

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 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 7th and 8th 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.*