

### III. RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

#### OVERVIEW

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 requires that the lead agency evaluate public comments on environmental issues included in a Draft EIR and prepare written responses to those comments. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(b), “The written responses shall describe the disposition of significant environmental issues raised (e.g., revisions to the proposed project to mitigate anticipated impacts or objections). In particular, the major environmental issues raised when the lead agency’s position is at variance with recommendations and objections raised in the comments must be addressed in detail giving reasons why specific comments and suggestions were not accepted.” The Guidelines call for responses that contain a “good faith, reasoned analysis” with statements supported by factual information. Some of the comments raised, however, are more general in context, stating opinion either in favor of or opposition to the proposed project. In such cases, the comment is for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration, along with all of the comments.

The City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning received 11 comment letters in response to the Draft EIR. Each comment letter has been assigned a number and the body of each letter has been separated into individual comments, which have also been numbered. This results in a tiered numbering system, whereby the first comment in Letter 1 is depicted as *Comment 1.01*, and so on. These numbered comments are included verbatim and in their entirety below, followed by the corresponding responses. The original comment letters are provided as Appendix A of this Final EIR. **Table III-1** includes a matrix that identifies the author of each of the letters and indicates what environmental issues area(s) the letter raised.

TABLE III-1 SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR																
Letter No.	Commenter	Project Description	Environmental Setting	Aesthetics/Views	Air Quality	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology and Soils	Hydrology/Water Quality	Land Use	Noise	Public Services	Transportation/Parking	Other Env. Considerations	Alternatives	Other
<b>STATE OF CALIFORNIA AGENCIES</b>																
1	Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit 1400 Tenth Street P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, CA 96812-3044															●
2	Department of Transportation District 7, Regional Planning IGR/CEQA Branch Cheryl J. Powell IGR/CEQA Branch Chief 100 Main Street, MS #16 Los Angeles, CA 90012-3606								●				●			
3	State of California Public Utilities Commission Rosa Munoz, PE Rail Crossings Engineering Section Consumer Protection and Safety Div. 320 West 4 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 500 Los Angeles, CA 90013												●			●
<b>REGIONAL AGENCIES</b>																
4	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California Laura J. Simonek Mgr., Environmental Planning Team 700 N. Alameda Street Los Angeles, CA 90012															●
<b>OTHER ENTITIES</b>																
5	Chatsworth Neighborhood Council Land Use Committee Linda van der Valk, Co-Chair	●		●							●		●			
6	Chatsworth Neighborhood Council Land Use Committee Teena A. Takata, Recording Secretary			●							●		●			●
<b>INDIVIDUALS</b>																
7	Steve Kreynes										●					
8	Ed and Christine Kozdrowicki Chatsworth, CA				●						●		●			●



STATE OF CALIFORNIA AGENCIES

**LETTER NO. 1**

June 3, 2005

Governor's Office of Planning and Research  
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit  
Terry Roberts, Director  
1400 Tenth Street  
P.O. Box 3044  
Sacramento, CA 96812-3044

**Comment 1.01**

*The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on June 2, 2005, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project's ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.*

*Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:*

*"A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."*

*These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.*

*This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.*

**Response 1.01**

The comment states that the State Clearinghouse received and distributed the Draft EIR to selected state agencies and that the project has complied with State Clearinghouse requirements for review of draft environmental documents pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The comment also states that the public circulation period for the Sierra Canyon Secondary School project Draft EIR closed on June 2, 2005. No specific response to this comment is necessary, but the comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**LETTER NO. 2**

April 22, 2005

Department of Transportation  
District 7, Regional Planning  
IGR/CEQA Branch  
Cheryl Powell, IGR/CEQA Branch Chief  
100 Main Street, MS #16  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3606

**Comment 2.01**

*Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above referenced project. The proposed project is to construct a 550-student secondary school on a 4.89-acre site.*

*We would like to remind you that all applicable transportation related safety measures will need to be implemented.*

**Response 2.01**

Various transportation-related safety measures would be implemented as part of the project. For instance, signal and street improvements proposed as mitigation would improve safety on the surrounding roadways by providing exclusive left-turn and right-turn lanes at the intersection of Tulsa Street and De Soto Avenue (Mitigation Measure IV.J-3) and providing dual right-turn lanes and signal upgrades at the intersection of Chatsworth Street and Mason Avenue (Mitigation Measure IV.J-6, which is incorrectly referred to as Mitigation Measure V.J-6 in the Draft EIR [see Correction and Addition No. IV.J-10 in Section II, Corrections and Additions of this Final EIR). In addition, the Automatic Traffic Surveillance and Control (ATSAC) System, to which the project would contribute (Mitigation Measures IV.J-1 and IV.J-5), would also enhance safety on the surrounding roadways.

As stated in Section IV.J, Transportation and Circulation (pages IV.J-29-30) of the Draft EIR, the two entrances to the site would be unimpeded with sufficient on-site queuing space to safely and efficiently accommodate pick-up and drop-off activities. In addition, left- and right-turn channelization would be provided to safely accommodate vehicles turning into the site and visibility at the project entrances would be unimpeded.

It is a stated objective of the project to provide safe and efficient access, parking, and internal circulation to accommodate students, faculty/staff, parents, and visitors (Section II, Project Description, Page II-19, Objective 3 of the Draft EIR). Final Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT) approval of the project's driveways, internal circulation and parking scheme shall also be obtained prior to issuance of any building permits. Any other specific safety measures recommended by Caltrans could be implemented, as feasible, although no specific measures are offered by the comment.

**Comment 2.02**

*We recommend the use of multi-passenger vehicles to transport students to and from the school.*

**Response 2.02**

The use of multi-passenger vehicles would be encouraged to the extent possible. The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program included as Mitigation Measure IV.J-1 of the EIR outlines strategies that encourage ridesharing among students, parents, faculty, and staff. Such strategies include the provision of an on-site Transportation Information Center, offering preferred parking for student and employee carpools, and establishing an emergency ride home program for carpoolers. As outlined in Mitigation Measure IV.J-1, the TDM Program would be monitored for effectiveness and changes would be mandated, if goals were not being met.

**Comment 2.03**

*Storm water run-off is a sensitive issue for Los Angeles and Ventura counties. Please be mindful that projects need to be designed to discharge clean run-off water.*

**Response 2.03**

Storm water runoff is discussed in Section IV.F, Hydrology and Water Quality of the Draft EIR. As stated therein, Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be implemented to address potential water quality impacts during construction and operation of the proposed project. These BMPs would minimize storm water pollution throughout construction and operation of the project. As noted on page IV.F-5 of the Draft EIR, "underground clarifiers and catch basin inserts would be utilized to provide first flush treatment of all runoff prior to discharging to the storm drain system in Rinaldi Street. As also stated on page IV.F-5 of the Draft EIR, the total post-development peak flow to the Rinaldi Street extension storm drain system would be less than the design capacity peak flows for the system. Thus, no significant water quality or hydrology impacts would occur as a result of the project.

**Comment 2.04**

*Any transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials which requires the use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways will require a Caltrans transportation permit. We recommend that large size truck trips be limited to off-peak commute periods. Thank you for the opportunity to have reviewed this project.*

*If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (213) 897-3747 or Alan Lin the project coordinator at (213) 897-8391 and refer to IGR/CEQA No. 050443AL.*

**Response 2.04**

As mandated by this comment, a Caltrans transportation permit would be obtained by the applicant, or its construction contractors, should oversized transport vehicles be required to travel on State highways as a result of the project. Such trips would be limited to off-peak hours to the extent feasible. Furthermore, the project would require approval of a haul route, to which the City of Los Angeles would impose restrictions, including restrictions on travel hours.

**LETTER NO. 3**

May 31, 2005

State of California Public Utilities Commission  
Rosa Munoz, PE, Rail Crossings Engineering Section, Consumer Protection and Safety Division  
320 West 4th Street, Suite 500  
Los Angeles, CA 90013

**Comment 3.01**

As the state agency responsible for rail safety within California, we recommend that the proposed Sierra Canyon Secondary School project be planned with the safety of the rail corridor in mind. The proposed project is near the Southern California Regional Rail Authority-Metrolink right-of-way. The full development of the project area will increase traffic volumes not only on streets and at intersections, but also at at-grade highway-rail crossings.

Safety considerations may include, but are not limited to, the following items:

- Grade separation of the crossings along major thoroughfares
- Fencing to limit the access of pedestrians onto the railroad right-of-way
- Improvements to warning devices at existing at-grade highway-rail crossings
- Improvements to traffic signaling at intersections adjacent to crossings
- Improvements to roadway geometry and lane striping near crossing
- Increased enforcement of traffic laws at crossings
- A safety awareness program on rail related hazards

The above-mentioned safety improvements should be considered when approval is sought for new developments; this includes mitigation measures at the Chatsworth Street highway-rail at-grade crossings. Working with Commission staff early in the conceptual design phase will help improve the safety to motorists and pedestrians in the community.

Please advise us on the status of the project. If you have any questions in this matter, please contact me at (213) 576-7078 or at rxm@cpuc.ca.gov.

**Response 3.01**

As stated in Section IV.J, Transportation and Circulation (page IV.J-3) of the Draft EIR, none of the transit lines in the area provide “front door” service to the project site. The nearest rail service to the site is Metrolink’s Ventura Line. This line runs in a north-south direction in the vicinity of the project site, and at its closest point, is approximately 0.7 mile to the west of the site. The Chatsworth stop of this line is located west of Canoga Avenue, between Lassen Street and Devonshire Street, approximately two miles southwest of the project site.

As shown in Section IV.J, Transportation and Circulation (Table IV.J-15, page IV.J-35) of the Draft EIR, while the project would add traffic to the surrounding roadways, traffic conditions with the project and the proposed mitigation measures would actually be improved as compared to future without project conditions. Thus, the project would not significantly impact surrounding streets, intersections, or at-grade highway rail crossings, and rail-related mitigation measures would not be required or warranted. However, Mitigation Measure IV.J-9 (which requires that

the school issue a newsletter that includes a section regarding parking and access issues) has been modified to include language that requires a section of the newsletter to address automobile and pedestrian safety on rail crossings in the area, as follows (see Correction and Addition No. IV.J-11 in Section II, Corrections and Additions of this Final EIR):

The school shall provide a newsletter to students and parents that shall be updated regularly with a section addressing parking and access to the campus. Through this newsletter, the school will direct students and parents to commute to the campus from readily available major boulevards and not utilize the neighboring residential streets. Specifically, the newsletter shall include a section directing parents to avoid utilizing Tulsa Street, Nashville Street or Lurline Avenue for student drop-off or pick-up activities (although there is no direct access to the school from any of these streets). The newsletter shall also contain a section addressing automobile and pedestrian safety on neighboring streets and rail crossings to the south and west.

#### **LETTER NO. 4**

##### *REGIONAL AGENCIES*

June 3, 2005  
February 28, 2005 attachment

Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  
Laura J. Simonek, Manager, Environmental Planning Team  
700 N. Alameda Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

#### **Comment 4.01**

*The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan) has received a copy of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the Sierra Canyon Middle School (Project). The Project consists of a 550-student (maximum enrollment) private secondary school north of the Rinaldi Street extension. The Project would include a classroom building, athletics center (500 person capacity), performing arts center (600 seats), administration building and aquatics center (80 person occupancy), and totaling 120,542 feet of floor area. Parking would be provided in an at-grade parking level for 236 vehicles with access provided from the extension of Rinaldi Street. The Project site is located at 11023 Lurline Avenue in the Chatsworth community of the City of Los Angeles. The 4.89-acre site is bounded by Los Angeles Department of Water and Power property on the north and northwest (including a small covered storage reservoir) and two vacant single-family lots on the west. Partially improved Lurline Avenue forms the eastern site boundary. The southern site boundary is defined by the existing termini of Rinaldi Street, east of De Soto Avenue, and by the right-of-way for the future extension of Rinaldi Street, which curves in a northeasterly direction through currently vacant property. Metropolitan is providing comment on this Draft EIR as a potentially affected agency.*

#### **Response 4.01**

The comment summarizes key components of the project and does not address specific environmental issues. The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 4.02**

*Metropolitan staff review of the Draft EIR indicates that Metropolitan owns and operates a facility, which traverses the Project boundaries in a generally north-south direction. Metropolitan's West Valley Feeder is an approximately 54-inch diameter pipeline located within permanent easement right-of-way. Metropolitan must be allowed to maintain access to its facilities at all times, in order to repair and maintain the current condition of this facility. Therefore, Metropolitan objects to the construction or maintenance of any structures within our easement areas.*

**Response 4.02**

As MWD is a responsible agency with authority over any construction built over their easements, they must approve all final project plans, prior to Plan Check approval by the City of Los Angeles and it is understood and acknowledged that project approval is contingent upon MWD's approval of project design plans. Based on consultation between MWD and the project architect/designer as noted by MWD's February 28, 2005 letter (see Comment Nos. 4.05 through 4.15), design adjustments will be required to ensure that access to the easement is provided to MWD's satisfaction. Such adjustments would not materially change the footprint, program or other significant project aspects, but rather may involve providing a 20-foot wide opening in the project plaza level ensuring that vehicles and equipment could move unobstructed over the easement. One or more pedestrian bridges could also be provided, if acceptable to MWD. Specific adjustments and final design specifications would be determined during MWD's design approval of the project. Nevertheless, MWD's objection to the construction or maintenance of any structures within their easement area is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 4.03**

*Metropolitan's Substructures Team staff reviewed design plans and provided a letter dated, February 28, 2005 (attached), which identified various requirements and issues that need to be resolved. Approval of the Project where it could impact Metropolitan's property must be contingent on resolution of these issues and Metropolitan's approval of design plans for the Project.*

**Response 4.03**

Responses to the letter referred to in the comment (dated February 28, 2005) are provided as Response to Comment Nos. 4.05 through 4.15, below. Per Response to Comment 4.02, it is understood and acknowledged that project implementation is contingent upon MWD's approval of project design plans.

**Comment 4.04**

*In addition, Metropolitan encourages projects within its service area to include water conservation measures. Water conservation, reclaimed water use, and groundwater recharge programs are integral components to regional water supply planning. Metropolitan supports mitigation measures such as using water efficient fixtures, drought-tolerant landscaping, and reclaimed water to offset any increase in water use associated with the proposed project.*

*We appreciate the opportunity to provide input to your planning process and look forward to receiving future environmental documentation, including a copy of the Draft EIR, for this project. If we can be of further assistance, please contact Mr. William Fong of the Environmental Planning Team at (213) 217-6899.*

#### **Response 4.04**

As stated in Section V (page V-8) of the Draft EIR, the project's water consumption would have a negligible impact on regional water sources and supplies. As such, no specific mitigation measures pertaining to water consumption are necessary. Nonetheless, water conservation features such as ultra-low-flow toilets and other water-efficient fixtures would be incorporated into the design of the project as necessary to comply with the City of Los Angeles Water Conservation Ordinance (No. 166,080), the City's Xeriscape Ordinance, and any other mandatory City of Los Angeles conservation requirements as may be identified through the project approval process. The applicant has also expressed interest in integrating environmentally sensitive features into the school's design. As stated in Section II, Project Description (page II-8) of the Draft EIR, such features would "seek to maximize water efficiency for irrigation and could include water reclamation through the use of captured rainwater recycled for irrigation, use of non-potable sources, including grey water, and planning of drought resistant/tolerant species." Such measures and compliance with the City's Water Conservation Ordinance would further offset any increase in water demand associated with the project.

#### **Comment 4.05**

*Thank you for your letter dated January 21, 2005, submitting prints of the site plans (Sheets A0 through A5), concept grading plans (Sheets C1 and C2), preliminary wet utility connections plan (Sheet H1), post developed hydrology map (Sheet H2) and a MWD pipeline exhibit (Sheet W1), for the proposed school site improvements located at 11023 Lurline Avenue in the Chatsworth area of the City of Los Angeles.*

*We have reviewed your submitted plans and reports, and our comments and requirements are as follows:*

- 1. The locations of our 54-inch-inside-diameter prestressed concrete West Valley Feeder No. 1 pipeline and accompanying 20-foot-wide permanent easement right-of-way, as shown on all pertinent sheets of your plans, are generally in agreement with our records. Please clarify and revise Sheets C1, C2, H1, H2 and W1 to reference our pipeline as a 54-inch-inside-diameter prestressed concrete pipe, not a 78-inch reinforced concrete pipe. In addition, we request that our triangular shaped permanent easement right-of-way located at Rinaldi Street (MWD Parcel 1801-8-3, approximate MWD Station 1290+00) also be shown and identified as Metropolitan's on all pertinent sheets of your plans.*

*Enclosed for your information and use are prints of our Drawings J2728 and J-2729 and Right-of-Way Map 1801-8.*

#### **Response 4.05**

As part of the MWD design approval process, revised prints of the requested exhibits are being prepared by the project civil engineer and architect, and are tentatively scheduled for submittal to MWD in July 2005. The revised prints will identify the MWD pipeline as a "54-inch-inside-

diameter prestressed concrete pipe,” as requested in the comment. As also requested in the comment, the triangular shaped easement located at Rinaldi Street will be shown and identified as MWD’s on all applicable plan sheets.

**Comment 4.06**

- 2. The proposed bridge/deck over a segment of our pipeline (from Station 1284+00 to 1286+00), as shown on all pertinent sheets of your plans, is not acceptable to Metropolitan. The terms of Metropolitan’s permanent easement deed prohibit the construction or maintenance of any structures within our easement areas. Please revise your plans accordingly.*

**Response 4.06**

See Response to Comment No. 4.02. Design adjustments will be required to ensure that access to the easement is provided to MWD’s satisfaction. Such adjustments would not materially change the footprint, program or other significant project aspects, but rather may involve providing a 20-foot wide opening (the width of the easement) in the project plaza level ensuring that vehicles and equipment could move unobstructed over the easement. One or more pedestrian bridges could also be provided, if acceptable to MWD. Specific adjustments and final design specifications would be determined during MWD’s design approval of the project. Nevertheless, MWD’s objection to the construction or maintenance of any structures within their easement area is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 4.07**

- 3. Based on plans revised per our comments in Item 2 above, in order for Metropolitan to further analyze your proposed grading and driveway that would require up to approximately 7 feet of cut along our pipeline (from Station 1286+00 to 1291+00), we request that a geotechnical report be submitted for our review for the school site. The geotechnical report should provide, but not be limited to, the depth of bedrock, stratigraphy of the area, compressibility of soil layers based on consolidation and other tests, ground water elevation and building loads. In addition, the report should also address settlement and/or rebound calculations due to excavation and building loads, at every 10-foot section along the pipeline.*

**Response 4.07**

Detailed geotechnical reports were prepared by Subsurface Designs and submitted to the Department of Building and Safety for review and approval in 2004. These reports, which are included as Appendix G of the Draft EIR, received a letter of approval from the Department of Building and Safety dated January 20, 2005. As requested, however, and as part of the MWD design approval process, an addendum or revised geotechnical report will be submitted to MWD that addresses the specific requested requirements .

**Comment 4.08**

- 4. Provided 1-foot minimum vertical clearances are maintained from our pipeline, the proposed 8-inch storm drain, 8-inch sewer lines, 8-inch fire water line and 6-inch water line that crosses our pipeline at four locations, as shown on Sheet C1 of your concept*

*grading plans and H1 of your preliminary wet utility connections, are acceptable to Metropolitan. However, the proposed 6-inch sewer line connection, which ties into the 8-inch sewer line within our permanent easement right-of-way, is not acceptable to Metropolitan. Please revise the sewer line tie-in to outside the limits of our right-of-way.*

*We request that all sewer and reclaimed water lines crossing our pipeline be installed in a continuous steel sleeve as a secondary containment for a distance extending a minimum of 10 feet beyond the outside edges of our pipeline.*

*The installation of the sewer and reclaimed water lines must also conform to all county and state health code requirements as relates to the installation of sewer and reclaimed water lines in the vicinity of pressurized water lines.*

#### **Response 4.08**

As requested, and as part of the MWD design approval process, all subsequent utility plans submitted to MWD shall be revised to show the proposed sewer tie-in outside the limits of the MWD right-of-way. Other revisions identified by the comment shall also be incorporated to the satisfaction of MWD, including secondary containment for any sewer and reclaimed water lines that cross the MWD right-of-way.

#### **Comment 4.09**

- 5. The proposed equestrian trail over a portion of our pipeline and within our permanent easement right-of-way, as shown on Sheets A2 and A3 of your site plans, is acceptable to Metropolitan. However, please note that this trail would be shut down should Metropolitan need to gain access to our pipeline in this area.*

#### **Response 4.09**

As stated in Response to Comment No. 4.02, MWD would be afforded continued access to their facilities throughout construction and operation of the project. Furthermore, it is noted that the equestrian trail may be temporarily closed, as necessary, to accommodate repair and/or maintenance activities.

#### **Comment 4.10**

- 6. Our West Valley Feeder No. 1 pipeline within the limits of this project is a prestressed concrete pipeline (PCP). Please note that PCP is subject to a catastrophic failure if damage occurs to the prestressing wire. Such damage could occur by the direct impact of construction equipment upon the pipe, or if the mortar coating, which protects the prestressing wire, is in some way damaged or cracked and corrosion occurs. Therefore, when excavating or potholing, no power equipment, including backhoes, may be used within 2 feet of our pipe. Only hand equipment will be allowed.*

#### **Response 4.10**

The applicant and its contractors will adhere to the requested measures regarding excavating or potholing within two feet of the West Valley Feeder No. 1 pipeline. In addition, civil engineering drawings submitted for review and approval by MWD, as part of their design approval, shall note all restrictions relative to construction near the existing prestressed concrete pipeline.

**Comment 4.11**

7. *A list and the specifications of all construction equipment proposed to be used over our pipeline must be submitted for our review and written approval at least 30 days prior to their use.*

**Response 4.11**

The requirement to provide MWD with a list and the specification of all construction equipment proposed to be used over MWD's pipeline at least 30 days prior to their use would be addressed through MWD's design approval of the project and could also be included as a condition of approval for the project CUP (either volunteered by the applicant and/or imposed by the decisionmakers). The condition would include the provision that work will not commence in this area of the project site (which would be developed with a portion of the proposed equestrian trail) until written approval is obtained from MWD.

**Comment 4.12**

8. *We request a stipulation be added to your plans or specifications to notify Mr. Kimber Rose of our Water System Operations Group, telephone (818) 832-2134, at least two working days (Monday through Thursday) prior to starting any work in the vicinity of our facilities.*

**Response 4.12**

A stipulation added to the plans and specifications to notify Mr. Kimber Rose at MWD at least two working days prior to starting any work in the vicinity of the MWD pipeline and easement would be addressed through MWD's design approval of the project and could also be included as a condition of approval for the project CUP (either volunteered by the applicant and/or imposed by the decisionmakers).

**Comment 4.13**

*We are returning one print each of Sheets A0 through A5 of your site plans, Sheets C1 and C2 of your concept grading plans, Sheet H1 (preliminary wet utility connections plan), Sheet H2 (post developed hydrology map) and Sheet W1 (MWD pipeline exhibit), stamped "REVIEWED—CORRECTIONS NOTED—RESUBMITTAL REQUIRED."*

**Response 4.13**

As requested, and as part of the MWD design approval process, civil engineering drawings are being revised per MWD comments and will likely be resubmitted to MWD in July 2005.

**Comment 4.14**

*Facilities constructed within Metropolitan's easement shall be subject to the paramount right of Metropolitan to use the easement for the purpose for which it was acquired. If at any time Metropolitan or its assigns should, in the exercise of their rights, find it necessary to remove any of the facilities from the easement, such removal and replacement shall be at the expense of the owner of the facility.*

**Response 4.14**

As stated in Response to Comment No. 4.02, MWD is a responsible agency with authority over any construction built over their easements, including removal of any facilities as may be needed to access the easement. It is understood and acknowledged that removal and replacement of any such facilities would be at the expense of the applicant.

**Comment 4.15**

*Provided that the driveway proposed along our pipeline and within our right-of-way is approved, please note that the driveway could be unavailable at any time, for a period of time, in the event excavation of our pipeline becomes necessary for maintenance and repair, replacement, or the addition of another pipeline. Metropolitan will not be responsible for any disruptions to the driveway if this were to occur.*

*For any further correspondence with Metropolitan relating to this project, please make reference to the Substructures Job Number shown in the upper right-hand corner of the first page of this letter. Should you require any additional information, please contact Mr. Ken Chung, telephone (213) 217-7670.*

**Response 4.15**

See Response to Comment No. 4.14. In the event that MWD work crews need to access the upper (northeast) entry to the proposed project, access to and from the school would continue to be provided by the lower (southwesterly) entry to the project until such work is completed.

**OTHER ENTITIES**

**LETTER NO. 5**

June 3, 2005

Chatsworth Neighborhood Council  
Land Use Committee  
Linda van der Valk, Co-Chair

**Comment 5.01**

*The Chatsworth Neighborhood Council's Land Use Committee (hereafter Land Use Committee) submits the below comments on the above-referenced draft Environmental Impact Report. These comments are based on commentary at a recent meeting of its Land Use Committee, which included input by various stakeholders, as well as a review of the DEIR, 2004-0164-EIR.*

*The following questions remained after the High School staff and project managers made their presentation. Therefore, we bring these questions forward to the attention of the City Environmental Section, especially when considering "Alternatives 1 through 4", pages 1 to 4.*

- 1. Height of the buildings, especially the "tower" that was illustrated in the elevation sketches and site layout shown to the Land Use Committee on May 19, 2005 is not clear. The applicant and his representative said the design was not a firm height or*

*design. Concerns that the visual impact would overpower the residential neighborhoods that have pre-existing (for decades) in and around the site has not been mitigated, since the height is still undetermined.*

*Because of the terraced nature of the site, elevations of the tower, the main classroom building, the buildings near the swimming pool, the performing arts center, and the gymnasium are requested, both from the final grade level surrounding the building and the final elevation from a consistent point, on say Rinaldi Street.*

#### **Response 5.01**

Representatives of the proposed Sierra Canyon Secondary School met with members of the Chatsworth Neighborhood Council in May 2005. At that meeting, preliminary plans for the project were shared in an attempt to involve neighbors in the process and keep them informed of the project's status. However, until a CUP is granted by the City, the final design of the school cannot be known, as the City will likely impose conditions regarding the design of the school as part of the CUP process. A conceptual design of the project, including the proposed heights of all on-site structures was analyzed in the Draft EIR and the heights of the structures will not be greater than those identified in the Draft EIR.

As described in Section II, Project Description (pages II-7 through II-8), and analyzed in Section IV.A, Aesthetics of the Draft EIR, the classroom building would have a maximum height of 69 feet above grade; the performing arts center would have a maximum height of 69 feet above grade; the athletics center would have a maximum height of 54 feet above grade; and the administration building would have maximum height of 69 feet above grade. All of these heights are measured from the lowest point of the adjacent grade within five feet of the structure to the highest point of the roof, structure, or the parapet wall (whichever is highest), per Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.03.

As the heights of the proposed buildings are measured pursuant to the Los Angeles Municipal Code, they are, thus, measured from a consistent point (i.e., the lowest point of the adjacent grade within five feet of each structure). Because heights are measured from the lowest point, rather than the average or highest points, of the adjacent grade within five feet of the structures, the actual maximum heights are considered worst-case. However, when measured relative to the immediate adjacent grades, most of the classroom building would range in height from between 45 and 60 feet and most of the performing arts center would range in height from between 40 and 53 feet. The range of heights indicated for the classroom building and performing arts center are provided to illustrate the actual height of these structures as measured from the finished grade, as the sloping nature of the area in which these structures would be located results in the maximum height measurements being greater than they would be if the structures were located on more level portions of the site. However, the comment's request for additional elevations is noted for the record here and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

The conceptual design of the project is illustrated in Section II, Project Description, Figures II-5 through II-9, of the Draft EIR. As shown, the project would be designed to create an academic village atmosphere comprised of separate buildings with simple building masses to complement the site's landform and sloping topography. By utilizing the sloping topography of the site through the terracing of structures, the residential character of the area would be better preserved than if the design disregarded the topography and created level pads on which to construct the proposed facilities. In addition, the project design will incorporate natural

materials, colors, and textures and would be extensively landscaped, which would further integrate it with the surrounding neighborhood. Thus, the Draft EIR found that the proposed school use would not detract from the existing style or character of the surrounding area. As discussed in Section IV.A, Aesthetics (page IV.A-17) of the Draft EIR, this is largely due to, "...the proposed design of the project, the site's relationship with existing neighborhoods to the south and north (which face away from the project site and thus, are buffered from the school) and that the site is adjacent to public uses on the northwest and north, as well as the physical barrier to be established by the extension of Rinaldi Street." Nevertheless, mitigation measures are identified in the Draft EIR (Mitigation Measures IV.A-1 through IV.A-3) that would ensure maximum compatibility of the project with the surrounding residential area. (Note that these mitigation measures were incorrectly numbered in the Draft EIR. Refer to Correction and Addition No. IV.A-14 in Section II, Corrections and Additions of this Final EIR.)

It should also be noted that the Draft EIR found that the project would still introduce a prominent and significant change to conditions in the immediate vicinity, resulting in a significant impact associated with the degree of contrast between existing project features and existing features that represent the area's aesthetic image. However, this significant, unmitigated impact is not solely tied to the height of the structures. Refer to Section IV.A, Aesthetics (pages IV.A-16 through 17) of the Draft EIR for a discussion of this impact.

#### **Comment 5.02**

2. *Noise from a public address system travels much further, especially one used to call students; to alert the entire grounds to the start of events/sporting and otherwise.*

*Sound from announcements should not to exceed beyond the 500-foot distance from the school's boundary, as per L.A.M.C. Pages 1-22 of the DEIR, "Noise" Operation does not correctly depict noise impacts.*

#### **Response 5.02**

A Noise Impact Technical Report was prepared by Terry A. Hayes Associates, LLC and is included as Appendix D of the Draft EIR. The analysis and conclusion regarding potential noise impacts of the proposed project was conducted in compliance with widely accepted standards and practices and accurately depicts potential noise impacts of the project. Specifically, operational noise impacts associated with traffic were estimated using the project traffic study, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) RD-77-108 noise calculation formulas, and the Caltrans Sound 2000 noise model. Traffic volumes, assumptions and methodologies provided in the project traffic study, were developed under the direction, and to the satisfaction of, the LADOT. These volumes were used as inputs in the FHWA noise calculation formulas and Sound 2000 noise model. Additionally, to estimate future increases in noise levels as accurately as possible, the noise readings that were taken at sensitive receptors were used to calibrate Sound 2000. Noise from car alarms, chimes, the public address system, and campus events were based on various studies that estimate the amount of noise that these noise sources would emit. Noise level reductions from these noise sources at sensitive receptors were calculated using formulas that have been adopted by various federal and state agencies.

The Noise Impact Technical Report is summarized in Section IV.H, Noise of the Draft EIR. Specifically, noise impacts resulting from the proposed public address system are analyzed in Section IV.H, Noise (pages IV.H-13 through 14). It was determined that the public address system would increase the ambient noise levels at the nearest residences with a direct line of

site to the project (i.e., the residences south of Rinaldi Street, approximately 130 feet south of the site) by approximately 2 decibels (dBA) ( $L_{eq}$ ), assuming that the system would emit noise 100 percent of the time during an event or assembly. As this increase is below the 5-dBA significance threshold, it was correctly concluded that such an impact would be less than significant. Furthermore, noise from the chime and public address system would not be audible beyond 190 feet. However, to ensure that the chimes and public address system would comply with the Los Angeles Municipal Code, Mitigation Measure IV.H-7 has been revised to speak to the concerns raised by this (and other similar) comment(s), as follows (see Correction and Addition No. IV.H-12 in Section II, Corrections and Additions of this Final EIR):

The sound path of school chimes shall be directed away from residential uses and school chimes shall not be placed on structures or walls of buildings that face residential uses. Similarly, both the use of chimes and any public address system shall comply with Sections 112.01 and 114.04 of the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance (No. 144,331). Any external speakers shall be directed inward to the school grounds and away from residential uses. Additionally, the location of speakers and chimes shall be set back sufficient distance from the property line as to ensure that noise levels from these sources do not exceed audible levels heard for a distance of greater than 150 feet from the property line for loudspeakers and 200 feet for chimes. In the event that audibility at these distances is exceeded, the school would be considered in violation of the Ordinance and sound levels from these sources would have to be adjusted downward to achieve compliance. Additionally, the project shall also be subject to Section 114.02, 114.04, and 114.06 of the Noise Ordinance regulating vehicle theft alarm noise, horns, and radios. Non-compliance (i.e., any vehicle theft alarm system that does not become automatically and completely silenced within five minutes) would result in an infraction under the Noise Ordinance in the LAMC enforceable by the Los Angeles Police Department. Furthermore, violators shall be penalized by the school by having their vehicular privileges revoked.

### **Comment 5.03**

3. *A "haul route" for removal of 19,800 cubic yards of material has not been identified. This should not be handled at the subdivision level, but should be delineated at the earliest opportunity.*

### **Response 5.03**

It is somewhat speculative to identify an exact haul route at this point in the approval process, as the specific destination of the export material will not be known with certainty until the haul route application is filed and receptor sites that are available at that particular time can be identified. However, as stated in Response to Comment No. 2.04, it is assumed that the haul trucks would travel from the Rinaldi Street extension to De Soto Avenue north to the SR-118 freeway on- and off-ramps, which are located approximately 0.6 mile northwest of the site. Thus, haul trucks would avoid residential streets and minimize exposure to residents in the area. A description of this local haul route has been added to Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR (see Response 2.04 and Correction and Addition No. IV.J-9 in Section II of this Final EIR).

**Comment 5.04**

4. *Section IV – “Transportation/Circulation” – The greatest concerns shown at the meeting developed as the applicant described the parking spaces as equivalent to the minimum City requirements for parking on site. Simple addition shows every one of the 236 spaces filled by faculty, students, or staff at all times. The concern, then is that additional students or parents or staff, visitors, salesmen, support or maintenance cars/trucks, visiting teams and/or adult spectators, and on and on, will have to go to a “satellite” parking area to be bussed to the site. The applicant stated no offsite parking sites have yet been secured or even identified. No bus routes or truck routes have been identified as part of the Draft EIR. Thus the impacts on the neighborhoods around these “hubs” have not been identified to be studied. For instance, a basketball meet with seating for 500 may bring an extra 250 cars to the site. All those cars must find parking in our community, and then, transportation routes to the event on school grounds, and a returning route. Impacts from such activity – perhaps several times a month, were not addressed by the draft EIR; nor were routes and “hub sites” identified by the applicant.*

*This is the major issue not mitigated, that the Land Use Committee found on May 19, 2005. These issues must be carefully thought out, and mitigated with items such as the following:*

- a. Additional Parking on site*
- b. Reductions of school site events*
- c. Reductions of student numbers and/or visitors*
- d. Extensive transportation plans that can be documented*
- e. Realistic parking space quotas set by the City*
- f. Designated visitor parking areas*
- g. Controlling hours major facilities are used to eliminate and/or reduce conflicts with normal school operation*
- h. Limit use of major facilities (performing arts center and gymnasium) to only one event to run simultaneously*

*Please review the above and advise us of appropriate answers at your earliest convenience.*

**Response 5.04**

The amount of parking proposed for the project (i.e., 236 spaces) would meet the daily needs of the school and is expected to meet the parking needs for most campus events, including athletic and performing arts events. In addition to meeting Los Angeles Municipal Code parking requirements, parking would exceed anticipated demand based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Parking Generation 3rd edition (2003) for a high school (both private and public). Under the High School land use (Land Use 550) parking rates indicate a demand of 0.26 spaces per student (inclusive of faculty and staff) in suburban areas, which would result in a demand of 143 spaces, leaving a surplus of 93 spaces (there is also an equation which calculates parking demand at  $P = 0.19(X) + 69$ , resulting in 174 parking spaces and a surplus of 62 spaces). Additionally, should the school eventually add 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades, the number of junior and senior drivers (and associated parking demand) would decrease.

Parking needs for annual events (e.g., graduation, open houses, “back to school” day/night) would be considered during the planning of such events, with adjustments made, as necessary (e.g., events can be separated by class level). However, in the event of any overflow parking,

the school would provide shuttle service from local parks upon permit, or other off-site locations. Possible locations include churches in the area that have accommodated parking for the existing elementary school. Parking would be subject to any conflicts and church approval at the time, if necessary. Church sites typically have 75 to 250 spaces from which buses could shuttle back and forth to the campus and generally are able to rent their parking spaces for such uses on a case-by-case basis (refer to Attachment A of Section III, Responses to Written Comments of this Final EIR, which includes a letter from a local church indicating their willingness to allow the applicant to rent parking spaces, if and when needed for special events at the Sierra Canyon Secondary School campus). Thus, while some parking would be available on Rinaldi Street adjacent to the project site, it is not expected that school-related parking would occur on neighborhood streets, as ample parking would be provided by the school. However, in response to this comment, and other comments concerning parking, additional mitigation has been added to this Final EIR that would require the school to prohibit any parking on residential streets and that would provide an on-site Parking Management Program (refer to Correction and Addition Nos. IV.J-11 through 13). Students and parents will be required to sign a statement at the start of each school year acknowledging that the use of residential streets for parking or loading/unloading is prohibited by the school and that the school will monitor and strictly enforce such parking and loading/unloading prohibitions. The Program also requires that Parents be informed through the Student/Parent Handbook where visitor parking is located, as would visitors upon their arrival to the campus by a driveway attendant. Additionally, conditions of approval for the project under the CUP will specifically regulate the number and types of events at the school, as well as their hours and whether any concurrent events would be permitted. Specific conditions will be volunteered by the applicant and/or imposed by the decisionmakers.

Also, see related Responses to Comment Nos. 6.07, 7.04 and 10.26 concerning school events, hours of operation and parking, as well as Alternative 3 (pages VI-18 through VI-26 ) in the Draft EIR, which addresses the impacts of a reduced enrollment project. All improvements and traffic mitigation identified in the Draft and Final EIRs (Mitigation Measures IV.J-1 through 12) will be documented and developed to the satisfaction of LADOT and the author of the comment is encouraged to follow-up with LADOT to review any engineering drawings and other technical documentation of public record. The comment is also noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

## **LETTER NO. 6**

June 6, 2005

Chatsworth Neighborhood Council  
Land Use Committee  
Teena A. Takata, Recording Secretary

### **Comment 6.01**

*Enclosed please find additional queries on the above referenced project from one of our Chatsworth Neighborhood Council Land Use Committee members.*

*Questions.*

*1. Can Tulsa Street be closed at DeSoto Street to stop cut-through traffic? Precedent is set at Tulsa Street and DeSoto Street on the west side.*

**Response 6.01**

The closure of Tulsa Street was considered as part of this project. However, it is anticipated that the project would not have a significant impact on this roadway. Consequently, no mitigation to the roadway was identified, or required, in the Draft EIR or by LADOT. The City does have a process by which this type of request can be considered separate from the project. The local Council office would be best able to assist with this endeavor. However, the comment is still noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 6.02**

2. *Will the city give a definitive answer if there will be parking on Rinaldi Avenue, south of the 118 Freeway to DeSoto Street.*

**Response 6.02**

Street improvement plans for the Rinaldi Street extension, which have been approved by the City of Los Angeles, indicate that on-street parking would be provided along both sides of the roadway in the vicinity of the project.

**Comment 6.03**

3. *Will the new sound wall along Rinaldi Street be landscaped on both sides of the wall?*

**Response 6.03**

No sound wall is proposed along the north side of Rinaldi Street adjacent to the school. Any sound wall that may be planned on the south side of Rinaldi Street is beyond the scope of the proposed project as this off-site property is not under the ownership or control of the school. The currently vacant property opposite the school on the south side of Rinaldi Street is proposed for a 7-lot subdivision and is identified in the Draft EIR as Related Project No. 3. Any attenuation barriers developed on the south side of the Rinaldi Street extension within or adjacent to the proposed subdivision would have to be undertaken by that property owner (Shapell Industries) in concert with the City of Los Angeles. Any landscaping of a sound wall on the south side of the Rinaldi Street extension would not be under the control of the school. It should be noted, however, that during circulation of the Draft EIR, the applicant held community meetings with neighbors and made a presentation to the Chatsworth Neighborhood Council, and, as a follow-up to that outreach, the school indicated a willingness to increase the height of a block wall along the south side of the existing Rinaldi Street right-of-way (and to close the current opening allowing pedestrian access from the terminus of Oklahoma Avenue to Rinaldi Street), per Response to Comment No. 9.01. However, how it would be implemented has not been determined, given that the existing wall and opening are not under the control of the applicant. Should individuals choose to pursue construction of the wall extension, the school would undertake the construction pursuant to City approval (assuming the wall and opening are within the public right-of-way) and would fund the cost of that construction. However, as construction of the wall extension is not part of the project and is not a required mitigation measure, it is not analyzed in the Draft EIR. Therefore, discussion of how that improvement could be landscaped is considered premature and is beyond the scope of this project.

**Comment 6.04**

4. *Will the storm drain behind Celtic Street be secured in some manner as to discourage it from being an “attractive nuisance.” Preferably with landscaping.*

**Response 6.04**

The storm drain behind Celtic Street (it is presumed that the comment is referring to partially improved Lurline Avenue) is outside the boundaries of the project site and not under the control of the school. As such, providing security landscaping at this facility is beyond the scope of this project. Nonetheless, the comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 6.05**

5. *Prior to approval of the high school building height will there be a demonstration to view its true perspective from the neighborhood?*

**Response 6.05**

Refer to Section IV.A, Aesthetics of the Draft EIR for a discussion of the visual aspects of the project (including proposed building heights) relative to the surrounding neighborhood. In addition, a scale model of the proposed project has been built to demonstrate the relative height and massing of each new building as it relates to local grades and landforms. This model is available for viewing at the site by appointment with the project applicant.

**Comment 6.06**

6. *Are there plans to discourage speeding on Rinaldi Street? It has not been discouraged with on the streets opened from Devonshire Street to Rinaldi Street into Porter Ranch.*

**Response 6.06**

Rinaldi Street improvement plans have been designed to facilitate traffic movement along this dedicated major highway. These improvement plans are not a part of this project but are a part of the Porter Ranch development. As with other major roadways in the area, speeding will be discouraged through the enforcement of traffic laws by the Los Angeles Police Department and the California Highway Patrol. Furthermore, the City of Los Angeles will be required to post a speed reduction zone with the presence of the school. Typically, school zones in the City of Los Angeles require that speeds be reduced to 25 miles per hour adjacent to any public or private school. Thus, the school will actually have a beneficial effect on speeds on Rinaldi Street.

**Comment 6.07**

7. *What are the hours of operation for the high school, with special attention to after school activities?*

**Response 6.07**

Page II-15 provides a general description of expected special events and related school activities. Events include interscholastic athletics in the gymnasium, and a variety of non-

athletic events such as admissions open houses, back to school day/night, testing, performing arts, college nights, etc., typical of a secondary school campus. This will include some weekend and weeknight use. The school expects that any weeknight activities would not start earlier than 5:00 PM and would be expected to end by 10:30 PM (athletic events ending by 8:30 PM). Weekend events would typically begin from around 8:00 to 10:30 AM on Saturday and 12:00 PM on Sunday, and would conclude from around 2:30 to 6:00 PM. Weekday operations would typically range from 6:30 AM to 8:30 PM. Additionally, conditions of approval for the CUP will address specific hours of operation for all activities and special events. Specific conditions will be volunteered by the applicant and/or imposed by the decisionmakers.

**Comment 6.08**

*8. Will the lighting, P.A. system, bell system be addressed as the building [sic] are completed. Will there be a yearly evaluation. What are the lighting requirements? Will there be glow at night from the high school?*

**Response 6.08**

Nighttime events will typically be held indoors and outdoor lighting will rarely exceed light levels produced by low-level security, walkway and exit lights. There will not be the kind of "glow" associated with nighttime outdoor sporting events. Lighting for the school will consist of indoor and outdoor systems. Indoor lighting will consist of direct and indirect fixtures as necessary to light the activities they support and meet the energy conservation requirements of Title 24. Light from these sources will be partially visible through window openings around the school perimeter during the limited weeknight and weekend events permitted under the CUP and would have minimal to no nighttime lighting impact.

The most important locations from which indoor lighting will be visible during these limited periods will be along Rinaldi Street at the Classroom Building (library level, the plaza level corridor and the science classroom level) and at the clerestory windows along the east elevation of the athletics center. Lighting at the athletics center would only be visible on nights of special athletic events. Interior lighting at all campus buildings may also be visible as a result of the operations of maintenance and janitorial staff.

Outside of this limited period when interior lighting would be visible to the neighborhood, only the outdoor lighting system will be active during nighttime hours. Outdoor lighting will consist of fully-shielded, low-level fixtures for the parking garage and exterior walkways, and surface mounted exit lights. Since all outdoor fixtures (except exit lights) will be fully shielded, they will not be visible as "point sources" and will not create a cumulative effect or glow from the campus. The only visible consequence of this lighting will be light falling on walkway, driveway or parking garage surfaces. Much of this effect will be diluted by the more important and brighter lighting provided by street lamping to be located on either side of Rinaldi Street.

With respect to the public address system and school chimes, Mitigation Measure IV.H-7 has been revised to require explicit compliance with the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance and applicable provisions for non-residential uses in residential zones (see Correction and Addition No. IV.H-13). The measure requires that any external speakers be directed inward to the school grounds and away from residential uses, and that the location of speakers and chimes be set back sufficient distance from the property line as to ensure that noise levels do not exceed audible levels heard for a distance of greater than 150 feet from the property line for loudspeakers and 200 feet for chimes. In the event that audibility at these distances is

exceeded, the school would be considered in violation of the Ordinance and sound levels from these sources would have to be adjusted downward to achieve compliance. Compliance with the measure would be required as soon as any of these systems are operational within the campus.

**Comment 6.09**

9. *Will there be a yearly evaluation as this project progresses?*

**Response 6.09**

It is unclear to what type of yearly evaluation the comment is referring. However, many of the mitigation measures require ongoing and regular monitoring as required by Section 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines. Refer to Section IV, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included as Section IV of this Final EIR for a complete list of the ongoing monitoring activities that will occur on the project site.

**Comment 6.10**

10. *Will DeSoto Street have no parking west of Tulsa Street to the 118 Freeway?*

**Response 6.10**

This project will not be changing the parking restrictions along De Soto Avenue.

**Comment 6.11**

11. *Can the high school be encouraged to landscape with mature growth?*

**Response 6.11**

As stated in Section IV.A, Aesthetics (page IV.A-14) of the Draft EIR, "...the project would utilize mature non-native ornamental species, native species where possible, and other plantings along the school perimeters to create a softened project edge and convey identify with the site's surroundings." A landscape plan will be provided for review and approval to the Los Angeles Planning Department as part of the project design process (pursuant to Mitigation Measure IV.A-3). This plan will indicate the type and location of plant materials proposed for the project site, and will incorporate mature landscaping, as feasible. Portions of the site would benefit more from mature landscaping than others, and it is these areas that will be the focus for such landscaping. The comment's request that mature growth landscaping be encouraged is noted for the record here and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

*INDIVIDUALS*

**LETTER NO. 7**

No Date

Steve Kreynes

**Comment 7.01**

*I offer the following suggestions*

*Please no buzzers or ringing bells.*

**Response 7.01**

The suggestion made in the comment for there to be no buzzers or ringing bells included as part of the project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration. However, the use of chimes is, nonetheless, proposed as part of the project to signify the beginning and end of classes. Potential noise impacts resulting from the use of these chimes are analyzed in Section IV.H, Noise of the Draft EIR. As concluded on page IV.H-14, "Although the chimes would be audible when they are being used, they would not emit noise often enough to incrementally increase the aggregate hourly noise levels by five or more dBA ( $L_{eq}$ ). Thus, impacts would be less than significant." Furthermore, as stated in Response to Comment No. 5.02, noise from the chimes would not be audible beyond 190 feet. Additionally, to ensure that the chimes (and public address system) would comply with the Los Angeles Municipal Code, Mitigation Measure IV.H-7 has been revised. Refer to Response to Comment No. 5.02 and Correction and Addition No. IV.H-13 in Section II, Corrections and Additions of this Final EIR.

**Comment 7.02**

*No noise from athletics or performing arts intruding on residential neighbors.*

**Response 7.02**

Noise from athletic and performing arts events were analyzed in Section IV.H, Noise of the Draft EIR. Events at each of the campus locations (e.g., athletics center, performing arts center, aquatics center, and campus plaza) were analyzed. The Draft EIR concluded that noise generated within the athletics center and performing arts center would not be noticeably audible at the surrounding residents. However, activities that could occur outside of these venues (e.g., people socializing as they enter and exit) could potentially emit noise levels that could be heard at nearby residences. A mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure IV.H-8) is included in the Draft EIR that would ensure that exterior noise generated during special events would be minimized at nearby residents by addressing potential problems as they arise, thereby maintaining incremental increases in noise levels at less than five decibels, which is below the level of significance. Events at the aquatics center and campus plaza would not generate significant noise levels.

**Comment 7.03**

*Use of sound wall not a 5 ½ foot wall to block some of the noise which otherwise would intrude on the home residents. Supplement that with a bountiful use of trees and high bushy foliage.*

**Response 7.03**

See Response to Comment No. 6.03. No sound wall is proposed along the north side of Rinaldi Street adjacent to the school and any sound wall that may be planned on the south side of Rinaldi Street is beyond the scope of the proposed project as this off-site property is not under the ownership or control of the school. Discussion of how any potential off-site sound wall should be landscaped is noted for the record here and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 7.04**

*Schedule athletics and performing arts to completion prior to 5 or 6 p.m. to protect the residents from intrusive noise.*

**Response 7.04**

See Response to Comment No. 6.07 concerning expected hours of operation for special events. While many athletics and performing arts events do conclude prior to 5:00 or 6:00 PM., due to the nature of such events, the scheduling requirements of a secondary school campus and the ability for friends and family to attend events after work, it is not feasible to schedule all athletic and performing arts events such that they would be completed prior to 5:00 or 6:00 PM. Additionally, a mitigation measure (Mitigation Measure IV.H-8) is included in the Draft EIR requiring that potential noise problems be addressed as they arise. In doing so, incremental increases in noise levels would be maintained at less than five decibels, which is below the level of significance. This measure would ensure that exterior noise generated during special events would be minimized at nearby residences. The comment's request that special events not be held after 6:00 PM is noted for the record here and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**LETTER NO. 8**

June 3, 2005

Ed and Christine Kozdrowicki  
Chatsworth, CA

**Comment 8.01**

*We are very concerned about the Sierra Canyon School project impact on our Neighborhood. Foremost the noise and pollution levels will be intolerable. A school with sports activities, Art performances, swimming meets will create a lot of noise and chaos.*

**Response 8.01**

The project's potential impacts to noise and air pollution are discussed in Section IV.H, Noise and IV.B, Air Quality of the Draft EIR, respectively. Regarding noise, as concluded on pages

IV.H-19-20 of the Draft EIR, operation of the school, including sports activities and special events, would not result in significant project noise impacts in the surrounding neighborhood, but a significant cumulative noise impact would occur at the residences south of Rinaldi Street (Receptor No. 3, as identified in Figure IV.H-1 of the Draft EIR). However, this cumulative impact would occur with or without the project, as the project itself would only contribute to approximately one decibel of the cumulative noise levels, which would not be, by itself, perceptible to the general public. Furthermore, pursuant to Mitigation Measure IV.H-8, surrounding residents shall be provided with a telephone number to register any noise complaints during special events. Based on complaints, the offending activity shall cease or the hours of such activity shall be adjusted, as needed. Thus, surrounding residents will have a means of bringing noise issues to the attention of the school so that they can then be dealt with in a timely manner.

Regarding air pollution, the Draft EIR concluded in Section IV.B, Air Quality, page IV.B-20 that regional and localized air quality impacts of the project would be less than significant. An assessment of air pollutant concentrations attributable to the project was performed at four neighboring residential locations to the west, south and east of the project site. That analysis found that CO concentrations at the four locations would all be well below State 1- and 8-Hour Standards.

**Comment 8.02**

*The vehicles will park all over our neighborhood and will create unsafe conditions for all of us and our children.*

**Response 8.02**

The amount of parking proposed for the project (i.e., 236 spaces) would meet the daily needs of the school and is expected to meet the parking needs for most campus events, including athletic and performing arts events. Parking needs for annual events (e.g., graduation, open houses, “back to school” day/night) would be considered during the planning of such events, with adjustments made, as necessary (e.g., events can be separated by class level). However, in the event of any overflow parking, the school would provide shuttle service from local parks upon permit, or other off-site locations. Possible locations include churches in the area that have accommodated parking for the existing elementary school. Parking would be subject to any conflicts and church approval at the time, if necessary. Church sites typically have 75 to 250 spaces from which buses could shuttle back and forth to the Campus and generally are able to rent their parking spaces for such uses on a case-by-case basis (refer to Attachment A of Section III, Responses to Written Comments of this Final EIR, which includes a letter from a local church indicating their willingness to allow the applicant to rent parking spaces, if and when needed for special events at the Sierra Canyon Secondary School campus). Thus, while some parking would be available on Rinaldi Street adjacent to the project site, it is not expected that school-related parking would occur on neighborhood streets, as ample parking would be provided by the school. However, in response to this comment, and other comments concerning parking, additional mitigation has been added to this Final EIR that would require the school to prohibit any parking on residential streets and that would provide an on-site Parking Management Program (refer to Correction and Addition Nos. IV.J-11 through 13). Students and parents will be required to sign a statement at the start of each school year acknowledging that the use of residential streets for parking or loading/unloading is prohibited by the school and that the school will monitor and strictly enforce such parking and loading/unloading prohibitions.

**Comment 8.03**

*We do not need a school to destroy the character of the area, especially since we have some very fine schools down the road.*

**Response 8.03**

While the perceived character of any particular project can be very subjective, the concern expressed by the comment is noted. The Draft EIR did assess the character of the project relative to land use and aesthetic issues and associated significance thresholds established by the City of Los Angeles for Draft EIRs. Specifically, as discussed on in Section IV.G, Land Use (page IV.G-21) of the Draft EIR, the Rinaldi Street extension would provide buffering between the proposed campus and the existing residential neighborhoods, creating an interface between the physical and operational characteristics of the project that would be substantially compatible with the surrounding area. In addition, private schools are permitted in the RE zone by CUP pursuant to the City of Los Angeles, which indicates that such uses are anticipated and appropriate in residential areas.

Relative to aesthetics, the Draft EIR found that “[b]ecause of the location and condition of the school site (between the extension of Rinaldi Street and the Ronald Reagan Freeway), it [the site] would not be considered as contributing to the valued visual character of the neighborhood, community, or localized area” (page IV.A-16 of the Draft EIR). Furthermore, as stated on page IV.A-17, “The campus would provide, through an articulate and uniform design, a landmark feature (e.g., the school as a whole would convey a sense of a distinct identity and visual character) that would enhance the visual quality of the property and surrounding area.” Aesthetic elements of the project, including the incorporation of building massing that would complement the site’s landform and sloping topography, the use of natural materials and textures, and landscaping, would ensure that a high quality visual environment would be created. While the Draft EIR found that the visual contrast of the project to existing features of the area would be considered a significant impact, such contrast in and of itself, would not “destroy” the character of the area.

Ultimately, the decisionmakers must evaluate the project and make findings that it is, or will be, compatible with existing and future development on neighboring properties, as part of the CUP approval process. The comment’s concerns about neighborhood character are noted for the record here and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 8.04**

*Please consider moving the project to another site.*

**Response 8.04**

Several alternative sites were considered for the proposed project. These sites are discussed in Section VI, Alternatives to the Proposed Project, (pages VI-27 through 35) of the Draft EIR. As discussed on Page VI-27, several sites were identified and eventually rejected because of their size or location relative to surrounding uses and/or the existing Sierra Canyon Elementary and Middle school. Additionally, negotiations for purchase on some of the identified sites could not be completed to the satisfaction of the seller or the applicant. The alternative site that was ultimately analyzed as Alternative 4 was concluded to have generally comparable impacts as

compared to the proposed project. It was also determined that this alternative would not fully meet the objectives of the project.

**LETTER NO. 9**

June 13, 2005

C.T. Lin  
10958 Oklahoma Avenue  
Chatsworth, CA 91311

**Comment 9.01**

*This is a request for the approval on raising the height of the existing brick wall on the north side of my residence property located at 10958 Oklahoma Ave., Chatsworth, CA 91311 and for asking Sierra Canyon School to pay to build the raised brick wall along the said property line.*

*After having consulting with Sanje Ratnavale, Chief Operating Officer, of Sierra Canyon School, about the noise that may be generated by the traffic and the school and potential intrusion or vandalism, he asked me to submit this request to raise the height of the existing brick wall that runs along the south side of Rinaldi Street, immediately adjacent to the current construction site of the paved street and the future Sierra Canyon Secondary School. Mr. Ratnavale, on behalf of the Sierra Canyon School, has agreed to pay for the expenses incurred in raising an addition 4-5 feet of brick wall above the existing wall once the City of Los Angeles has approved the request.*

*The wall runs about 160 feet along the property line of my residence by the south side of Rinaldi Street, immediately next to a street access opening that is currently present in the existing wall, connecting between Oklahoma Avenue and Rinaldi Street. It has been decided by the City and the School that this existing opening will be blocked and sealed with brickwork to avoid the residential area nearby the opening to become an access for dropping-off and picking-up students in the future.*

*Please give this request a favorable consideration and reply to me through a regular mail sent to my home address at the location above, or through fax at 818-772-5327 (please call first). Thank you very much.*

**Response 9.01**

During circulation of the Draft EIR, the applicant held community meetings with neighbors and made a presentation to the Chatsworth Neighborhood Council in order to share project information, involve neighbors in the process, and keep them informed of the project's status. As a follow-up to these outreach efforts, the author of the comment and a representative of the school discussed the school's willingness to increase the height of the existing wall on the south side of Rinaldi Street and close the current opening allowing pedestrian access from the terminus of Oklahoma Avenue to Rinaldi Street. However, how these improvements would be implemented has not been determined, given that the existing wall and opening are not under the control of the applicant. Should individuals pursue construction of the wall extension, the school would undertake the construction pursuant to City approval (assuming that the wall and opening are within the public right-of-way) and would fund the cost of that construction. However, as construction of the wall extension is not included as part of the project and is not a

required mitigation for the project, it is not analyzed in the Draft EIR. Therefore, for purposes of this Final EIR, the comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration as part of the CUP approval process.

**LETTER NO. 10**

No Date

Scott and Jolene Munson  
20648 Tulsa Street  
Chatsworth, CA 91311

Peter and Supartra Slutzky  
20648 Tulsa Street  
Chatsworth, CA 91311

Niles and Fran Goodsite  
20656 Tulsa Street  
Chatsworth, CA 91311

**Comment 10.01**

General Comment:

*The site has been rezoned once to increase density (additional dwellings) – now again? The Porter Ranch development has already placed a burden on this area – now more? The floor area of the proposed project is equivalent to 60 dwellings currently rezoned for only 7. We believe this neighborhood has already done its fair share to promote growth/commerce in LA.*

**Response 10.01**

No zone change is required for the project and no such change is, therefore, being requested. The proposed school would be developed in accordance with existing zoning for the site. As stated in Section IV.G, Land Use (pages IV.G-21 through 22) of the Draft EIR, “Private school uses are permitted in the RE zone by Conditional Use Permit (CUP) under City of Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Section 12.24(U), subsection 24(b)...School development and operation adhering to vesting Conditional Use provision would be considered consistent with the RE11 zone. The project would be consistent with uses allowed under the existing zoning by the CUP process and by right, and no zone change would be required.”

Pursuant to the current zoning for the site, a maximum of 26 residential units could be built across the entire 4.89-acre site, not seven, as stated in the comment. However, for purposes of providing a conservative alternative’s analysis, Alternative 2 (No Project/Eight Single-Family Residential Development Lots and Retain Existing Residence Alternative) assumed that a total of eight new residences would be developed on-site and the existing on-site residence would be retained. Furthermore, while it is unclear how the determination that the floor area of the project is equivalent to 60 residential units was made, to apply equivalencies across uses based solely on floor area does not provide an accurate comparison, as the layout of the site and residential lot requirements do not allow for direct correlations. Nonetheless, the comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

Finally, growth-inducing impacts are analyzed in Section V.C of the Draft EIR. As stated on page V-4 of that section, "...the project would not remove obstacles to population growth, result in an increase in the population that may tax existing community service facilities, or encourage or facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment or the area, either individually or cumulatively. Thus, the project would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts."

**Comment 10.02**

Specific Comments:

II-A: Project Description

*Special Events/School Events (page II-16): We are opposed to events occurring during typical non-school hours or on holidays or weekends. These activities are not conducive to our low density residential area. We suggest you use the existing school's facilities for these events.*

**Response 10.02**

See Response Nos. 6.07 and 7.04 concerning expected hours of operation for special events. While many athletics and performing arts events do conclude prior to 5:00 or 6:00 PM, due to the nature of such events, the scheduling requirements of a secondary school campus and the ability for friends and family to attend events after work, it is not feasible to schedule all athletic and performing arts events such that they would be completed prior to 5:00 or 6:00 PM.

Additionally, due to scheduling conflicts and the need for separate facilities for a secondary school program, it is not feasible for the proposed secondary school to utilize the elementary/middle school facilities for all of its athletics and special events needs. The use of these off-site facilities would also generate additional impacts associated with increased intensity of use at the elementary/middle school as well as impacts associated with transporting students to an off-site location for all such events. In addition, extra-curricular and other program-enriching activities are an integral part of any secondary school. Thus, in order for the school to meet its programmatic needs, it is necessary that the school be permitted to hold certain events and activities during non-typical school hours. Nonetheless, the comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 10.03**

*Project Phasing: Adequate on site parking must be constructed prior to occupying any temporary classrooms.*

**Response 10.03**

Phasing for the proposed project is discussed in Section II, Project Description, pages II-15 through 16 of the Draft EIR, and revised per Correction and Addition No. II-5. During the initial site occupancy phase, temporary classrooms would be provided in up to 10 modular units. To accommodate parking needs during this initial site occupancy phase, 51 surface parking spaces would be provided, which would be in place prior to operation of the temporary classrooms. As the parking level would be constructed during the first construction phase, parking needs during subsequent phases of construction would be met per Los Angeles Municipal Code requirements, as discussed in Section IV.J, Transportation and Circulation of the Draft EIR.

**Comment 10.04**

*Also, how long will this temporary school be operated? We see little discussion regarding operational criteria and mitigation measures for the temporary school. This is a separate project by itself and needs to be thoroughly discussed!*

**Response 10.04**

As discussed in Section II, Project Description, page II-16 of the Draft EIR, installation of the modular classrooms is expected by Fall of 2006 and construction of the classroom building would be completed in time for operation in the 2007-2008 school year. Thus, the initial site occupancy phase would occur for one school year. The majority of all mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR will be required either during construction or prior to issuance of any building permits, including any temporary permits (see Section IV, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program of this Final EIR). Therefore, the initial site occupancy phase was considered in the analysis and any resulting impacts from operation of this phase have been analyzed and mitigated, as necessary. However, the comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 10.05**

IV-A: Aesthetics/Views

1. *The variance requested is for a 69' height as opposed to the 45' max height limitation (i.e. exceeds by 53%). Additionally, this height increase will appear even higher since the school is to be built on a hill above the local residences.*
2. *No detailed explanation is given as to why there must be a significant height variance. Some parts could be built below grade.*

**Response 10.05**

As stated in the comment, the project requires relief from the 45-foot height limit within the existing RE11 and A2 zones. The City Planning Commission is authorized to grant such relief in appropriate circumstances pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.24(F). No variance, as authorized by Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.27, is required or is being requested by the applicant. Pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.03, all of the heights of the proposed school structures are measured from the lowest point of the adjacent grade within five feet of the structure. Therefore, due to the sloping nature of the site, these heights are considered worst-case. When measured relative to the immediate adjacent grades, most of the classroom building would range in height from between 45 and 60 feet and most of the performing arts center would range in height from between 40 and 53 feet. These proposed building heights would be no greater than three stories. Furthermore, the design of the proposed structures would complement the site's landform and sloping topography, thereby creating a uniform character and general height across the site's frontage. The design takes advantage of the sloping grade to place a parking level within the lower elevations of the campus with the classroom building and performing arts center built entirely above, the parking level and the athletics and administration building constructed partially above this facility.

The heights are proposed in order to accommodate a 550-student secondary school. Should the school not receive relief from the height limit, the project would have to be significantly downscaled and, as a result, would likely not be able to meet the facility and financial requirements of a 550-student secondary school. Such an alternative to the project was

addressed as Alternative 3 (Reduced Enrollment/Modified Project Alternative) in the Draft EIR, on pages VI-18 through 26. This alternative reduced building heights by reducing enrollment and developing subterranean parking. Under the alternative, enrollment dependent environmental impacts would be reduced, while construction and development related impacts would increase. Finally, it should also be noted that residential uses are afforded similar relief procedures pursuant to the Los Angeles Municipal Code (i.e., a variance pursuant Section 12.27 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code) to allow for increased heights.

**Comment 10.06**

3. *Construction of the homes and property line walls south of Rinaldi prior to opening the school would help alleviate this significant aesthetic impact on existing adjacent homes.*

**Response 10.06**

The significant aesthetic impact of the project (identified and analyzed in Section IV.A of the Draft EIR) is related to the contrast between the project's features and existing site features. Thus, while the construction of new residences in the area may reduce this impact by acting as a buffer to other residences, it would not likely eliminate it. Furthermore, the school has no control over when residences or associated structures are constructed. Thus, while the residences south of Rinaldi Street and west of Lurline Avenue are considered in the cumulative analysis (Related Project No. 3), they cannot be employed as project mitigation. Should the related project and any accessory walls be developed as a part of that subdivision prior to construction of the school, any associated benefit would occur at that time and independent of the school's construction schedule. The comment is, however, noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 10.07**

IV-B: Air Quality

*Construction Mitigation Measures: The Porter Ranch Developer has done a poor job at keeping dust under control in this windy area. We need a 24-hour hot line to call for an immediate response.*

**Response 10.07**

As stated in Section IV.B, Air Quality of the Draft EIR, the project would comply with the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) Rule 403 Fugitive Dust Control Measures, which control daily dust and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions during construction. Mitigation Measures IV.B-1 through IV.B-10 on page IV.B-18 of the Draft EIR would further ensure proper implementation of Rule 403. Rule 403 is attached (Appendix F) to the Air Quality and Noise Impact Technical Report, which is included as Appendix D of the Draft EIR. Compliance with these measures will be monitored through field inspections undertaken throughout project construction. However, should a neighbor have a specific concern regarding construction, a mitigation measure has been added to this Final EIR that requires that a 24-hour hotline be provided to address construction-related air quality complaints (see Correction and Addition No. IV.B-6 in Section II, Corrections and Additions of this Final EIR). Specifically the new measure is as follows:

Mitigation Measure IV.B-11: During construction, a 24-hour hotline shall be established for residents to register air quality complaints and inquire about the

construction process. Upon receipt of complaint, the cause of the complaint shall be determined, including the specific activity and location, and reasonable measures shall be implemented to resolve the complaint, including but not limited to, additional watering, covering of stockpiles, and other related dust control measures. Any construction notices circulated to area residents, as well as signs posted at the construction site, shall list the telephone number for the coordinator.

**Comment 10.08**

*IV-B-8: Suspend operations when wind gusts exceed 25 mph and begin an aggressive watering schedule.*

**Response 10.08**

SCAQMD's Rule 403 addresses wind gusts as well as watering. Mitigation Measure IV.B-8 requires that operation on any unpaved surfaces be suspended when winds exceed 25 miles per hour and Mitigation Measures IV.B-1 through IV.B-4 and IV.B-7 all address watering. However, in response to this comment, Mitigation Measure IV.B-8 has been revised (see Correction and Addition No. IV.B-5 in Section II, Corrections and Additions of this Final EIR), as follows:

Mitigation Measure IV.B-8: Operations on any unpaved surfaces shall be suspended when winds, including wind gusts, exceed 25 miles per hour. In addition, when winds exceed 25 miles per hour, all unpaved surfaces and stockpiles shall be watered.

**Comment 10.09**

IV-H. Noise

*General: There is no adjustment in noise calculations for:*

- 1. School height above existing residences*
- 2. Normal daily afternoon breeze/wind from the Northwest.*

**Response 10.09**

Section cuts and oblique views of the project site were taken into consideration when estimating noise levels at existing residences. Based on reviews of section cuts and oblique views of the proposed project, it was determined that the school would have a direct line of sight to existing residences. Noise levels were, therefore, calculated assuming that no barriers would be located between the existing residences and the proposed school.

Wind in the vicinity of the project site, as recorded by SCAQMD, indicates that northwesterly winds occur less than seven percent of the time in the afternoon. According to SCAQMD wind data, afternoon winds predominately come from the southeast. Thus, afternoon winds would generally be directing noise away from the residences. Additionally, wind direction varies depending on the time of day and season. Adjustments for northwesterly winds were not accounted for because afternoon winds from the northwest do not occur frequently.

**Comment 10.10**

*Construction Noise: Table IVH-7 indicates significant impact of construction noise to local residents based on conservative (high) noise estimates for the completed Rinaldi St. What will be construction noise impacts if Rinaldi St. noise is significantly less?*

**Response 10.10**

As concluded in Section IV.H, Noise (page IV.H-9 and 10) of the Draft EIR, the project would have significant construction noise impacts prior to mitigation at the proposed classroom building (receptor no. 1) as well as at the residences on Lurline Avenue and south of Rinaldi Street (receptor nos. 2 and 3, respectively). This conclusion is based on worst-case estimates for construction noise impacts (assuming no barriers or attenuation between the construction noise source and the receiver) and future traffic volumes used to estimate ambient noise levels when the Rinaldi Street extension is completed. Traffic volume estimates were determined by, and to the satisfaction of, LADOT. As they are estimates, these predicted existing noise levels may not be exact, but LADOT does not anticipate that traffic volumes on Rinaldi Street would be less than estimated. Therefore, the estimates are assumed to be accurate and valid for purposes of providing a reasonable analysis.

**Comment 10.11**

**Operation**

*General (pages H13-14): Noise from car alarms, horns, radios, bells, PA and chimes are averaged into continuous noise to lead to the conclusion they are not a significant impact. This is not true if you live close to these nuisance noises. Additional mitigation is needed for these short term noises.*

**Response 10.11**

As suggested by the comment, Mitigation Measure IV.H-7 has been revised to address potential nuisance noise from car alarms, horns, radios, bells, the public address system, and chimes (see Response to Comment No. 5.02 and Correction and Addition No. IV.H-13 included in Section II, Corrections and Additions of this Final EIR).

**Comment 10.12**

*Athletics Center and Performing Arts Center: All exit doors should face away from residences or have a permanent sound barrier constructed in front of them.*

**Response 10.12**

The main entry and exit doors to and from the athletics center and performing arts center face into the school's interior plaza and away from residential areas. However, the doors on the southeast side would not have a direct line-of-sight to nearby residences as these doors provide access to the hallways of the performing arts center rather than directly to the auditorium. Additionally, the classroom building is located between the performing arts center and nearby residences to the southeast (see Correction and Addition No. IV.H-10). Thus, noise generated within these facilities would not be audible at the residences south of Rinaldi Street.

**Comment 10.13**

*Aquatics Center and Campus Plaza: Any amplified noise/PA system shall be designed and operated to be inaudible at 150' from school property line. This is consistent with L.A. City municipal code governing noise that private residences can emit (Chapter XI, Sections 112.01 and 114.04). Design should allow for typical wind.*

**Response 10.13**

As suggested by the comment, Mitigation Measure IV.H-7 of the Draft EIR has been revised specifically to ensure that noise generated from the chimes and public address system would be consistent with Sections 112.01 and 114.04 of the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance (see Response to Comment No. 5.02 and Correction and Addition No. IV.H-12 in Section II, Corrections and Additions of this Final EIR).

According to SCAQMD wind data, winds predominately come from the southeast in the project area. Thus, typical wind in the area would direct noise away from the residences.

**Comment 10.14**

**Mitigation**

*H1: How will they be monitored? What are suitable noise attenuation devices? Playing of radios/boom boxes shall not be permitted on the construction site.*

**Response 10.14**

As stated in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included as Section IV of this Final EIR, Mitigation Measure IV.H-1 would be monitored by field visits throughout construction and would be documented in quarterly certification reports. If the contractor does not meet the requirement to use equipment that is equipped with mufflers or other noise attenuation devices, the contractor would be in breach of contract and appropriate penalties would be applied. Suitable noise attenuation devices include noise barriers (e.g., acoustical blankets), mufflers, and air intake silencers. The use of radios/boom boxes on the construction site would also be required to comply with Section 112.01 of the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance.

**Comment 10.15**

*H2: Send notice to residences within 1/4 mile of the site.*

**Response 10.15**

Mitigation Measure IV.H-2 states that all residential units within 600 feet of the construction site shall be sent a notice regarding the construction schedule of the proposed project. The distance of 600 feet was used as a benchmark because residences living within 600 feet of the project site would experience incremental increases in noise levels of five decibels or more, which is the City of Los Angeles' significance threshold during construction activities, prior to the implementation of mitigation measures. For mitigation purposes, it is not necessary to provide notices to residences who live more than 600 feet from the project site because these residences would not be significantly impacted during construction of the project site. However, the comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 10.16**

*H3: Disturbance call response should be within 10 minutes. Notice to residences within 1/4 mile of site.*

**Response 10.16**

See Response to Comment No. 10.15 regarding the suggestion that residences within ¼ mile of the site receive notices. Additionally, Mitigation Measure IV.H-3 has been revised to require prompt attention to any construction noise complaints as follows (see Correction and Addition No. IV.H-11 in Section II, Corrections and Additions of this Final EIR.):

Mitigation Measure IV.H-3: A “noise disturbance coordinator” shall be appointed. The disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. Upon receipt of any complaints, the disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and shall implement reasonable measures to resolve the complaint. The noise disturbance coordinator shall respond to the complaint as soon as it has been received, and preferably within 10 minutes of the call. All notices that are sent to residential units within 600 feet of the construction site and all signs posted at the construction site shall list the telephone number for the noise disturbance coordinator.

**Comment 10.17**

*H4: Following the standard LA City Code is not acceptable mitigation for construction of a 120,000 square foot facility in a low density residential zone. Construction should be limited to Monday through Friday from 7am to 4:30pm, and no construction on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. (This site was already rezoned and increased in density for the construction of only 7 dwellings.)*

**Response 10.17**

Compliance with Chapter IV, Section 41.40 of the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code as addressed by Mitigation Measure IV.H-4 would ensure that nearby residences would not be exposed to construction noise during the night when residents are sleeping. Specifically, Section 41.40 of the Noise Ordinance prohibits construction in any residential zone, or within 500 feet of land so occupied, before 8:00 AM or after 6:00 PM on any Saturday, and at any time on Sunday and that construction activities shall not be conducted in a manner as to disturb the peace and quiet of neighboring residents or any reasonable person of normal sensitiveness residing in the area. The Draft and Final EIRs also include a number of other mitigation measures that would further ensure that nearby residences would not be exposed to noise levels greater than five decibels (City of Los Angeles’ significance threshold) and that any complaints associated with construction of the proposed project would be resolved. The comment’s request for construction hours that exceed the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance requirements for residential areas is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 10.18**

*H5: What is the duration of the construction sound barrier?*

**Response 10.18**

The sound barrier would be placed along the perimeter of the construction site during the grading/excavation, foundation, and structural phases of construction.

**Comment 10.19**

*H7: (Same as Aquatics Center Comment).*

**Response 10.19**

See Response to Comment No. 10.13.

**Comment 10.20**

*H8: There should be no special events outside of normal school hours and normal school days. This is a low density residential area and should not be disturbed at all by the school during typical leisure time.*

**Response 10.20**

See Response Nos. 5.04, 6.07 and 7.04 for a discussion of special events that would occur on the project site. The comment's objection to special events held outside of regular school hours during the week is noted for the record here and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 10.21**

*Note: A possible noise mitigation measure that was not included is requiring the houses and block fences planned for south of future Rinaldi St. to be constructed prior to the school opening. This would help create a buffer zone from school and Rinaldi St. noise. This could be a major mitigation for the local residents.*

**Response 10.21**

While the proposed seven-lot subdivision on the south side of Rinaldi Street (Related Project No. 3 in the Draft EIR) may act as a noise barrier of sorts, it is not under the ownership or control of the school. Therefore, Related Project No. 3 cannot be employed as mitigation for the project. Any block fences or other attenuation barriers developed on the south side of the Rinaldi Street extension within or adjacent to the proposed subdivision would have to be undertaken by that property owner (Shapell Industries) in concert with the City of Los Angeles, and any attenuation benefit that could be provided by Related Project No. 3 would further reduce any estimated noise levels at neighboring locations as analyzed in the Draft EIR. In addition, during circulation of the Draft EIR, the applicant held community meetings with neighbors and made a presentation to the Chatsworth Neighborhood Council, and, as a follow-up to that outreach, the school indicated a willingness to increase the height of a block wall along the south side of the existing Rinaldi Street right-of-way and to close the current opening allowing pedestrian access from the terminus of Oklahoma Avenue to Rinaldi Street (see Response to Comment No. 9.01). However, how it would be implemented has not been determined, given that the existing wall and opening are not under the control of the applicant.

Should individuals pursue construction of the wall extension, the school would undertake the construction pursuant to City approval (assuming that the wall and opening are within the public right-of-way) and would fund the cost of that construction. However, construction of the wall extension is not included as part of the project nor is it a required mitigation measure for the project. As such, it is not analyzed in the Draft EIR.

**Comment 10.22**

Significance After Mitigation

*Parking Level Noise: Intermittent noise (car alarms, horns, radio, etc) is significant to the community. The parking structure southwest wall should be closed off or have a permanent sound barrier placed in front of it*

**Response 10.22**

Mitigation Measure IV.H-7 of the Draft EIR has been revised to address potential nuisance noise from car alarms, horns, radios, bells, the public address system, and chimes (see Response to Comment No. 5.02 and Correction and Addition No. IV.H-13 in Section II, Corrections and Additions of this Final EIR). The request to enclose the southwest wall of the parking structure is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 10.23**

*Chimes and P.A. Noise: Same as response to H7.*

**Response 10.23**

See Response to Comment No. 10.13.

**Comment 10.24**

*Special Event Noise: Same as response to H8.*

**Response 10.24**

See Response to Comment No. 10.20.

**Comment 10.25**

*Last sentences of Chapter IV-H reads: 'Thus, the proposed project would contribute to significant cumulative noise impacts over a 24-hour period at this location. This impact is considered cumulatively significant and unavoidable.'*

1. *However, we see no analysis to show that the 'unavoidable' impact on the Lurline residences is truly unavoidable. Please clarify."*

**Response 10.25**

The proposed project would not contribute to cumulative noise impacts at residential uses on Lurline Avenue. Although noise levels at these residences would cumulatively increase by 14

dBA, which exceeds the significance threshold of a five decibel or more increase in ambient noise level, the proposed project would contribute to approximately two decibels of the cumulative noise increase. The two decibel contribution from the proposed project would not be perceptible by the general public and the five decibel threshold would still be exceeded even without implementation of the proposed project. Additionally, cumulative noise levels would remain within the “conditionally acceptable” category of the Land Use Compatibility Chart. Thus, unlike the receptor on the south side of Rinaldi Street (receptor no. 3 in the Draft EIR) where the 1 dBA CNEL increase would push future ambient noise levels into the “clearly unacceptable” category (see page IV.H-18 of the Draft EIR), the proposed project is not anticipated to contribute to cumulative impacts at the analyzed Lurline Avenue location (receptor no. 2 as identified in the Draft EIR).

**Comment 10.26**

IV-J: Transportation and Circulation

Parking:

1. *Calculation of 236 spaces was done using zoning code requirements for assembly areas. Please explain how 136 spaces is enough for 550 students every day. (236-100 staff spaces = 136 student spaces – 1 space per 4 students.)*

**Response 10.26**

Since this is a private school, a great amount of control can be exercised over the student parking and driving behavior. As limited parking would be made available to students, most students will be dropped off and picked up by parents. Permits will be provided to eligible drivers to park at the school, thereby controlling the number of student drivers and, subsequently, the number of parking spaces necessary to accommodate these drivers. Additionally, as described by Mitigation Measure IV.J-1 and as revised by Correction and Addition No. IV.J-8, “the TDM plan would only allow junior and senior students to drive when accompanied by one other student (two-student carpool)”. Parking permits would not be issued for students who wouldn’t carpool and would be limited to junior and senior drivers. Thus, adequate on-site parking would be provided for day-to-day school activities.

**Comment 10.27**

2. *How will you assure cars are not parked on adjacent residential streets due to heavy DeSoto Ave. traffic for typical school days (or special events, page J28)?*

**Response 10.27**

In response to this comment, and other comments concerning parking, additional mitigation has been added to this Final EIR that would require the school to prohibit any parking on residential streets and that would provide an on-site Parking Management Program (refer to Correction and Addition Nos. IV.J-11 through 13). Additionally, parking will be available along both sides of Rinaldi Street in the vicinity of the proposed project. During larger events the school will provide off-site parking locations where the attendees can park and then shuttle to the campus. See Response to Comment Nos. 5.04 and 8.02 concerning this issue.

**Comment 10.28**

3. *How will you assure that parents will not use Nashville or Lurline to drop off students "across the street from the school?"*

**Response 10.28**

The Rinaldi Street extension will be a major highway carrying large volumes of traffic at a speed not conducive to crossing. There will be sufficient on-site accommodations for drop off and pick up activities internal to the campus parking level and parents will be instructed to use these accommodations. Additionally, as addressed by Response to Comment No. 10.27, new mitigation is provided that will prohibit parking on these streets and will include enforcement authority to rescind driving privileges. As described in the TDM plan, the school will also be encouraging parents and students through periodic newsletters to be aware of the surrounding community and to be a good neighbor by not intruding into the neighborhood. Nevertheless, as Nashville Street and Lurline Avenue are public streets, it is impossible to ensure that none of the project-related traffic will utilize these roadways (although there is no direct access to the school from any of these streets). The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 10.29**

Mitigation Measures:

J1:

1. *How will you enforce (mandatory student) two person car pool rule?*

**Response 10.29**

Students will be required to receive a parking permit before being permitted to drive to and from school. In order to receive a permit, the student will be required to list the name of the other student(s) with whom they will be carpooling. Additionally, the arrivals and departures of the students will be monitored by school personnel through random vehicle checks. If school personnel determine that a student is parking on the campus who is not carpooling, the student will have their parking permit revoked and the permit will not be reinstated until the student complies with the carpooling mandate.

**Comment 10.30**

2. *Explain TDM numeric goals and how you will meet those goals so that 136 student parking spaces are adequate. The DEIR provides only a general guideline.*

**Response 10.30**

The project's overall TDM goal is to achieve a 25 percent reduction in trips (see Appendix A of the traffic analysis which is included as Appendix I of the Draft EIR). This means that one out of every four cars that would otherwise have been accessing the site will not be on the roadway network because of student ridesharing. This is an overall goal for vehicle trip reduction for parents dropping off students (who do not park), school personnel, and student drivers. The TDM plan includes components to encourage ridesharing through incentives as detailed in Appendix A of the traffic analysis included as Appendix I of the Draft EIR. Additionally, refer to

Response to Comment No. 10.29 for a discussion of how mandatory student carpooling will be enforced.

**Comment 10.31**

3. *The TDM study should be done twice a year (Spring and Fall). How many days are studied?*

**Response 10.31**

The LADOT will require monitoring of the TDM plan once per school year on a random day. The monitoring will be coordinated with LADOT and the school will not be notified of the day of monitoring. The suggestion to conduct a TDM study twice per year is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 10.32**

4. *Send TDM study results to residents within 2000' south and east of the school.*

**Response 10.32**

Once completed, the school and City can make the results of the TDM monitoring available for review upon request by any interested party. The suggestion to send the TDM study results to residents within 2,000 feet to the south and east of the school is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 10.33**

5. *TDM study should not be terminated after 5 years unless approved by Chatsworth Neighborhood Council.*

**Response 10.33**

LADOT considers a five-year time frame a sufficient period in which to determine the effectiveness of a TDM program. The suggestion that the termination of TDM monitoring after five years should only be allowed by approval of the Chatsworth Neighborhood Council is noted for the record here and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 10.34**

6. *What are penalties for school not meeting TDM goals?*
7. *What are penalties for student/parents violating TDM requirements?*

**Response 10.34**

If TDM goals are not met, LADOT will work with the school to modify their program to target additional reductions. Subsequent evaluations will be conducted to determine if the additional and/or modified measures are effective. However, per Mitigation Measure IV.J-1 and as described on page IV.J-32 of the Draft EIR, "in the event the School still does not meet its goals, the School shall reduce its enrollment an amount commensurate to meet the goals for the

following year.” LADOT would have the authority to enforce the restriction on the number of students enrolled at the school.

Regarding student and parent penalties for violating the TDM, The school has not yet developed specific penalties for violating these requirements. However, penalties are likely to be along the lines of warnings for first offenses, to revocation of parking permits and expulsion or not being invited back to the school in the case of repeat offenders.

**Comment 10.35**

*J2: This is unclear. A drawing is needed to clarify. NOTE: WE WILL NOT ACCEPT ANY MODIFICATIONS WHICH ENCOURAGE USE OF TULSA STREET. ADDITIONALLY, THE RESTRICTED LEFT TURN REQUIREMENT MUST REMAIN. The applicant should analyze if other restrictions would be beneficial.*

**Response 10.35**

Mitigation Measure IV.J-2, to which this comment refers, addresses signal system improvements at De Soto Avenue and Rinaldi Street, while Mitigation Measure IV.J-3 addresses improvements at De Soto Avenue and Tulsa Street. Currently, there is no channelization on Tulsa Street as it approaches De Soto Avenue. Mitigation Measure IV.J-3 will provide striping that will channelize vehicles to a dedicated right-turn lane and left-turn lane. The existing restriction for southbound traffic will remain. The changes will provide for a more efficient use of the roadway but it is unlikely that it will encourage the use of Tulsa Street because the changes will be subtle and visible only to those who currently use the roadway. Through traffic will not likely be diverted from the typical travel patterns due to the channelization changes.

**Comment 10.36**

*J4: This mitigation should be physically completed prior to school opening.*

*J5: Same as J4.*

*J6: Same as J4.*

**Response 10.36**

In order for the school to obtain a certificate of occupancy, non-ATSAC street improvements outlined in Mitigation Measures IV.J-2 through IV.J-6 will have to be in place (the applicant has no control over when the City elects to implement area ATSAC improvements, although as stated in Mitigation Measure IV.J-2, “[c]urrently, the date for completion of the system is September 2008). In some circumstances, if the applicant has made its required financial contribution or the improvement has progressed sufficiently (to the degree that completion of the improvement is guaranteed,) and to the satisfaction of LADOT and Bureau of Engineering, a temporary Certificate of Occupancy will be issued until the improvement is completed.

**Comment 10.37**

*J9: The TDM should include provisions requiring parents and students to not use Tulsa and Lurline as “short cuts” to the school. They need to sign a statement acknowledging this annually. Penalties should be described on the statement. School should keep a list of vehicle*

*license plate numbers (updated annually) of students, parents, and staff so that violators can be easily tracked.*

**Response 10.37**

Mitigation Measure IV.J-9 of the Draft EIR requires that the school provide students and parents with a newsletter that includes a section addressing parking and access to the campus. Specifically, as stated in Mitigation Measure IV.J-9, the newsletter would direct students and parents to commute to campus from readily available major boulevards and not utilize the neighboring residential streets. This mitigation measure will be expanded to further address the possible use of Tulsa Street and Lurline Avenue by parents and students. Per Correction and Addition No. IV.J-11, Mitigation Measure IV.J-9 now states that the newsletter shall include a section specifically directing parents to avoid utilizing Tulsa Street or Lurline Avenue for student drop-off and/or pick-up (although there is no direct access to the school from these streets). In addition, a new mitigation measure has been added to the EIR requiring the school to adopt a policy whereby, at the beginning of each school year, parents and student drivers shall sign a statement acknowledging that the use of Tulsa Street and Lurline Avenue is not permitted by the school. Refer to Correction and Addition No. IV.J-12 in Section II, Corrections and Additions of this Final EIR. Although the school does not have the legal authority to issue citations to parents or students who use the surrounding public streets, they can issue warnings, take away driving privileges and expel students.

**Comment 10.38**

V. Other Environmental Considerations

*Two of the impacts stated as significant and unavoidable include:*

- 1. Visual (height)*
- 2. Noise (residences south of Rinaldi)*

*These impacts could be reduced by:*

- 1. Building school structures partially below grade*
- 2. Possible design changes, but none were discussed or analyzed. No reason was given!!*

*These above impacts are described as unavoidable because of the design chosen. This is made clear when reading the last sentence of page VI: "Thus, in order to meet the objectives, the project is being proposed despite the significant and unavoidable visual impacts and cumulative noise, fire, and police protection impacts."*

*This means to us that the local residents "objectives" of having a project which produces similar impacts as few single family homes as approved by the current plan will not meet in favor of meeting the school's objectives.*

**Response 10.38**

Please refer to Alternatives 2 and 3 (pages VI-9 through VI-26) in the Draft EIR. These alternatives address residential development of the site with 8 new single-family lots and a reduced enrollment school. Both the alternatives address the design and use related issues raised by the comment.

**Comment 10.39**

*Also, the last sentences of part A reads, "Overall, the benefits realized through the achievement of the project objectives would justify the relatively minimal significant and unavoidable impacts." We disagree. These sentences should be removed as there is no evidence to prove this statement. (Those who approve the EIR make this decision).*

**Response 10.39**

The Draft EIR section referred to in the comment is specifically intended to outline the reasons why the project is proposed, notwithstanding significant and unavoidable impacts. These reasons, as well as the CEQA requirement to discuss such reasons, are addressed on pages V-1 through 2 of the Draft EIR. It is from this discussion that the conclusion quoted in the comment is made. Nevertheless, the comment is correct in stating that, ultimately, the decisionmakers will have to make the determination as to whether the overall benefits of the project justify the significant and unavoidable impacts. The lead agency (in this case, the City of Los Angeles) will have to adopt a statement of overriding considerations, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, if the project is approved as proposed. As stated in Section 15093(a) of the Guidelines, "CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether or not to approve the project." Section 15093(b) of the Guidelines goes on to state that, "When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record."

**Comment 10.40**

VI-B Alternatives

*Alternate 4: (Reduced enrollment, 365 students). This project is much less intrusive to the community with fewer impacts. It is rejected mainly because of its subterranean parking. Why is this so bad? It appears that the applicant will only accept an A+ facility with "all the amenities" rather than a compromised A-facility.*

**Response 10.40**

Until approval of the project, none of the alternatives have been rejected. Alternative 3 - The Reduced Enrollment/Modified Project Alternative (which was incorrectly referred to as Alternative 4 in Table VI-1 of the Draft EIR and was included in pages VI-18 through VI-26) would reduce the significant unavoidable visual impacts associated with the project, but otherwise, would, overall, result in impacts similar to the project. This alternative, as with all of the alternatives analyzed in Section VI of the Draft EIR, was considered by weighing the impacts as well as the alternative's ability to meet the project objectives. While the development of subterranean parking is not ideal in that it would create additional impacts that would not occur with the project and would be counter to a stated objective of the project, it is not used as a reason to reject the alternative. Ultimately, the decisionmakers must consider the merits of all of the alternatives as well as the proposed project in determining whether or not to approve the project.

**Comment 10.41**

*Alternative 5: (Alternate sites) There was no discussion about building on vacant commercial/residential land north of the 118 freeway in Porter Ranch. Please discuss this alternative.*

**Response 10.41**

As described on Page VI-27 of the Draft EIR, the school sought candidate secondary school sites dating back to 1998, with the current Board of Trustees initiating their search in early 2001. During the search, the Board met with Shapell Industries (the Porter Ranch developer) to identify any potential school sites for purchase. Although two candidate school sites (approximately 7 and 15 acres) had been identified as part of the overall Porter Ranch development, these elementary and junior high school sites are designated for development by the LAUSD as part of the New School Construction Program currently underway throughout the City and are not available for purchase or use by a private educational entity. Should LAUSD elect not to build on these sites, Shapell Industries would pursue subdivisions for residential development on these sites. No other sites were brought to the attention of the Board by Shapell Industries during the Board's site search.

**Comment 10.42**

*The alternate project located west of DeSoto Ave. was rejected mainly because of the possible cumulative impact from two schools close together. However, Table VI-1 shows that impacts of this alternate site can be mitigated to the same level as the proposed site. Additionally, this comparison neglects to state that the residents east of DeSoto Ave. have, and continue to take, the "brunt" of the impacts from the huge Porter Ranch development (traffic, noise, construction dust, etc.). The residents west of DeSoto Ave. have partially isolated themselves from the Porter Ranch development by blocking entry on Tulsa St., requiring the future Rinaldi St. to be constructed as a non-secondary highway and apparently not wanting the development of a high school in there are to educate many of the children living in Porter Ranch. Therefore, because of continuous impacts from the Porter Ranch development, we suggest it is more appropriate to build this school west of DeSoto Ave. (Alt. 5).*

*Closing*

*We, a group of concerned residents of Tulsa Street, thank you for your consideration. We look forward to reading your responses and discussing them with you.*

**Response 10.42**

The comment's preference for the project to be constructed on the alternative site identified in the Draft EIR is noted for the record here and will be forwarded on to the decisionmakers for their consideration. Additionally, as addressed on pages VI 27 through VI-36 of the Draft EIR, while it is expected that development at an alternative site could reduce environmental impacts through mitigation similar to development at the proposed project site, some impacts would be expected to be reduced while others would be expected to increase. Ultimately, the decisionmakers must weigh the merits of both the proposed project and feasible alternatives, and fully consider the environmental impacts as analyzed in the Draft EIR, in their determination to approve the project.

**LETTER NO. 11**

June 2, 2005

Jeannie Plumb  
Chatsworth, CA

**Comment 11.01**

*Following are comments on the Sierra Canyon Secondary School Draft Environmental Impact Report, EIR 2004-0164-EIR. These flow in order of description in the document, hopefully making them easy to follow and cross-reference to the text. My comments are brief in explanation, to the point and factual so their validity can be substantiated.*

*Alternatives to reduce or avoid significant effects: Alternative 3 discusses the visual impact of the proposal, but does not mention reducing that the school has designed the layout to support a preordained enrollment number to meet the financial requirements. This project design was “backed into” when the number of students i.e. income was determined from the need to build swim stadium and performing stages on a sloping site at great cost. Reducing enrollment reduces the scope of the project and its visual impacts on the surrounding existing neighborhood, while still providing the school with the opportunity to build its critical structures.*

**Response 11.01**

The Draft EIR addresses the project as proposed by the applicant including all relevant programmatic and design information. Although, the Draft EIR identifies the applicant's objectives for the project, including achieving a 550-student program to support fixed costs and other funding considerations, it is not within the Lead Agency's responsibility or authority to determine the applicant's objectives. Furthermore, as stated on page VI-1 of the Draft EIR, “[a]lternatives are an important tool in the CEQA process to provide decisionmakers with comparative information about the impacts of a specific project, and how other possible projects could reduce those impacts, *even if some of the objectives of the project are not met.*” [emphasis added]. Thus, whether or not the “project design was backed into” as the comment contends, is secondary to the evaluation of environmental impacts of the program under consideration and an evaluation of other alternatives to provide a comparative basis for the decisionmakers to consider when they weigh project approval. While Alternative 3 (see pages VI-18 through VI-26 of the Draft EIR) may not achieve all of the objectives identified by the applicant, it was evaluated in the Draft EIR to assess whether the significant impacts of the proposed project could be reduced with another design.

Specifically, Alternative 3 (The Reduced Enrollment/Modified Project Alternative) was developed to address the significant, unmitigatable visual impact that would occur with the proposed project and involves both a modified project design as well as a reduced student enrollment. As discussed in the description of this alternative in Section VI, Alternatives to the Proposed Project (pages VI-18 through 19) of the Draft EIR, the maximum enrollment under Alternative 3 would be 365 students, which represents a reduction in enrollment of one-third as compared to the proposed project. The enrollment number under this alternative was not “backed into” based on the financial needs of the school, but rather, was determined by the available physical capacity of a modified campus that would have reduced building heights, reduced site coverage, decreased building massing, and increased open space. The alternative would also reduce the occupancy of the performing arts center from 600 to 400 and the athletic center from 500 to

400. The comment is correct in stating that allowing for a design that would require a reduction in enrollment would reduce the scope of the project and its visual impacts on the surrounding neighborhood. As stated on page VI-19 of the Draft EIR, "...by breaking up the uniform campus design and emphasizing individual structures with reduced building heights, the Reduced Enrollment/Modified Project Alternative would effectively reduce the significant impact of the proposed project resulting from a contrast between proposed and existing features." While the project's enrollment of 550 students was determined based on the school's financial and facilities needs over a sustained period of time, an alternative with one-third reduction in enrollment was evaluated in the Draft EIR even though it would not meet associated financial and facilities objectives. Ultimately, the decisionmakers must weigh the merits of both the proposed project and feasible alternatives, and fully consider the environmental impacts as analyzed in the Draft EIR, in their determination to approve the project.

**Comment 11.02**

*Construction Operation Mitigation Measures IV.B-5 & B-6 does not define the haul route that will be used to take 19,800 cubic yards of dirt from the site. This route needs to be identified at this stage of public investigation as this project does not go through the subdivision process: the impact of dirt-hauling through a community is enormously disruptive, especially since, in this case, there will be several stages of construction that could continue off and on for years. Identification of a haul route is one of the most important functions of the EIR as proven in case law from the City of Los Angeles history.*

**Response 11.02**

As discussed in Response Nos. 2.04 and 5.03, it is somewhat speculative to identify an exact haul route at this point in the approval process, as the specific destination of the export material will not be known with certainty until the haul route application is filed (which typically does not happen until just before construction commences) and receptor sites that are available at that particular time can be identified. However, it is assumed that, locally, haul trucks would travel from the site via Rinaldi Street to De Soto Avenue north to the SR-118 freeway on- and off-ramps, which are located approximately 0.6 mile northwest of the site. Thus, haul trucks would avoid residential streets in the vicinity of the proposed project, thereby minimizing exposure and disruption to residents in the community. A description of this local haul route has been added to Section IV.J, Transportation and Circulation of the Draft EIR (see Response 2.04 and Correction and Addition No. II-9 in Section II of this Final EIR).

**Comment 11.03**

*Transportation/Signal and Street Improvements IVJ-4 The Deer Lake Ranch Project, for which "the applicant is solely responsible for negotiating the term..." etc. is not feasible. The Deer Lake Project is in the County of Los Angeles; its conditions for subdivision and traffic improvements have been finalized by the County Board of Supervisors with NO reference whatsoever to Sierra Canyon School, its approval process of Environmental Review, or accountability to the City of Los Angeles for this particular improvement. It is inappropriate to tie this mitigation to the County project that makes no mention of negotiating with Sierra Canyon School in its recorded CUP.*

### Response 11.03

Pursuant to Mitigation Measure IV.J-4, the Sierra Canyon Secondary School project would negotiate with the Deer Lake Ranch project to assume a portion of the responsibility and cost for improvements to the intersection of Chatsworth Street and De Soto Avenue. While the Deer Lake Ranch project has its approvals in place and is not required to negotiate with the project applicant, the project applicant is required by the City to negotiate with representatives from that project. Without such negotiations, the Deer Lake Ranch project will be required to implement and assume the entire cost of the intersection improvements. However, since the capacity increase resulting from these improvements is sufficient to mitigate potential traffic impacts from both the Deer Lake Ranch project and the Sierra Canyon Secondary School project, it is beneficial to both projects to share the improvement costs and responsibility. This is not an unusual practice in the City of Los Angeles. Furthermore, as the Deer Lake Ranch project had no way of knowing the specific intersection impacts that would result from the Sierra Canyon Secondary School project, it would have been impossible for them to make reference to the school when developing mitigation. Thus, it is the subsequent project (e.g., the proposed project) that must reference to the original project. There is typically no reason not to share mitigation, as it is a benefit to both projects, the City, and the community.

As the measure is included as mitigation (and hence, a condition of project approval), the school cannot move forward without an agreement in place. However, it should be noted that there are rare circumstances where an agreement cannot be negotiated, and in such a situation, LADOT has the final discretion to identify another improvement of equal mitigation benefit and similarly require such improvement as a condition of project approval.

### Comment 11.04

*Project Description has a significant flaw: the Secondary School has continually testified in front of the Chatsworth Neighborhood Council, published significant amounts of school literature and recorded documents with the City of Los Angeles that this site will contain grades 9, 10, 11, and 12. Yet, page II-1 state "...could eventually include grades 7 and 8 as well...". How can an EIR on grades 9 through 12 make findings when the school actually plan to add grades from a middle school not disclosed in the above-mentioned publicity? The project is not being truthfully described or presented. Whether the enrollment numbers stay the same, the structure of the project does not match findings for the stated 9 through 12 grade school.*

### Response 11.04

Independent 9-12 schools have become a rarity both regionally and nationally over the years by adding 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades in order to stay competitive. While it is the intent of the school to begin with a high school program, many schools have discovered that the breadth of a secondary (i.e., Grades 7 through 12) program better serves the athletic and academic opportunities for their students and for the school admissions goals. Therefore, it is the intent of the school to leave this option open for future consideration. As stated on page II-1 of the Draft EIR, "...whether the school operates as a high school or as a secondary school that includes grades 7 and 8, the maximum enrollment would not exceed 550 students." Thus, the potential addition of grades 7 and 8 would neither affect the overall enrollment nor the operation characteristics of the school. Furthermore, no physical elements of the project would change and the environmental analyses included in the Draft EIR would remain entirely applicable, as user-driven impacts are tied to overall enrollment, not the breakdown of grades, and the physical characteristics would be unaffected. Finally, it should be noted that no plans to add

grades 7 and 8 are currently in place for the project and the EIR nevertheless fully discloses the addition of these grades as an eventual possibility.

**Comment 11.05**

*In addition, the description of the buildings and their uses on page II-6 prove that the minimum City requirements for parking spaces is not only inadequate and unrealistic; it shows no study or thought has been really put towards mitigating the traffic and parking issue that the school will generate.*

**Response 11.05**

Traffic and parking impacts associated with the project are analyzed in Section IV.J, Transportation and Circulation of the Draft EIR. This section is based on a traffic study prepared by Crain & Associates that is included as Appendix I of the Draft EIR. This traffic study was prepared under the direction, and to the satisfaction of, LADOT and utilizes LADOT-established base assumptions, technical methodologies, geographic coverage, and significance thresholds. As concluded by the study and discussed in Section IV.J, the mitigation measures proposed on pages IV.J-30 through IV.J-34 would result in improved conditions at all of the studied intersections as compared to future conditions without the project, and no significant impacts to the local and regional freeway system would occur. Thus, as illustrated in Table IV.J-15 (page IV.J-35) of the Draft EIR, all project-related traffic impacts would be mitigated to less than significant levels.

See Response to Comment Nos. 5.04, 8.02 and 10.26 regarding parking. The school would provide adequate parking to meet the requirements of the City of Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code, which is based on maximum seating capacity. Thus, assuming maximum site occupancy of 1,180 people, a total of 236 on-site parking spaces are proposed. This amount of parking would be adequate to meet the expected demands of a typical school day. As addressed by Response to Comment No. 5.04, parking would also exceed anticipated demand based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Parking Generation 3rd edition (2003) for a high school (both private and public) resulting in a minimum of 62 surplus spaces. Additionally, should the school eventually add 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades, the number of junior and senior drivers (and associated parking demand) would decrease. Since the proposed project is a private school, a great amount of control can be exercised over the student parking and driving behavior. As limited parking would be made available to students, most students will be dropped off and picked up by parents. Permits will be provided to eligible drivers to park at the school, thereby controlling the number of student drivers and, subsequently, the number of parking spaces necessary to accommodate these drivers. Additionally, as described by Mitigation Measure IV.J-1 and as revised by Correction and Addition No. IV.J-8, “the TDM plan would only allow junior and senior students to drive when accompanied by one other student (two-student carpools)”. Parking permits would not be issued for students who wouldn’t carpool and would be limited to junior and senior drivers. The arrivals and departures of students will be monitored by school personnel through random vehicle checks. If school personnel determine that a student is parking on the campus who is not carpooling, the student will have their parking permit revoked and the permit will not be reinstated until the student complies with the carpooling mandate. Thus, adequate on-site parking would be provided for day-to-day school activities.

No additional parking was determined necessary by LADOT in their review of the project traffic study. However, periodic special events at the school could generate a parking demand in

excess of on-site capacity. As stated on Page IV.J-29 of the Draft EIR, in such cases, "...the project would provide for additional special event parking (for graduation, open houses, etc.) at off-site locations, with shuttle transport offered to and from the site when special events are held, if needed." Additional overflow parking would also be available along Rinaldi Street, adjacent to the project. Furthermore, in response to this comment, and other comments concerning parking, additional mitigation has been added to this Final EIR that would require the school to prohibit any parking on residential streets and that would provide an on-site Parking Management Program (refer to Correction and Addition Nos. IV.J-11 through 13).

In the event of overflow parking, the school would provide shuttle service from local parks upon permit, or other off-site locations. Possible locations include churches in the Chatsworth area that have indicated to the school a willingness to accommodate overflow parking that have accommodated event parking for the elementary school. Parking would be subject to any conflicts and church approval at the time, if necessary. Church sites typically have 75 to 250 spaces from which buses could shuttle back and forth to the Campus and generally are able to rent their parking spaces for such uses on a case-by-case basis (refer to Attachment A of Section III, Responses to Written Comments of this Final EIR, which includes a letter from a local church indicating their willingness to allow the applicant to rent parking spaces, if and when needed for special events at the Sierra Canyon Secondary School campus).

**Comment 11.06**

*The scheme described as mitigation Measure TDM has the APPLICANT conducting it's own monitoring program; certainly, this does not encourage honesty, objectivity, or the possibility of an oversight committee not connected to the school that can assure the surrounding community that some honesty is present during the study periods. The TDM plan referred to at the elementary and middle school is not effective as the DEIR claims. One only has to observe the long lines of illegally parked and idling cars awaiting entry into the school for pick-up and drop-off of students to see that congestion for hours is an everyday occurrence which the school cannot mitigate because of the increased enrollment that has occurred (illegally) through much of its existence.*

**Response 11.06**

It is common practice for a project applicant to be responsible for conducting its own TDM monitoring program. However, the school will be accountable to LADOT for their TDM plan and subsequent monitoring activities. The vehicle counts will be conducted by the school or under contract but will be monitored and reviewed by LADOT as to their accuracy and effectiveness. Any findings for compliance or restrictions due to noncompliance will come out of LADOT's evaluation program, which is entirely objective. While measures similar to those included in the elementary/middle school TDM program will be adopted by the secondary school, such measures would be expanded and/or modified, as appropriate, to take into account the older student population. Additionally, this Final EIR includes a new mitigation measure to implement a Parking Management Program (see Correction and Addition No. IV.J-13) that would prevent excess queuing. Under this program:

"...[f]aculty and staff shall be assigned to specific parking areas and/or spaces based on their typical scheduled arrival and departure times in order to minimize overlap of their ingress and egress with vehicle queues associated with student drop-off and pick-up process. Parents shall be informed through the

Student/Parent Handbook where visitor parking is located, as shall visitors upon their arrival to the campus by a driveway attendant.

Also, refer to the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included as Section IV of this Final EIR for more information regarding the reporting and monitoring requirements applicable to this mitigation measure. Also, unlike the existing elementary and middle school, the proposed project will have more than sufficient on-site queuing space to ensure that cars will not be backed up on to Rinaldi Street during morning drop-off and afternoon pick-up periods.

**Comment 11.07**

*Hence, the major points of this paper come into focus as I, by the use of simple addition, calculate that each and every parking space (236 total) will be occupied every day, all day by staff and students. Any visitor, or if ANY event takes place at any of the numerous planned venues, i.e., swim, performing arts, athletics, or a parent/teacher meeting, all the visitors will have to find off-site parking. During presentation of the DEIR to the Chatsworth Neighborhood Council, the applicant stated that the overflow of traffic generated everyday and on event days (and nights) would find "satellite hub parking" and be bused to the school by private carriers. The applicant could not identify these hub sites; indeed, no research had been done to locate and explore the feasibility of such mitigation measure to the obvious impact of gridlock in the neighborhood during school activity.*

*The DEIR does not address the immediate impacts of the proposal to the neighborhood streets as Rinaldi will be signed "No Parking", and there is no ancillary parking on campus. Hearing the ambitious schedule of events this school proposes it is of immediate concern that the City Planning Department not pass over as acceptable the minimum space requirement for the school to meet; it is an illogical number that will burden the neighborhoods with a permanent impact that the school has given no thought. Mitigation either requires immediate identification and proof of availability throughout the school year for hub parking (probably in excess of 500 to 800 cars) and the routes the private transportation will use, as well as all the air quality and traffic impacts inherent to the mitigation. This part of the Sierra Canyon Secondary School Plan is as much an integral part of the application as any of the buildings, landscaping, or geology study. Without addressing this issue the school must consider downsizing it's scope of operation, it's student and teacher/staff size, and/or acquiring more land for parking at all times.*

**Response 11.07**

See Response to Comment No. 11.05. As stated in that response, parking would be adequate to meet the expected demands of a typical school day and no parking deficit was identified by LADOT in their review of the project traffic study. Parking would be sufficient to meet staff, administrator, maintenance, visitor, and limited student driver needs. Additionally, current street improvement plans for Rinaldi Street indicate that parking will be available on both sides of Rinaldi Street adjacent to the school (despite the comment's assertion to the contrary). Additionally, off-site parking for special events, and any associated effects, were discussed in the Draft EIR. Pages IV.J-28 and 29 of the Draft EIR states that such events "would generally occur in the evenings, after normal class times, and following the PM peak hour of traffic on Rinaldi Street and other streets in the project area. Thus, conditions on these roadways will have returned to good levels of service at the time of the special events, and no traffic impacts are anticipated due to a majority of the school events. The exception would be a maximum of five events per year, which may start during the PM peak hour. Any event of this nature could degrade the evening peak hour traffic conditions for attendees accessing the site but would be

temporary in nature and occur no more than five times per year. The school will provide adequate management of parking by providing access information to guests and offering off-site parking with shuttles as necessary.” As stated on Page IV.J-29 of the Draft EIR, “...the project would provide for additional special event parking (for graduation, open houses, etc.) at off-site locations, with shuttle transport offered to and from the site when special events are held, if needed.” Furthermore, as stated, additional overflow parking would also be available along Rinaldi Street, adjacent to the project. In the event of the need for overflow parking, the school would provide shuttle service to and from local parks upon permit, or other off-site locations including churches that have provided event parking for the elementary school. Church sites typically have 75 to 250 spaces from which buses could shuttle back and forth to the Campus and generally are able to rent their parking spaces for such uses on a case-by-case basis (refer to Attachment A of Section III, Responses to Written Comments of this Final EIR, which includes a letter from a local church indicating their willingness to allow the applicant to rent parking spaces, if and when needed for special events at the Sierra Canyon Secondary School campus).

With respect to regional emissions, the Draft EIR analyzed regional air quality impacts associated with 984 daily vehicle trips. As shown in Table IV.B-6 of the Draft EIR, the 984 daily vehicle trips generated by the proposed school would result in criteria pollutant emissions of 16 pounds per day (ppd) of ROG, 14 ppd of NO<sub>x</sub>, 98 ppd of CO, less-than-one ppd of SO<sub>x</sub>, and nine ppd of PM<sub>10</sub>. These emissions are well below the SCAQMD significance thresholds of 55 ppd of ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>, 550 ppd of CO, and 150 ppd of SO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> (if daily vehicle trips were to double, the proposed project would still be below the SCAQMD thresholds). Should a maximum of 250 off-site parking spaces be required during special events (highly unlikely with multiple occupant vehicles) an additional 500 total non-peak trips would occur (250 trips inbound and 250 trips outbound), which would not cause criteria pollutant emissions to exceed daily SCAQMD significance thresholds.

With respect to localized CO concentrations, the Draft EIR estimated CO concentrations at roadway intersections surrounding the project site based on the addition of 506 project-related AM peak hour vehicle trips. The CO hotspot analysis in the Draft EIR found that the addition of 506 AM peak hour vehicle trips on roadways surrounding the project site would incrementally increase CO concentrations by a maximum of 0.2 parts per million (ppm) and 0.1 ppm during the one-hour and eight-hour period, respectively (see Table IV.B-7 and pages IV.B-14 through 17 of the Draft EIR). Assuming that 500 vehicle trips (250 inbound and 250 outbound) could be generated by parking off-site, they would contribute to less traffic on roadways within that localized area than the 506 AM peak hour trips traveling to and from the proposed school. Additionally, the 250 inbound or outbound trips would be generated in the early evenings when roadway conditions in the area have returned to good levels of service. Thus, it is anticipated that 250 pre- and post-event trips from off-site parking would contribute to less than 0.2 ppm and less than 0.1 ppm of the overall CO concentration at roadways surrounding that location during the one-hour and eight-hour period, respectively.

Data recorded at the nearest monitoring station (Reseda monitoring station) indicates that the area has not violated the State CO standards in the past three years. As such, it is not likely that the streets surrounding an off-site parking location would violate the State CO standards even when an additional 250 trips are traveling on roadways in that immediate area. Even if the streets surrounding off-site parking exceeded State CO standards, an incremental increase of less than 0.2 ppm during the one-hour period and less than 0.1 ppm during the eight-hour period (based on 506 AM peak hour trips with the proposed project - increases would be lower with 250 non-peak hour trips from off-site parking) would be less than the measurable increase

of one ppm and 0.45 ppm for the one- and eight-hour period, respectively, and would not exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds. As such, off-site parking would not be expected to adversely affect localized air quality along area roadways. The comment's concerns regarding special event parking and any associated impacts are still noted for the record and will be forwarded on to the decisionmakers for their consideration.

**Comment 11.08**

*The Draft Environmental Impact Report is a document used to identify and mitigate, if possible, issues before a proposed project becomes a burden to the community and City agencies. The above impacts I have cited are not minor; have not been mitigated; and therefore need to be looked into as soon as possible, and not left to the Conditional Use process to sort through.*

*Thank you for your attention to these matters.*

**Response 11.08**

Refer to Response Nos. 11.01 through 11.07. The comments are noted and will be forwarded to the decisionmakers for their consideration.