

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*