wasn’t always easy. During my first two years at Archer we had to walk a couple blocks between classes because there wasn’t enough space for us at the original Archer School in the Pacific Palisades. Once the school day was over we either walked to the main campus again or we would go to the Eastern Star in Brentwood to prepare for the school plays. As I’m sure you are aware 3pm is one of the worst times to be heading East on Sunset, but we did it because it was our only option.

Beyond the inconvenience of traveling just to partake in extracurricular activities, there was the great negativity we felt around Brentwood. I grew up in the Pacific Palisades, so the restaurants, art classes, tutors, and grocery stores we often went to were in Brentwood. During Archer’s transition from the Palisades to Brentwood it was heartbreaking to me that a neighborhood that was so happy to have us there as consumers suddenly had signs on every other corner trying to prevent us from having the expansion of our school in their neighborhood. There is something jarring about a community coming together to fight against an educational institution, especially one that was so committed to trying to
preserve and connect with its surroundings. I suppose that this was another of the great lessons I learned at Archer, because we never let the negativity keep us from respectfully fighting for our home and our education.

I am so excited for Archer’s Campus Plan. I live in New York and, unfortunately, I don’t see a possibility of my children attending Archer. I am not writing this letter for the people in my life who will benefit from this amazing expansion. I’m writing in support of the thousands of girls who will be fortunate enough to attend a school that will teach them how to be their own cheerleaders, how to push themselves to overcome their insecurities and face the world with confidence. A school that not only teaches young women that they can be the leaders in whatever industry they choose, it gives them the tools to do it well.

Archer is a wonderful school that I am very proud to have attended, but the plans for the expansion of Archer that they are working toward affords the students so much more. These girls deserve to have every opportunity that their school can give them. They are at Archer learning to lead and they deserve to feel the support and confidence of their community. It would be a shame for another group of young women to feel that there are people in their community who want to stand in the way of all of the great things they can learn and achieve. I wholeheartedly support this plan and it is my hope that you will see how your support of it will change the lives of women for many years to come.

Response to Comment No. 430-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 431

Nahal Shakib
1490 Capri Dr.
Pacific Palisades, CA 90272

Comment No. 431-1

My name is Nahal Shakib and I graduated from The Archer School for Girls last year. I am currently studying at the Stephen M. Ross School of Business at the University of Michigan.

I am writing in support of Archer’s campus plan and to express how much The Archer School for Girls has contributed to the person I am today. I was a student at Archer for 7 years. But, going to this school is not simply riding the school bus to go to classes until the day is over and it is time to go home. When you are a student at Archer, you attend school. You are a member of a community built with a foundation that creates leaders in their students—girls who use curiosity as fuel for discovery and discovery as the base of innovation. I graduated with 60 other girls who I had the privilege to grow up with, from our awkward preteen years to graceful, ambitious, University-ready, world-ready women.

This school is everything it is because of its students, its faculty and, of course, its administration. The students actively participate on campus. The faculty fosters an environment ideal for girls to develop into learners, thinkers and creators. The administration has a vision and they see it through. They want Archer to be the place where girls find their passions and are able to express them in a space created to support them. The administration has made Archer a place people like me will forever be able to call home.

I know that every girl on that campus feels supported by the individuals who have gotten to know them for their character, their talents and their aspirations. I truly believe that this plan is more than a simple architectural endeavor. This is Archer’s next big leap is shaping the girls we know will be making huge improvements to the world. Remember that the environment you are in and the resources that you have access to directly correlate to your future successes. This plan will help Archer raise the bar in the way they educate their girls.

I would be happy to speak to you further about how much Archer has impacted me, and most of all, how much I believe in this plan. Feel free to email me at nahalshakib@gmail.com or call me at (310) 966-0908. I am always available to speak on behalf of my home.
Thank you so much for your time.

**Response to Comment No. 431-1**

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 432

Laurie Shearing
905 Centinela Ave.
Santa Monica, CA  90403

Comment No. 432-1

My daughter, Claire De Los Rios is in 7th grade at The Archer School for Girls and my husband and I truly regard Archer as a partner not only in our daughter’s education, but as a integral institution in our westside community. For many months now, the school has been diligently working with the neighbors and local stakeholders to create a campus improvement plan that will greatly enhance the students’ overall educational experience, with added benefits to the community. I am writing to ask that the City support this plan.

At Archer, our girls learn the value of giving back to the community and putting others before themselves and Archer not only teaches this everyday on so many levels, but most importantly, they model it. The school administration has worked hard with community members who have concerns about the plan to ensure that everyone benefits. They plan to streamline parking to help improve traffic flow and reduce noise in the busy Brentwood neighborhood, and when they move essential athletic and arts facilities onto campus, they will be removing the need for additional carpools to off-campus venues. This is a win-win situation for us all.

Simply, Archer is requesting the facilities that many of its peer institutions already have and in the process, is being incredibly mindful of its surrounding community. They pride themselves on enrolling girls from allover the city and providing much needed dollars for financial aid families. I take pride in knowing my daughter benefits from their outreach. Archer is a unique institution. I have never been involved in a school where the administration truly walks their talk. And it is with this knowledge that you and the community as a whole can feel sure that with Archer Forward, Archer is not just going to be better able to shepherd our daughters to become future leaders in the world, but it is building an institution that our whole community can take pride in. I hope that the next generations of Archer students will be able to enjoy the benefits of Archer Forward. So please, join us in support of this very important project.

Response to Comment No. 432-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 433

Lisa Sherman
Sherman Law Corp.
1990 S. Bundy Dr., Ste. 390
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Comment No. 433-1

Our daughter, Alex Sherman, is a freshman at The Archer School for Girls. Archer has been transformative for her and for us since she began her journey in 7th Grade. While she came to Archer as a kind soul and the inherent ability to speak publicly with ease, in less than two years’ time, she has already evolved into a true leader fully immersed in all that Archer has to offer, such as serving on student council, the ambassador leadership board working with admissions, participating in musical theater, and creating films and persuasive writings in support of women and the complex issues our country faces today. In less than two years’ time, she has already become confident, even more compassionate and, beyond her academic success, she is already able to critically analyze her weaknesses and set goals for overcoming many of her insecurities and fears which I have never seen in a fifteen year old. Driven to succeed and unafraid to fail, Archer has provided our daughter with what no other school in LA could ever give her—love of learning, strong values, mentors and role models, and a full understanding of how to navigate our technological world, projecting a positive image in whatever she does, and the power to believe that she can be successful in math/science or anything she puts her mind to. Unlike any other school, Archer has given Alex what is referred to as the “grit” experience, by for example, learning to survive on very little with her classmates for a week every other year in the NOLS program that trains astronauts and high-powered executives survival skills. Through these experiences, Alex fully understands that success is only achieved by being uncomfortable, struggling outside of her comfort zone, falling on her face, and getting right back up again.

For these reasons, Archer Forward is essential to continue Archer’s mission and allow girls, like Alex, the unique opportunity to benefit from this educational and personal experience. Our complex world is in dire need of female leadership led by compassionate, confident women with strong values, equipped to overcome grit, all of which Archer graduates earn. We hope that you will put your support 100% behind Archer Forward so that tomorrow’s female leaders will have the privilege and opportunity to earn an Archer diploma.

Your vote in support of Archer Forward is a critically important expression of your belief that we need to preserve and continue cultivating the next generation of female leaders, all of
whom will be taught to lead with integrity, compassion, and most of all, humility, by allowing Archer to move forward.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. We hope that you fully understand the love we have for this special place and how passionate we feel about what Archer has provided our daughter and how committed we are as members of the Archer community to support its mission.

Response to Comment No. 433-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 434

Andrea Shintani
1343 Warner Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Comment No. 434-1

My daughter is currently enrolled at the Archer School for Girls in Brentwood, and I’d like to personally urge the City to support the school’s improvement project, Archer Forward. It’s in the best interest of the school and the students, and therefore is a good step forward for the community and the City as well.

Our students spend hours commuting to practices, games and performances because Archer lacks the facilities necessary to allow these events to happen on campus. It’s a wonderful school that is offering our girls a comprehensive, 21st century education—but in order for the school to continue to make good on its mission, it needs the facilities and space every modern school requires.

I am proud that Archer prides itself on being a responsible and active member of the community. As parents, we abide by many rules—particularly with regards to carpools and buses—to make sure that the school is doing its part to reduce traffic in Brentwood. The school administration values community service, something they put into practice by participating in local neighborhood councils and groups, and requiring all students to complete community service hours in the local area.

Archer Forward is a good plan for the students, the school and the city. I respectfully request the City’s support.

Response to Comment No. 434-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 435

Hanna Shohfi

**Comment No. 435-1**

My name is Hanna Shohfi and I’m a science teacher at the Archer School for Girls. I started teaching at Archer eight years ago after changing careers from scientific research to science education. This change was inspired by the disconnect that I saw between the science that was being conducted by scientists in academia and how it was being taught in schools. In order to engage more students in the sciences, I knew that science needed to be taught as a process rather than a collection of facts to memorize. However, to teach students about the process, I needed to find a school that would support opportunities for them to do the science rather than just talk about it. Fortunately, I found Archer, and my efforts to encourage girls to pursue careers in STEM fields have been supported since Day 1.

While Archer continues to encourage the innovative teaching that provides the STEM education that its students deserve, the school lacks the critical facilities that enable the growth of these programs for all students to enjoy. I believe the Archer Forward plan will allow the school to provide an even better education for students, by adding modern classrooms, a regulation-size athletic field, a gymnasium and spaces for swim and performing and visual arts.

I hope the city will support the Archer Forward plan to enable Archer to provide our students with the facilities that every student deserves.

**Response to Comment No. 435-1**

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 436

Betty Sigoloff
mrsbettyesig@aol.com

Comment No. 436-1

Do whatever you can to prevent Archer’s expansion plan. It’s the worst thing that could possibly affect traffic on the entire west side of the 405!! Betty Sigoloff

Response to Comment No. 436-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to decision-makers for review and consideration.

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Comment No. 436-2

I understand that Brentwood School will also be expanding. How will this be dealt with? Thank you for all you’re doing, Betty Sigoloff

Response to Comment No. 436-2

On June 13, 2014, the City issued a Notice of Preparation and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting for the Brentwood School Education Master Plan. The City will be the Lead Agency and will require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Brentwood School Education Master Plan. The Brentwood School Education Master Plan will have a public review process.
Comment Letter No. 437

Emily Silver

**Comment No. 437-1**

As an art teacher at Archer I see this future plan of Archer Forward to be an extremely necessary step forward for the education of our young girls. The school is a unique learning institution that offers girls the opportunity to explore the arts and apply them to their everyday life in a creative way. Though we have the amazing faculty and talented students, the facilities here often hinder the potential of many of the students instead of accentuating what they could do. Currently I have to share my classroom with another teacher, where collectively over 6 course [sic] a semester is taught in this room, causing storage and normal activity space to be challenging.

The arts are a very crucial part to a girl's education and the future of Archer forward will contribute largely to the importance of this in education. The new plan will offer a larger space for the students to explore and push their creative problem solving, it will also allow the faculty greater potential to collaborate across artistic disciplines, in turn helping create well rounded individuals.

Originally coming from teaching at colleges across the country, Archer, in comparison has been a wonderful unique experience. This school is forward thinking and establishing new ways of educating our future. I ask that you please support our steps forward, as this will only have a wonderful impact on our future adults of Los Angeles.

**Response to Comment No. 437-1**

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 438

Orly Simpson  
435 Westbourne Dr.  
Los Angeles, CA 90048

Comment No. 438-1

For many months now, my daughter’s school, Archer School for Girls, has been working with the community to create a campus improvement plan to enhance the students’ overall educational experience, with added benefits to the community. For that reason, I am writing to ask that the City support that plan.

Archer girls are taught the value of community service and thinking of others before themselves. The school administration reflects that—they have worked hard with community members who have concerns about the plan to ensure that everyone benefits from what they’d like to make happen on campus. They plan to streamline parking to help improve traffic flow and reduce noise in the busy Brentwood neighborhood, and when they move essential athletic and arts facilities onto campus, they will be removing the need for additional carpools to off-campus venues. This is a win-win situation for us all.

Archer is simply requesting the facilities that many of its peer institutions already have. They pride themselves on enrolling girls from all over the city and providing millions of dollars in scholarships. I firmly believe that many future leaders will graduate from Archer, and I hope that future generations of Archer students will be able to enjoy the benefits of Archer Forward. Please join us in support.

Response to Comment No. 438-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 439

Lisa Small
lisa@beverlyhillsmanners.com

Comment No. 439-1

We are a new family to Archer School for Girls. Our daughter, Sydney, will be attending in the 7th grade this fall and we are hoping that our daughter, Dylan, will follow in her footsteps in two years from now.

Archer is an amazing school with so much to offer our girls. The faculty and staff provides the utmost support, encouragement and inspiration our girls need to grow and thrive in today's world. However, the facilities at Archer are in great need of expansion and improvement in order for them to maintain their high standards, educational goals, and vision for the school's future.

It is my hope that my girls will have modernized classrooms in which to work in, that they will have a proper gym, athletic field and pool for exercise, and an auditorium to host school-wide events. They are both performers and I would also love for them to have a large performing arts center so that they may display their talents to vast audience members. My husband is in a wheelchair and it would certainly be nice to have a school with more space that can accommodate ample parking and special concessions for those with disabilities.

For all of the reasons above, I hope you will comply with Archer's Forward Plan.

Response to Comment No. 439-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 440

Amy Jo Smith
President
The Digital Entertainment Group
10635 Santa Monica Blvd., Ste. 160
Los Angeles, CA  90025

Comment No. 440-1

While I am respectful of the needs of the Archer School and their goals to improve the facility, I am strongly opposed to their proposed plan before the Los Angeles City Council.

Response to Comment No. 440-1

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 440-2

Traffic in the area is intolerable as it is now. This would aggravate the situation making it worse ... something imaginable.

Response to Comment No. 440-2

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Comment No. 440-3

Please do not approve the plan proposed by the Archer School.

Response to Comment No. 440-3

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 441

Dennis Smith
DDavsmith@aol.com

Comment No. 441-1

I am a long time resident (over 27 years) of Brentwood and reside in Mandeville Canyon. Sunset Blvd. and the streets surrounding Barrington Ave. and Bundy Dr. are my primary ways of navigating through Brentwood and all of Los Angeles.

The proposed expansion of Archer School will clearly place an unreasonable increase in traffic and congestion in this already overburdened area.

My neighbors and I are simply unwilling to endure more construction, traffic delays and increased vehicle use of the Archer School property.

Response to Comment No. 441-1

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. Refer to Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, regarding the impacts of construction activities and the proposal to reduce the overall construction timeframe for the Project from six years to five years. Refer to Topical Response No. 6, Overview of Construction Traffic and Parking, for a detailed discussion regarding construction traffic.

Comment No. 441-2

Please note my opposition and be assured that my family, my neighbors and I are strongly opposed to the proposed change in the Archer School’s conditional use permit.

Response to Comment No. 441-2

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the school’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.
Comment Letter No. 442

Kim Smith

Comment No. 442-1

I’ve had the great fortune of being the Varsity Soccer Coach here at Archer for the past four years. There are some coaches that get to walk into great sports programs and then there are coaches who get to be a part of making a sports program great. I decided to coach at Archer for the latter reason. These past years I have watched Archer soccer grow at an incredible rate. This season we qualified for CIF playoffs and have advanced for the first time in Archer history to the CIF Final Four. Since I joined the Archer faculty, sport has grown into something greater than any individual, it has become more than a game. It has inspired an entire community. Standing on the sidelines of our Quarterfinal match with over 100 faculty members and students standing in a torrential downpour, it occurred to me that we need space to grow to accommodate the spirit of our athletes and our community. We train on a field that is 80 x 45 yds wide and share it [sic] the Middle School soccer team. We are unable to play home games and prepare for a full field match with our current field conditions. I’ve watched student-athletes use sport to gain confidence, build self-esteem, and experience a sense of community. What a great opportunity to expand our facilities so that we may build upon this spirit and have a positive effect on the students and the community. What we have is ineffable. What we have here deserves the dimensions our surrounding schools are afforded. I am asking you to support our plan that will positively impact not only the young lives at Archer, but the surrounding community.

Response to Comment No. 442-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 443

Scott C. Smith
3544 Griffith Park Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA  90027

Comment No. 443-1

As a parent of a student at the Archer School for Girls, I am writing to you in support of the Archer Forward plan.

Archer’s commitment to the community starts with its traffic management plan—the strictest in the city, to ensure that the school is not imposing an undue burden on the neighborhood—and also extends to its extensive volunteer service program. Archer girls are involved in issues and organizations that serve our community in many different ways. Through service projects and after-school partnerships with organizations like the Daybreak Women’s Shelter in Santa Monica and Brentwood Green, Archer helps make our West LA community a better place.

Archer Forward is an essential next step in the improvement of our campus, providing crucial academic, arts and athletic facilities. Parking will be moved underground garage thus increasing green space on campus and reducing noise and traffic in the neighborhood. Currently, students must use offsite facilities for arts and athletics programs; however, it would be extremely beneficial for the school and the community alike if Archer was able to provide these opportunities on campus.

This plan has been reviewed by community leaders and neighbors for many months, and I believe that it is both a good balance for the neighborhood and the school. Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 443-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 444

Susan Smith

Comment No. 444-1

My name is Susan Smith and I am the orchestra director and 8th grade dean at the Archer School for girls. I have been teaching at Archer since 2001, and want to let you know what an amazing and unique school it is. The education and experience that our students receive here ever [sic] day is exceptional. The dedication from our faculty to the school and students is something I have not seen anywhere else. As a result, we graduate confident, ambitious and highly capable young women, who are innovative and life long learners.

While our students have the privilege of receiving this outstanding education, the facilities are in need of expansion. As the orchestra director, I would like to specifically address the challenges for this program. Daily classes and rehearsals are held in a classroom that is too small, where students have to sit in cramped conditions. In addition, there is no adequate climate control, so it is often too hot. This does not just affect the comfort of the students, but it is also bad for the instruments. In addition, there is not any adequate storage for instruments. Instrument racks and performance risers outline the room, reducing the already small teaching space even more.

However, performances present the biggest challenge. A stage has to be set up with stage extensions every time we have a concert. This stage is also too small and students have to give their performances without adequate room to comfortably play their instruments. My students work hard, they have a lot of talent, and they sound fantastic. They deserve to rehearse and perform in spaces that are spacious enough and that have climate control.

I ask for your support in the plan to expand our campus. It is an important and necessary next step for our students.

Response to Comment No. 444-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 445

Robert Smyth
1019 26th St.
Santa Monica, CA  90403

Comment No. 445-1

We have two daughters who attend Archer. We are very excited and strongly in support of
the Archer Forward Plan.

We were sitting at the dinner table one evening and our then 11 year old daughter asked if
she could go to a school that had smaller class sizes (some of her then classmates had to
bring in chairs to fit into her classes) that would offer more academic attention. With a little
research and a lot of luck (Archer had an opening for her), we knew it was a smart
decision, as we had heard nothing but incredible things about Archer. As soon as our
second daughter found out about Archer the following morning she was up before dawn to
look for the bus that would transport her to her future school. We found a gem on the
Westside of Los Angeles! Not only was it an all-girls school, but also, it was the only
secular school in the area. Our girls soon found themselves in a truly amazing learning
environment so much so that even they recognized it within the first week (our youngest
daughter came home after her first 3 days “wow, everyone here asks such interesting
questions!”). It has a powerful academic and life empowerment curriculum.

Archer girls come from all over the city creating a true sample of the city’s diverse
population. Archer develops outstanding students who will be the future leaders of our
communities. There may be only one thing to add to the campus is up to date facilities.
They would only benefit from bigger classrooms, regular athletic facilities and outdoor fields
instead commuting to other locations. Archer’s future plans would only complement the
girls’ empowering education.

I understand that trepidation may arise with changes. But what better changes are there
than to complement and complete an exemplary educational institution? To our knowledge
the Archer community has gone beyond the city requirements in the past. The facilities
need to be upgraded, since they are adhering to all requirements, why not do the best that
we can? Archer’s upgrading the property will only enhance the community. This is why we
are unconditionally supporting the Archer Forward project, and we hope that you will also
expedite the process!
**Response to Comment No. 445-1**

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 445-2**

Robert Smyth  
1019 26th street  
Santa Monica, CA 90403

**Response to Comment No. 445-2**

In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list.
Comment Letter No. 446

Negar Soufer
negar.villabristol@icloud.com

**Comment No. 446-1**

I am writing you because I strongly support Archer’s plan for the future, Archer Forward. Not only am I a parent, but I am also a CD 11 resident and have seen firsthand Archer’s commitment to being a good neighbor and creating a beautiful new environment to educate the girls of Los Angeles. I hope that the City will help Archer by moving this thoughtful plan forward through the review process.

As a parent, I can truly say that the Archer Forward plan is critical to Archer remaining competitive among independent schools. Arts and athletics are a fundamental part of the middle and high school experience, but without a gym, regulation athletic fields, or a pool, Archer is challenged to support their students who want to compete. Instead of spending time on schoolwork, Archer girls spend hours travelling to practices or games and the school has to rent facilities all over town. Schools cannot be expected to operate like this—these facilities are a necessity for Archer’s campus. Archer has gone above and beyond to design a wonderful plan for a campus that provides these facilities AND is respectful to the surrounding neighborhood.

Over the last two years Archer has held numerous meetings with the community and has demonstrated a willingness to share information and discuss significant changes to the plan. I know that those conversations are continuing. The Draft EIR plan incorporates many changes—and is responsive to the neighbors’ key concerns.

I hope that the Planning Department, along with Councilmember Bonin, will work with Archer to move this plan forward in the City review process. It’s a plan that has been many years in the making. Thank you.

**Response to Comment No. 446-1**

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 447

Jeffrey and Christina Spitz
15210 Friends St.
Pacific Palisades, CA  90272

Comment No. 447-1

Attached is our comment letter for filing in regard to the above referenced DEIR.

Response to Comment No. 447-1

This introductory comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 447-2

We are long-time residents of Pacific Palisades. Our daughter Hannah attended the Archer School from 2003-2010. Jeffrey’s firm, Lerman Pointer & Spitz LLP (where we both practice law), is located in Brentwood. We shop, dine and visit friends and colleagues in Brentwood. We travel On Sunset Blvd. and neighboring Brentwood streets regularly, often during peak travel hours. Sunset is in fact one of only two primary routes of ingress and egress in the Palisades (the other being Pacific Coast Highway); it is the most direct route to Brentwood, the 405 Freeway and points north/east. We have first-hand experience with the already-deplorable traffic conditions on Sunset and neighboring streets. During peak traffic hours, travel time from the Palisades Village area to the 405 Freeway—a distance of only about 5 miles—routinely averages 45 minutes and can exceed 1-1/2 hours, due to gridlocked traffic on Sunset which we have observed at times to back up as far west as Allenford Dr. in Pacific Palisades.

Both of us were actively involved parents at Archer, having served in leadership roles with the school’s annual Career Day and Archer Dads. Hannah played varsity soccer and participated in other Archer athletics and extracurricular activities. We are familiar with the school’s operations under the controlling Conditional Use Permit (CUP) during the 7 year period of Hannah’s attendance. In our experience the school operated well under the CUP. In 2004, City Councilmembers at a PLUM meeting (which Christina attended) publicly extolled the CUP as a model for other schools in balancing school and neighborhood needs and in mitigating traffic impacts.¹

¹ The 2004 PLUM meeting involved an appeal by Brentwood Homeowners Association of the Z.A.’s approval of a maximum increase in student enrollment, solely for flexibility in acceptances, from 450 to
518—a number which was “not intended to be reached” and to our knowledge has not been reached to date (CF 04-1570; 6/17/04 Daniel Green determination letter; appeal denied).

**Response to Comment No. 447-2**

This comment does not raise an issue specific to the Draft EIR and the environmental impacts addressed therein. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 447-3**

During our years at Archer the then-administration expressed a desire to improve existing facilities with the addition of a gym and underground parking. We are not aware of any discussion at the time about additional new structures, increased uses or changes in the CUP. We have questions about the larger size and scope of the currently proposed project (assuming enrollment levels remain consistent with the intent of the 2004 determination) and the project’s potential impact on Brentwood and Pacific Palisades in terms of increased traffic.

**Response to Comment No. 447-3**

As evaluated in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the proposed buildings would be designed to complement the historic Main Building and respond to and respect the residential scale and character of the surrounding area. Refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood. The existing enrollment consistency of 518 students would remain.

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the school’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

As evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all operational Project traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.
This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 447-4**

We note the Department of Transportation’s conclusions that several locations will be significantly impacted under certain scenarios and that these impacts cannot be mitigated (Appendix P2, 2/17/14 DOT letter, pp. 3, 5-6). We are concerned that the project as proposed could lead to increased levels of traffic congestion and very negative impacts on the surrounding and nearby communities (including potentially impairing prompt emergency response during peak hours).

We request that the final EIR address these concerns as well as the feasibility of reasonable alternatives to reduce negative traffic impacts and fairly balance Archer’s needs with those of nearby communities.

**Response to Comment No. 447-4**

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Refer to Section IV.J.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, and Section IV.J.2, Public Services—Police Protection, of the Draft EIR, and Topical Response No. 9, Emergency Vehicle Access, regarding emergency vehicle access.

Also refer to Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations.
Comment Letter No. 448

Arthur & Maryam St. Antoine
10787 Wilshire Blvd., #1003
Los Angeles, CA  90024

Comment No. 448-1

As the parents of a girl at the Archer School for Girls, I am very much in support of the Archer Forward plan, and hope that the City, and Councilmember Bonin, will strongly support the project as well. Archer Forward is smartly designed project with numerous benefits for the students of Archer, the Los Angeles education system, and Brentwood itself.

The improvements under the plan will enhance Archer students’ education and well-being. The new facilities will ensure that the girls have the facilities they need for a 21st century education with the extracurricular activities and athletics that they deserve. At the same time, this plan is thoughtful, coming after months of meeting with Brentwood residents, and has numerous modifications that help Archer’s neighbors. These include changing the site design, hours and landscaping.

In sum, this plan is the best step forward for Archer—a unique school in Los Angeles—and is responsive to the needs of neighbors. Archer fully intends to keep meeting with neighbors as it has done through out this entire public process. I hope that the City will support Archer Forward and move it quickly through the process.

Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 448-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 449

Cari Stahler
caristahler@me.com

Comment No. 449-1

I am writing this letter to express my strong support for Archer’s plan for its future, Archer Forward. I am the proud parent of a girl at Archer and a Council District 11 resident. I look forward to the new campus design and the needed facilities that this plan will provide. I hope you choose to support it.

The plan will finally allow Archer to provide the core programs that are integral to the school’s curriculum and commitment to the arts and athletics on its own campus. Nearly all schools, both public and private, already have these facilities, including gymnasiums, performing and visual arts centers, regulation athletic fields, and a pool. Archer’s mission to be a diverse community that reflects that of the greater Los Angeles area has meant a longstanding and intense commitment to financial aid. Archer Forward allows the school to sustain this mission as a competitive independent school with state of the art facilities.

The entire public process for Archer Forward is a testament to the values of the School. Archer has conducted an unprecedented amount of outreach, before the plan was even finalized! Numerous modifications have been made to the plan, and more may come. These modifications were all made to reduce burdens on the neighbors.

Archer is a wonderful, unique treasure in the City and I hope that the City works with Archer to move this plan forward quickly through the review process. Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 449-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 450

Ira Stein
ira.stein1@verizon.net

Comment No. 450-1

As I turned left (east) onto Sunset Blvd. from Kenter Ave. the nightmare [sic] began. It took one hour to reach University Synagogue and another hour to reach the 405. There were no accidents, or construction. Just traffic.

Can’t you see the inherent problems with this decision?

What on earth are you thinking?

Response to Comment No. 450-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to decision-makers for review and consideration.

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

In addition, as evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.
Comment Letter No. 451

Emily Stern
13503 Bayliss Rd.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 451-1

I am writing because I strongly support Archer’s plan for the future, Archer Forward: Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan. I am a parent at the school, live in CD 11, and have seen first-hand Archer’s commitment to being a good neighbor and creating a beautiful new environment to educate the girls of Los Angeles. I hope that the City will help Archer by moving this plan forward through the review process.

As a parent, I know that the Archer Forward plan is critical to Archer remaining competitive among independent schools. Arts and athletics are fundamental in middle and high school, but without a gym, regulation athletic fields or a pool, Archer is challenged to support their students who want to compete. Today Archer girls spend hours travelling to practices or games and the school has to rent facilities all over town. Schools can’t be expected to operate like this—Archer quite simply needs to have these facilities on campus. And they have designed a wonderful plan for a campus that provides these facilities AND is respectful to the surrounding neighborhood.

Archer has held numerous meetings with the community and has demonstrated a willingness to share information and discuss significant changes to the plan over the last two years. I know that those conversations are continuing. The Draft EIR plan incorporates many changes—and is responsive to the neighbors’ key concerns.

I hope that the Planning Department, along with Council member Bonin, will work with Archer to move this plan forward in the City review process. It’s a plan whose time has come. Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 451-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 452

Violetta Sternberg, Ph.D
violettasternberg@gmail.com

Comment No. 452-1

I am the proud parent of a student at The Archer School for Girls and a CD 11 resident. I am writing to show my support for the Archer Forward Plan.

Since coming to Brentwood, Archer has been a model institution; strictly complying with the conditions mandated by the City, and in many cases, going above and beyond what is required. Under Archer Forward the School will continue its commitment to reduce any burdens on its neighbors. This includes raising the number of students riding the bus to school from 50 to 70 percent, preserving “silent Sundays,” and planting ample mature trees around the campus to green the area and block noise from campus. I can truly say that Archer Forward was crafted carefully and thoughtfully with enormous input from the Brentwood community.

Most of the independent schools in the area already have or are permitted to build the facilities that Archer is requesting to add to its campus. Archer Forward will allow Archer to take that big step forward by permitting the School to provide its excellent curriculum and extracurricular activities *on campus*. As a parent who has to drive around the City to see my daughter compete or perform, this is an enormous plus and is long overdue.

Archer and its students deserve to have this plan. I fully support it and hope that the Planning Department and Council member Bonin will do everything they can to move this forward quickly and secure City approval. Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 452-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 453

Carly Steward
1070 Bella Vista Ave.
Pasadena, CA 91107

Comment No. 453-1

My name is Carly Steward and I teach photography at the Archer School for Girls. This is my first year teaching at Archer. I have taught at various schools in Los Angeles County over the past five years, and I cannot express enough how lucky I feel to be a part of such a progressive, and supportive environment here at Archer. Archer is unique in that we teach girls how to think and advocate for themselves. Archer is an environment where emphasis is not only placed upon the students learning but also the faculty continuously learning and growing. In the time that I have been a part of the Archer I have improved my skills as an educator. Archer has dramatically and positively changed my perspective on education as a whole.

One of the struggles of teaching at Archer is the constraint posed by the facilities. In my current classroom, I have classes with sixteen students. It is a struggle to physically fit all of the girls into the room during lectures and discussions. Since I teach photography, we spend a lot of class time moving around the room and the photography lab and creating enough adequate space for each student can often be a challenge. With more workspace in the classroom my students would have enough room to work independently without getting in the way of their peers. I believe the new Archer forward plan would positively impact the overall impact students have in my class and I ask that the city support the plan.

Response to Comment No. 453-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 454

Thomas Stockfisch and Linlin Zhang
tstockfisch@yahoo.com

Comment No. 454-1

Our daughter is in her third year at Archer. We live in Hollywood, so she spends two hours daily on buses to and from the school. The education she’s experiencing certainly warrants the inconvenience. Archer must be appreciated as an asset to the city as a whole, because it serves students from far beyond its immediate neighborhood.

The school has progressed remarkably in the generation since its founding, and deserves the opportunity to improve even more.

Response to Comment No. 454-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 455

Mindy Stone

Comment No. 455-1

I am the Division Coordinator and Registrar at The Archer School for Girls. The six years that I have been a part of this incredible school has given me a true appreciation for the creativity, resilience, passion and dedication embedded here. Each day the faculty and staff work tirelessly to uphold the mission of Archer by creating a space for future female leaders to realize their true potential. We do this challenging and rewarding work within the walls of a beautiful, historical building; a building as unique as the students who attend. It is for these unique, young women that we are seeking approval for our Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan.

This thoughtful, innovative plan preserves all the character and charm of our historic home, does not disturb the residential look of the neighborhood and ensures that our students and teachers have the resources they not only need but deserve. Resources that nearly every other independent and public school in Los Angeles already has but that we currently lack. Gymnasiums, regulation sized athletic fields, performing and visual arts facilities will allow us to better support the athletic and artistic endeavors of our students while updated, climate controlled classrooms, offices and newly created common spaces will allow for most effective teaching practices. The creation of an underground parking structure will eliminate the woefully inadequate parking situation we currently work with and create a safer environment for our parents, students and visitors who would no longer have to park across the street and navigate the heavy traffic on Sunset Blvd. in order to reach our property. In planting mature trees to increase green space, moving parking underground to reduce noise, and continuing to enforce strict traffic management standards the plan will positively impact the surrounding neighborhood and maintain Archer’s status as both a community asset and good neighbor.

Embedded in our mission is our commitment to teach students to “embrace possibility.” We see the endless possibilities open to our students with an updated facility tailored to help them achieve their goals. It is my sincere hope that the City will embrace these possibilities along with us by supporting this important plan.

Response to Comment No. 455-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 456

Ron Stone  
1926 Parnell Ave.  
Los Angeles, CA  90025

Comment No. 456-1

Please see the attached letter in support of the Archer Forward project (ENV-2011-2689-EIR).

Response to Comment No. 456-1

This introductory comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 456-2

As a Trustee at The Archer School for Girls and as a parent of a 10th grade Archer girl, I know first-hand the value of an Archer education. I also know that the school is an important institution in the Brentwood community and the city of Los Angeles. I am writing to you today to request your support for our Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan, Archer Forward.

Over the past few years, I have participated in dozens of meetings regarding Archer with our Brentwood neighbors—including those directly adjacent to the school. The response has been clear and consistent—Archer has been a great neighbor. We get well-deserved praise for enforcing one of the strictest traffic control programs of any school in the city. Nearly 80% of the students at Archer take an Archer-provided, and CNG-fueled bus to school, and the rest of the girls use carpools. We do not allow any parking on neighborhood streets and we employ security guards to vigilantly monitor traffic and parking.

Archer is fortunate to have a beautiful and inspiring campus on Sunset Boulevard. The school has been a steward of this important resource and will continue to serve in that role in the years ahead.

That being said, we unfortunately lack the fundamental facilities necessary to deliver the cutting-edge educational, artistic and athletic programs that our Archer girls need and deserve. Many other schools in Los Angeles—including some in our direct
neighborhood—have such facilities. Simply put, the Archer Forward plan is critical to ensuring that Archer thrives now and in the future.

We look forward to continuing a constructive dialogue with our neighbors now that the Draft Environmental Impact Report for this plan has been released. I hope you will join us in supporting Archer Forward as it continues through the public review process.

Response to Comment No. 456-2

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 457

Lisa Stothard-Bernhardt
1905 Benedict Canyon Dr.
Beverly Hills, CA  90210

Comment No. 457-1

There are many independent schools in Los Angeles and I believe strongly that we chose a very special school for our daughter Bella by deciding to come to Archer. She will begin attending classes next year and I am incredibly excited for her to reap the benefits of such an exceptional education. As a family that is new to the Archer, I want you to know that I thoroughly support their campus plan.

Archer girls are self-confident and not afraid to speak their minds as well as being intelligent, kind, poised, and driven. Having toured other schools in the area, I felt strongly that Archer had something special to offer. I am proud that I can now call my daughter an “Archer Girl.” I know the school will bring out her natural talents and foster her creative mind like no other.

My daughter is a performer, a dancer, a gymnast, and a swimmer as well as an outstanding student. It seems only fair that Archer should be allowed to have facilities that foster extracurricular activities on a competitive level that the other schools in the area have. It is clearly evident that the school is forward thinking and they should have a campus that reflects that. The Archer Forward plan will do just that. The school is proposing to build a gymnasium, aquatics center, and a performing and visual arts center for its students. I believe the proposal is quite reasonable, considering the fact that every other independent and public school in this area already has these same type of facilities. The space is there for this wonderful school to grow into a campus worthy of it’s students and staff. My hope is that Archer will be allowed to go ahead with it’s plans and make their vision a reality.

Please support this plan and give Archer girls the chance to have the experiences that the rest of their peers are enjoying at other schools.

Response to Comment No. 457-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 458

Lindsey and David Strasberg
thestrasbergs@gmail.com

Comment No. 458-1

I am writing in support of the Archer Forward plan being put forth by The Archer School for Girls. Our oldest daughter entered the 7th grade at Archer this year and our second daughter will enter as a 7th grader this coming Fall.

As a parent of a relatively new Archer student, I can tell you that the school has surpassed our family’s wildest dreams. Archer provides its students with a rigorous education and demands that the students grow academically, socially and personally, while also providing the girls with the type of support and guidance that is essential to meeting these challenges without experiencing the burn-out that has become so common in secondary schools. Through our daughter’s activities, our family has also experienced the way in which Archer emphasizes the importance of community, both within and outside the school.

Archer is an essential force in shaping the future of female leadership in Los Angeles and beyond. We firmly believe that Archer’s mission and philosophy are contributing to its students and to the greater Los Angeles community in a way that has yet to be fully measured. In order to continue its important work, Archer must realize its Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan. This plan, which will allow Archer to continue to attract top students from all over the city, has been developed with pain-staking attention to the impact on the neighboring community. Although, our family does not live in the Brentwood area, we have immediate family and very close friends who live within walking distance from the school and who unwaveringly support Archer’s efforts to improve its campus.

As I am sure you can tell, we are passionate about Archer School for Girls and we are available to answer any questions and/or to discuss our thoughts further.

Response to Comment No. 458-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 459

Merle Strauss
merlestrauss@yahoo.com

Comment No. 459-1

As a resident of Mandeville Canyon for over 35 years, I am totally against the Archer Forward Plan. 15 years ago, when the school opened, an agreement was reached that balanced the residents of Brentwood’s [sic] rights to the peaceful enjoyment of their homes with the school’s ability to successfully operate.

Response to Comment No. 459-1

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

Comment No. 459-2

The Archer School chose to open on Sunset Boulevard, the main thoroughfare to the 405 freeway.

Now, 15 years later, Sunset Boulevard has become a nightmare, an impediment to a good quality-of-life for the residents of Brentwood. The hours of smooth traffic flow lesson every month. Regrettably, my comings and goings are regulated around traffic patterns on this road.

The increased traffic that would result from this forward plan with severely and dramatically worsen traffic, and noise pollution as well. If passed, it would also be a greenlight for other schools in the neighborhood to come up with similar plans.
Response to Comment No. 459-2

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

As evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

In addition, as discussed on pages IV.I-110 through IV.I-111 in Section IV.I, Noise, of the Draft EIR, off-site traffic noise impacts associated with the Project would be less than significant.

Comment No. 459-3

This plan would also impact several streets that feed into Sunset Boulevard, which would result in a worsening of the gridlock situation that occurs at peak hours. During these hours, instead of taking 15 minutes from Mandeville to the 405 as in past years, is currently can take up to 45 minutes. What would happen in case an emergency vehicle needed to drive across Sunset? I cannot imagine.

Response to Comment No. 459-3

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site. Refer to Section IV.J.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, and Section IV.J.2, Public Services—Police Protection, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response No. 9, Emergency Vehicle Access, regarding emergency vehicle access.

Comment No. 459-4

After enduring four years of construction due to the 405 widening project, Archer is now asking Brenwood [sic] to endure six more years of construction, as well as endure lasting alteration of traffic on Sunset Boulevard. This is unconscionable

Response to Comment No. 459-4

Refer to Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, regarding the impacts of construction activities and the proposal to reduce the overall construction timeframe for the Project from six years to five years. Refer to Topical
Response No. 6, Overview of Construction Traffic and Parking, for a detailed discussion regarding construction traffic.

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

As evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

**Comment No. 459-5**

For all of these reasons, I support the downsized alternative plan proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer.

**Response to Comment No. 459-5**

Refer to Topical Response No. 14, Residential Neighbors’ Proposed Alternative, for a detailed response to the alternative proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer. In response to comments on the Draft EIR, several of the modifications proposed by the Residential Neighbors of Archer have been incorporated into the Project.
Comment Letter No. 460

Katy Strouk
1225 Beverly Estates Ter.
Beverly Hills, CA 90210-2118

Comment No. 460-1

The Archer School for Girls is an extremely valuable resource to Los Angeles, and I am writing in support of Archer Forward, the school’s improvement plan. For the past 15 years, the school has been a valuable and responsible member of the Brentwood community.

Nearly every other independent and public school in Los Angeles has essentials like gymnasiums, performing arts and visual arts facilities, regulation sized athletic fields and aquatic centers. Currently, the school spends significant resources renting offsite facilities for practices, games and performances, and lacks gathering spaces for the entire student body.

Archer’s student body includes girls from a wide range of cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds: approximately 36% of Archer students come from minority backgrounds, and Archer students currently reside in 92 zip codes throughout Los Angeles County. The school prepares young women for leadership in a global world.

Archer believes that this is the most effective plan to meet the needs of the school and to offer a competitive array of opportunities for future students. I am proud to enroll my daughter at the Archer School for Girls because not only is she receiving a world-class education, but also because the school is committed to doing its job well. Please help move the Archer Forward plan forward quickly. Thank you.

Response to Comment No. 460-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 461

Dan Sturman
591 N. Beachwood Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90004

Comment No. 461-1

Please see my attached letter in support of Archer’s Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan.

Response to Comment No. 461-1

This introductory comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 461-2

I am writing in support of Archer’s Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan.

My daughter, Cece Sturman, is presently a sixth grader at Archer.

I’m a strong supporter of the school’s academic mission. The school attracts some of the top students in all of Los Angeles, and it pushes these students to challenge themselves and to excel. Unlike other high achieving schools, however, Archer is unique in that it puts a premium on “joyful learning” instead of fostering a pressure-cooker environment.

The purpose of the Archer Forward plan is to provide expanded opportunities and resources to a group of extraordinary students. In doing so, the plan will increase the likelihood that these students may themselves some day achieve great things. Approval of the plan will benefit the future of Archer and the future of girls’ education in Los Angeles.

Thanks so much for your consideration.

Response to Comment No. 461-2

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 462

Lindsay Sturman
lindsay.sturman@gmail.com

Comment No. 462-1

I am a mom at a wonderful school in Brentwood, The Archer School for Girls. Our school is hoping to embark on a campus improvement plan. Archer has been an absolutely wonderful educational environment for my daughter, Cece, and I hope you will support Archer in this endeavor. Archer has a commitment to diversity and excellence, and most importantly, educating girls.

Los Angeles is a world class city, and it needs a world class education system both public and private. While our family is extremely committed to public education in both our volunteer work, my partner’s professional work, and as a family—all four of our children attend or attended public school—we also believe that strong independent schools such as Archer are civic institutions for our city.

Archer’s campus plan will also create important construction jobs for our city.

We hope you will support Archer in this important endeavor.

Response to Comment No. 462-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 463

Susan Sullivan
1700 Greenleaf Canyon Rd.
Topanga, CA  90290

Comment No. 463-1

I am an art teacher at Archer School for Girls. I am writing support of Archer’s Campus Plan for several reasons. I am heartened on a daily basis by the excellent teaching that takes place at Archer and the incredibly positive changes I see in the young women we teach. I have taught here for 13 years and have been prouder every year by the opportunities for growth that we provide for students from all over Los Angeles.

Proud as I am of the teaching and learning that takes place here, Archer students and faculty are challenged daily by the lack of facilities; we need what most schools have: a gymnasium, a room where our entire community can gather, performing and visual arts facilities and space for athletics, without having to bus out the students. Archer’s Campus Plan will make immense improvements with minimal impact on the neighborhood. Archer School has been a good neighbor and an asset to this neighborhood. I ask you to support this plan.

Response to Comment No. 463-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 464

Jay Sures
485 Halvern Dr.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 464-1

My name is Jay Sures and my wife Molly Isaksen and I live at 485 Halvern Drive in Brentwood which is 1/4 of a mile from Archer School. We have owned our property since 2009.

We have significant concerns about Archer’s proposed expansion due to the traffic gridlock that has become an everyday occurrence in our neighborhood. As a result, there are certain times of the day when we cannot get out of our neighborhood to head east on Sunset Blvd. This proposed expansion is going to exponentially increase the problem.

Response to Comment No. 464-1

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

As evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Comment No. 464-2

Our second concern is public safety. The traffic can be so terrible at certain times of the day that access for public safety vehicles including ambulance and fire vehicles can be severely hampered. There are times when gridlock would make it impossible for emergency vehicles to enter and exit the neighborhood in an orderly, safe, and expedited manner. All it takes is one incident, and we will all look to one another and say why did we allow this to happen when it was so preventable.
Response to Comment No. 464-2

Regarding public safety, refer to Section IV.J.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, and Section IV.J.2, Public Services—Police Protection, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response No. 9, Emergency Vehicle Access, regarding emergency vehicle access.

Comment No. 464-3

We feel a downsized alternative might be acceptable, but the full expansion would be disastrous to all of us who live in the neighborhood.

Response to Comment No. 464-3

The commenter indicates support for a downsized alternative. However, a specific recommendation for a reduced Project alternative is not provided. It is noted that in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project includes refinements, such as reducing the square footage and massing, width, and length of some of the proposed buildings; reducing the number of parking spaces; and creating expanded landscape buffers. Overall, the Project’s net new floor area would be reduced from 75,930 square feet to 68,989 square feet.

Comment No. 464-4

Our public officials have an obligation to evaluate all traffic issues and public safety issues. I urge you both to spend ten minutes near our house at 430pm and tell us if you find it acceptable.

Response to Comment No. 464-4

This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 465

Janis Susskind
282 N. Saltair Ave.
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 465-1

Attached please find the letter I wrote to Elizabeth English in 2012. My concerns have not changed but, in fact, have grown as I have learned more about the negative impact the Archer Forward Plan will have on our neighbor and the surrounding community.

The DEIR just proves my fears were right.

Response to Comment No. 465-1

This introductory comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 465-2

I would like to be included in your mailing list to receive your notices.

Our address is: 282 N. Saltair Ave
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Response to Comment No. 465-2

In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list.

Comment No. 465-3

I attended your Neighborhood Liaison Committee meeting last Saturday morning and listened carefully to what you and your team presented. I also listened carefully to what people in attendance expressed (both pro and con) but except for a few intelligent remarks, I think most missed the point and not much was accomplished. My thoughts did not fully crystallize until I reached my house on North Saltair (I walked home) and now find it necessary to express how I am feeling with respect to your upcoming expansion project.
Response to Comment No. 465-3

This introductory comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration. Specific comments regarding the Draft EIR are provided and responded to below.

Comment No. 465-4

We moved to this neighborhood in 1993, approximately 2 years before the Archer School purchased the property from the Eastern Star Home. We loved the quiet, tranquil country-like feeling yet we were in walking distance to Brentwood Village and minutes away from freeway access, markets, our kids’ schools etc. It was the perfect place for our family. Soon after the Archer School took possession of the property the neighbors, having learned what they were planning to do, were “up in arms”. Since you have only been here for 5 years, you may not be familiar with the history of the “neighborhood vs. the Archer School”. We, too, hired fancy lawyers such as Latham and Watkins, had meeting after meeting and wrote check after check in an effort to put restrictions in place so that the integrity and quality of our neighborhood would not be compromised. It’s not an accident that your event parking is at the VA or that you are restricted to a certain number of events per year or that your hours of operation are limited or that the majority of your students arrive at school by bus etc. etc. Archer agreed to adopt these and other conditions and restrictions in order to minimize their impact on the neighborhood. Your current expansion proposal undermines everything we were trying to achieve. For the most part, Archer has been a good neighbor but that is mainly because of the conditions we negotiated that subsequently became part of the current CUP.

Response to Comment No. 465-4

As described in Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, Archer is currently operating pursuant to CUP No. 98-0158, which was approved through the required public process and contains conditions of approval governing campus operations and physical improvements. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment No. 465-5

It was puzzling that you chose to fill your presentation time by rattling off facts and figures supporting and extolling the historic and present virtues of girls’ schools. I do not think that anyone objects to the concept of single sex education or the Archer School per se. Archer is clearly a fine school doing an excellent job educating girls. I found it fascinating, although entirely irrelevant, to learn that the number of heads of state who attended all girls’ schools is disproportionate with those having attended coed schools. No one is disputing that fact that Archer has a wonderful and diverse student body, performs extensive community service, draws from a wide array of public schools and has girls who excel in math and science. Most people would find that having a high quality girls’ school, as an educational option is an asset to the community. In my opinion, that is NOT relevant and is NOT the issue at hand but merely a distraction and a diversion from what I believe to be the main issue, preserving and maintaining the quality and integrity of our neighborhood.

Response to Comment No. 465-5

As evaluated in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the proposed buildings would be designed to complement the historic Main Building and respond to and respect the residential scale and character of the surrounding area. As such, the Project would be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and the Brentwood–Pacific Palisades Community Plan regarding conservation of and compatibility with the scale and character of the City’s residential neighborhoods. Also refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood.

The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 465-6

This was my first meeting with the Archer School. We were either not notified about other meetings or could not attend so the details, the scope and the magnitude of your project was brought to my attention (my husband was out of town) at Saturday’s meeting for the first time.
Response to Comment No. 465-6

This comment does not raise an issue specific to the Draft EIR and the environmental impacts addressed therein. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 465-7

I would like to compliment you on your expansive vision and beautiful architectural renderings—your professional lineup and organized PowerPoint presentation. In a perfect world or in a vacuum this is a gorgeous plan, a mini college campus—even more beautiful than some college campuses I have visited. However, I believe you failed to consider your plan in the context of this residential neighborhood.

Response to Comment No. 465-7

As evaluated in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the proposed buildings would be designed to complement the historic Main Building and respond to and respect the residential scale and character of the surrounding area. The Project would also include the use of architectural features that add visual interest and reduce massing to maintain the residential street character when viewed from Chaparal Street and Barrington Avenue. Refer to Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR for a detailed analysis of the Project’s potential impacts on surrounding residential uses. As described in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the Project has been designed to be consistent with adjacent residential development. Also refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project’s consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood.

Comment No. 465-8

The fact that you currently have 107 above ground parking spaces rather than underground parking does not really concern me. A parking space is a parking space. What concerns me is that you want to DOUBLE the number of cars to be parked on site. Those extra 93 cars do not just fly into your proposed self ventilated underground parking lot. They have to enter and exit by driving on our already overly congested neighborhood streets.

Response to Comment No. 465-8

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.
As evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

As described in Topical Response No. 3, Overview of Reduced Parking Spaces, Parking Demand, and Parking Enforcement, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the underground parking structure is proposed to be reduced.

**Comment No. 465-9**

Your plan also calls for more athletic fields and facilities. Most weekday afternoons I hear yelling and screaming coming from your fields and we live 2 blocks north of Archer. Having had a daughter involved in high school athletics I know first hand that it is entirely appropriate and expected for girls to cheer and yell when their team scores a goal or hits a home run, which I assume Archer does often. I cannot imagine what it must be like for the Waxmans or the people living on Westgate who back up to the school. I also cannot imagine how intrusive and loud it will be if the number of sports teams using the fields at the same time were increased.

**Response to Comment No. 465-9**

As explained on page IV.I-9 in Section IV.I, Noise, of the Draft EIR, Archer’s existing campus includes athletic field and sports courts used for outdoor student activities such as softball, soccer, basketball, and volleyball practices and games. As discussed on page II-1 of Section II Project Description of the Draft EIR, the Project proposes to improve the existing field to include regulation-size soccer and softball fields, a Multipurpose Facility, which would relocate basketball and volleyball activities indoor, and an Aquatics Center. As discussed in Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been refined to include additional measures to reduce noise associated with campus operations. With the incorporation of additional mitigation measures all operational noise impacts would be reduced to less than significant Monday through Friday. With the implementation of additional mitigation, Saturday significant impacts would be reduced to 10 days a year within a 4-hour time frame between 10:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.

**Comment No. 465-10**

The added traffic from parents and visiting teams would increase multifold.
Response to Comment No. 465-10

As evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all Project operational traffic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance. The restrictions on Interscholastic Athletic Competitions that are contained in the additional measures would apply to traffic generated by both Archer parents and spectators, as well as visiting teams' parents and spectators.

Comment No. 465-11

Your plan is too ambitious, too massive and way out of proportion with what is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Even one of your own trustees criticized the size and scope of your project as being too large and inappropriate.

Response to Comment No. 465-11

As evaluated in Section IV.H, Land Use, of the Draft EIR, the proposed buildings would be designed to complement the historic Main Building and respond to and respect the residential scale and character of the surrounding area. As such, the Project would be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and the Brentwood–Pacific Palisades Community Plan regarding conservation of and compatibility with the scale and character of the City's residential neighborhoods. Also refer to Topical Response No. 12, Site Plan Consistency with the Residential Scale and Character of the Neighborhood, for a discussion of the Project's consistency with the residential scale and character of the neighborhood.

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 465-12

We just lived through months and months of traffic congestion associated with the widening of the 405 bridge and even though it is now completed, the congestion still remains a huge problem.

Response to Comment No. 465-12

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.
Comment No. 465-13

I will be very curious to see what your traffic studies show. I cannot imagine Sunset Blvd being able to handle any more cars during peak hours. I would challenge your traffic consultants to try making a left turn on to Sunset from Barrington between 3:00 pm and 6:00 pm on any given weekday. Many days the line of cars on Barrington goes as far north as Crescenda St and on Sunset as far west as Cliffwood. As one gentleman so eloquently expressed, “we are trapped in our neighborhood”. There is no way out if you want to go east on Sunset or south on Barrington.

Response to Comment No. 465-13

Refer to Topical Response No. 10, Traffic Congestion Along Sunset Boulevard, for a detailed discussion of traffic congestion in the vicinity of the Project Site.

Comment No. 465-14

Your plan will clearly make things worse while compromising our quality of life, not to mention the thought of more construction, excavation, heavy trucks, noise, dirt, pollution and years of disruption to the neighborhood.

Response to Comment No. 465-14

As detailed in Topical Response No. 11, Overview of Construction Refinements, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been refined to reduce the construction period from six years to five years. In addition, as described on page II-38 of Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Project is proposed to be developed in phases to facilitate continued School operations and minimize disruptions to neighbors with access for haul trucks and equipment/material delivery trucks varying between the different phases of construction. Further, as described on page IV.K-109 of Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, the Project would include implementation of Mitigation Measures K-4 through K-14 to address potential traffic and access issues during construction.

In accordance with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403 as set forth in Regulatory Compliance Measure B-1 on page IV.B-32 of Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, the Project shall incorporate measures to control fugitive dust, which may include watering, street sweeping, installation of wheel washers, covering of haul trucks, suspending earthmoving operations if wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour, and installing an information sign at the entrance of the construction site that provides a telephone number to report complaints regarding excessive fugitive dust generation.
With regard to noise, refer to Mitigation Measure I-1 on page IV.I-114 of Section IV.I, Noise, in the Draft EIR, which provides for the development of a Construction Noise Management Plan that would provide measures to reduce noise by up to 15 dBA.

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 465-15**

Lastly, I would like to address transparency and the house on Barrington, which we now know is owned by the Archer School. For years, Archer would not admit to owning the house. For some reason they kept it a secret and very hush hush. It sat there (and still does) neglected and is a neighborhood eyesore. If Archer is so concerned about being a good neighbor, forthright about its plans and truly cares about the integrity and beauty of the neighborhood then why have they neglected the house for so many years and denied owning it?

**Response to Comment No. 465-15**

This comment does not raise an issue specific to the Draft EIR and the environmental impacts addressed therein. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 465-16**

It is very disconcerting to read on Wikipedia that “commencing in 2013, the Archer School will embark on a significant expansion and construction project, which will include a new aquatics, visual arts and performing arts centers.” Yes, this is on Wikipedia!! Look it up! It sounds like this is a done deal (again, not forthcoming) and you are just humoring us with meetings. It would be quite suspect if EIRs, traffic reports, feasibility reports and city council approval all allow you to proceed with a project of this size.

**Response to Comment No. 465-16**

This comment does not raise an issue specific to the Draft EIR and the environmental impacts addressed therein. Refer to page I-19 on Section I, Executive Summary, of the Draft EIR and Topical Response No. 16, Environmental Review and Conditional Use Permit Processes, for a discussion of the public review process for the Project. This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
**Comment No. 465-17**

We, along with our neighbors, love living in this neighborhood. We have made significant investments in our homes and property and take pride in them. We do not want to see our neighborhood undermined by the noise, pollution and congestion that come along with your proposed project.

**Response to Comment No. 465-17**

With regard to noise, as described on page II-27 of Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the buildings would be designed to shield neighbors from internal campus activities and noise, including having no operable windows that open on the sides of buildings directly adjacent to Chaparal Street and Barrington Avenue. In addition, as discussed in Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional operational mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the significant noise impacts of the Project. With implementation of such mitigation measures, noise impacts associated with use of the athletic field for athletic activities on weekdays and use of the Aquatics Center would be reduced to a less than significant level.

As discussed in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, localized operational air quality impacts from Project operation would be less than significant.

As evaluated in Section IV.K, Traffic, Access, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, and as discussed in Topical Response No. 5, Additional Mitigation Measures to Eliminate Significant Traffic Impacts, with implementation of the operational mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, all operational Project traffic impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

This comment expressing opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 465-18**

We do not want longer school hours, more cars, more events, more construction, lighted sports fields and a commercial (requiring a change of zoning) service access on Barrington for deliveries to your performance and arts pavilion.

**Response to Comment No. 465-18**

As discussed in Topical Response No. 1, Refinements to Proposed Operations, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional restrictions on Archer’s operations are proposed including additional limitations on the hours of operation including additional
limitations on Saturdays, reducing the number of proposed School Functions from 98 to 86, and eliminating community use of the facilities and the rental, lease, or use of the facilities for non-School Uses. In addition, as described in Topical Response No. 2, Removal of Athletic Field Lighting and Refinements to Lighting, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, the Project has been refined to eliminate the proposed athletic field lighting. As described on page II-32 of Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, Barrington Avenue may be utilized for limited campus deliveries and would provide direct access to the designated trash enclosure at the rear of the Performing Arts Center (now, the Aquatics Center). Barrington Avenue would also be used for emergency vehicle access. A zone change is not required for use of Barrington Avenue for limited campus deliveries and trash pick-up.

This comment expresses opposition to the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

**Comment No. 465-19**

This is a quiet residential neighborhood and we want to keep it that way!!

**Response to Comment No. 465-19**

As described on page II-27 of Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the buildings would be designed to shield neighbors from internal campus activities and noise, including having no operable windows that open on the sides of buildings directly adjacent to Chaparal Street and Barrington Avenue. In addition, as discussed in Topical Response No. 4, Additional Measures to Reduce Noise, in response to comments on the Draft EIR, additional operational mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the significant noise impacts of the Project. With implementation of such mitigation measures, noise impacts associated with use of the athletic field for athletic activities on weekdays and use of the Aquatics Center would be reduced to below a level of significance. A new CUP and other concurrent entitlement requests, if approved by the decision-makers, would subject the School to a new set of conditions of approval, including conditions regarding compatibility of the School’s operations and its facilities with the surrounding neighborhood.

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 466

Hannah Sussman
rphannah@mindspring.com

Comment No. 466-1

I am a parent of a current student at the Archer School for Girls. We also happen to live in the neighborhood and I am writing in support of the Archer Forward Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan, which will truly pave the way for the school to provide an excellent 21st century education for the next generation of female leaders.

Archer is an asset to both the Brentwood community and the greater Los Angeles area. The school has made a significant impact through its diversity and scholarship programs, commitment to educating girls and maintenance of an important historic building in Brentwood. These are real and tangible benefits to the Los Angeles community.

Archer does an exemplary job of balancing the needs of its students with the needs of the community. Archer is a top school, offering a high quality education to students who go on to contribute to this very community. They have also managed to create transportation and community outreach programs that are models for what schools, both public and private, should be striving for across Los Angeles.

From my experience, I believe that Archer is a committed and conscientious member of the community. As a parent, I am deeply interested in the school’s mission and its success, and strongly support Archer Forward.

Response to Comment No. 466-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 467

Catherine Sustana
13764 Raywood Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Comment No. 467-1

I am an Archer Parent and Council District 11 resident. I am writing in strong support of the Archer Forward Plan. I hope that the Los Angeles Planning Department will move the project forward quickly so that Archer can create the 21st century campus that its students genuinely deserve.

The Archer Forward plan proposes only the facilities that most public and independent schools already have: modern gyms, playing fields, performing and visual arts facilities, and a pool. Archer has made sure that these facilities are designed with limited impact on the neighbors in regards to light or noise, and the new buildings will be fully consistent with the residential feel of the community. Therefore, this plan will actually contribute to and enhance the community.

I also think it is very important for the City to recognize the tremendous effort that Archer put into its community outreach for this plan. The School has been meeting with its neighbors and other community members for over two years, and has made significant changes in its original plan in order to meet the concerns of its neighbors. The modifications in the plan will make a quieter, greener campus, which benefits both the School and the community.

I know that Archer is continuing to work with the community on this plan, but it is important for the school to keep this plan moving forward. I hope that you will help Archer move quickly through the City process so that Archer girls will soon have the facilities they need and so greatly deserve.

Response to Comment No. 467-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 468

Robin Swartz
robin@hiresmusic.com

Comment No. 468-1

My daughter graduated from Archer in June 2013. Even though it has been nearly a year since she graduated, Archer still holds a special place in her heart as well as mine.

For seven years, Devon came home excited about what she learned in school, happy to have the great friends she met there and thrilled to have the opportunities Archer provided. I think it can be difficult for children to actually enjoy going to school daily, but I can honestly say most of the girls at Archer felt the way my daughter did. The school faculty and staff made Archer a positive place to be and encouraged the girls to follow their passions and learn new things.

Although my daughter was extremely happy at Archer, all of the students felt the impact from the lack of space. With the Archer Forward Campus Improvement Plan, that can all be changed. The school is simply asking to add facilities that they do not currently have, and that most independent schools do have. The new facilities would allow the girls to have a more enjoyable experience at school. Furthermore, the changes on the campus will help improve pedestrian safety—as there will be underground parking—and students and parents will no longer have to park in lots across the street in order to attend school events.

I hope you can see that this plan is great for the school, the community, and even the neighbors. I hope you will support this plan and move it through the city process quickly.

Response to Comment No. 468-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.
Comment Letter No. 469

Maryam Talaie, D.D.S.
11830 Mayfield Ave., No. 102
Los Angeles, CA  90049

Comment No. 469-1

As the parent of a student at The Archer School for Girls and a CD 11 resident, I am thrilled about the Archer Forward plan, and hope that the City, and Councilmember Bonin, will strongly support this important project. Archer Forward is beneficial for education in Los Angeles, and beneficial for Brentwood.

The improvements under the plan are specifically designed to enhance Archer students’ education and well-being. The new facilities will ensure that the girls have the facilities they need for a 21st century education with the extracurricular activities and athletics that they deserve. At the same time, the plan is thoughtful, coming after months of meeting with Brentwood residents, and has numerous modifications that take into account and actually help Archer’s neighbors. These include changing the site design, hours and landscaping.

In summation, this plan is the best step forward for Archer—a unique and special school in Los Angeles—and is responsive to the needs of neighbors. Archer fully intends to keep meeting with neighbors throughout the public process, and I hope that the City will support Archer Forward and move it quickly through the process.

Response to Comment No. 469-1

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.

Comment No. 469-2

My address is 11830 Mayfield ave. #102 LA, CA 90049

Response to Comment No. 469-2

In response to this comment, the commenter will be added to the EIR mailing list.
Comment Letter No. 470

Kristin Taylor
1164 N. Mentor Ave.
Pasadena, CA  91104

Comment No. 470-1

I have been an English teacher at the Archer School for Girls since 2006, and I can honestly say that it has been the most incredible school I have ever been a part of in my 17-year teaching career. Archer’s mission is unique, and under the leadership of Elizabeth English, the school has become a progressive, research-based institution that is educating future female leaders, innovators, and entrepreneurs. A measure of my devotion to this school lies in my willingness to commute 30 miles from Pasadena through some of the worst traffic in the country every day. I’ve had offers from other schools—many much closer to home—but I cannot imagine leaving this incredible place. Every day I see joyful, ambitious young women exploring their passions and finding their voices.

That said, the most difficult aspect of working at Archer has been the lack of facilities. This building was originally created to house the elderly women of the Eastern Star, and so the classrooms—while charming—do not provide an ideal learning environment for our students. They are quite simply too small for our girls to engage fully in the active learning research shows is most effective. It is difficult for me to move my classroom into different configurations when switching between small groups and whole class discussion, and I have room on my wall only for one small whiteboard. I also do not have a single shelf or closet. Additionally, the temperatures in the classrooms range from boiling on warm days to frigid on cool days—we don't have air conditioning, and the old boiler has a hard time reaching my classroom at the very end of the hallway.

On a larger scale, we desperately need a space where we can hold larger gatherings. The only space big enough for the whole school to gather currently is the courtyard (directly exposed to the sun on hot days), and we don’t have a true auditorium or performance space. I am the coordinator for our annual Literature &... Conference, which not only benefits our school, but students in schools across Los Angeles. At the most recent conference, which happened Feb. 26, we had eight schools in attendance for a full day of panels, yet we had limited room for attendees. I was put in the position of having to turn people away because of our limited facilities. Having a true auditorium would allow me to include more schools, to allow more students to share their passions and be inspired by one another.
Archer is a special place, and the faculty, staff, and students go out of their way to be good neighbors. Our students deserve the facilities that every other school has: real classrooms, an auditorium, a gym. I ask that you and the City of Los Angeles support our campus improvement plan.

**Response to Comment No. 470-1**

This comment indicating support for the Project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decision-makers for review and consideration.