
ERRATA #2 TO THE FINAL EIR

INTRODUCTION

The City of Los Angeles (City) has prepared this Errata to provide clarifications to the proposed 6433 La Tuna Canyon Road Project (the Project). Specifically, this document comprises the second Errata to the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) and constitutes part of the Final EIR that will be considered by the decision makers prior to approving, approving with conditions, or disapproving the Project.

Following circulation of the Original Draft Environmental Impact Report (Original DEIR) and related Recirculated Portions of the Draft EIR (RP-DEIR) for public and agency review and comment, the Final EIR was prepared in accordance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines. The Final EIR was circulated to commenters, agencies and other interested parties on September 24, 2018.

Subsequent to circulation of the Final EIR, minor clarifications are proposed to help guide the decision-makers on this Project. In particular, the Original DEIR and Final EIR did not fully disclose the environmentally superior alternative to the Project. This Errata sheet helps to clarify this issue for the record.

Additionally, corrections to Final EIR Mitigation Measures are also listed below. These corrections do not alter the conclusions of the Draft EIR, RP-DEIRs, or the Final EIR. When applicable, the changes to the Final EIR are listed by the corresponding page number. Additions and corrections to the Final EIR are provided in underline and ~~strikeout text~~, (as shown) to indicate deletions and additions to the Final EIR, respectively.

CLARIFICATIONS

Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA requires that an EIR alternatives analysis include designation of an “environmentally superior” alternative. Based on the analysis presented in this section, Alternative 1: No Project would result in the greatest reduction in Project impacts and would be the environmentally superior alternative. However, CEQA also requires that if the environmentally superior alternative is the “No Project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives (*CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6[e][2]).

To demonstrate the differences between alternatives, Table 1, below, shows the conclusions of the impact categories for each alternative. Several impact categories (for example: geology and soils) are “site dependent” and would occur under any reasonable development of the Project Site. Other impact categories (for example: Noise and Transportation/Traffic) are “project-specific” (related to project size and land use) and could be reduced/avoided by the alternatives that generally have less development. Thus, for these impact areas, the table indicates the degree (less, greater, or similar) to which the impact would occur under the Alternatives, as compared to the Project.

As shown in Table 1, the level of significant impacts under the Project would be similar to the Alternatives presented with implementation of the same Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features (PDFs), as identified in this Original DEIR for the Project. The severity of the impacts, however, fluctuates between the Project and each Alternative presented.

Alternative 6(a) (Reduced Walkable Village Alternative) was selected as the Environmentally Superior Alternative since this alternative would reduce potentially significant impacts of the Project (with mitigation) to less than significant levels. In particular, Alternative 6(a) would reduce potential traffic impacts due to a reduction in total number of proposed residential units and would reduce potential aesthetic impacts due to its orientation and lower overall grade level, when compared to the Project. Also, potential Project impacts would be reduced under this Alternative as it relates to Cultural Resources, since it focuses all development on the Project Site outside of the designated Historic Cultural Monument (HCM) area. Alternative 6(a) would also meet the Project Objectives to the same degree as either the Project or other Alternatives, as outlined below:

- To provide housing for local and area residents to meet existing and future needs of those desiring to live in the northeast San Fernando Valley and to help alleviate the substantial housing shortage in the City.
- To provide greater regional housing opportunities for homebuyers and assist in satisfying the housing needs for the region.
- To invigorate the local economy by providing employment and business opportunities associated with the construction, use, and occupancy of the Proposed Project.
- To locate the residential development in proximity to existing infrastructure and services where possible.
- To provide safe and efficient streets in the residential development with convenient connections to adjoining arterials and freeways, while minimizing traffic impacts on existing residential neighborhoods.

MINOR CORRECTIONS

1. Traffic Mitigation

In review of the traffic mitigation measures in the RP-DEIR, and based on the LADOT November 2, 2018, assessment letter, the following changes are made to ensure consistency between the environmental document and the City's final traffic assessment:

- N-1 La Tuna Canyon Road:** Provide a ~~31~~-foot dedication and any necessary sidewalk easements along the entire project frontage on La Tuna Canyon Road to bring the total right-of-way and sidewalk to the Avenue II Secondary Highway standard required by the LA Mobility Plan General Plan.

N-2 Tujunga Canyon Boulevard: Provide a variable width dedication to complete a ~~4352~~-foot half right-of-way and a variable width widening and improvement to complete a ~~2840~~-foot half roadway and a ~~1542~~-foot sidewalk along the entire Project frontage on Tujunga Canyon Boulevard to the Avenue II standard required by the LA Mobility Plan.

CONCLUSION

The City has prepared the Errata and has determined that it does not change any of the findings or conclusions of the Final EIR and does not constitute significant new information. The clarification of the identified environmentally superior alternative and correction to existing mitigation measures do not constitute a substantial revision such that a Supplemental/Subsequent EIR need be prepared, as set forth in CEQA Guidelines 15163. The change constitutes updated information which makes insignificant corrections and clarifications to the Final EIR and does not introduce new information that was not known previously, and recirculation is not required.¹ There would be no new significant impacts or new mitigation measures required as a result of the Project.

¹ State CEQA Guidelines 15163

Table 1

Impact Area	Proposed Project Impact with Mitigation	Alternative 1 No Project (No Construction)	Alternative 2: All Residential Townhomes	Alternative 3: Mixed Use Residential and Retail	Alternative 4: Mixed Use Residential/ Retail/Office	Alternative 5: Existing Zoning/Equestrian Estates	Alternative 6: Walkable Village	Alternative 6(a): Reduced Walkable Village
Aesthetics Aesthetics/Views Light and Glare	Significant L-T-S	LESS LESS	LESS LESS	LESS GREATER	LESS GREATER	SIMILAR SIMILAR	LESS LESS	LESS LESS
Air Quality Construction Operational	L-T-S L-T-S	LESS LESS	LESS LESS	LESS GREATER	LESS GREATER	SIMILAR LESS	LESS LESS	LESS LESS
Biological Resources Special Status Species Riparian/Wetland Habitat Trees	L-T-S L-T-S L-T-S	LESS LESS LESS	LESS LESS LESS	LESS LESS LESS	LESS LESS LESS	GREATER SIMILAR GREATER	LESS LESS LESS	LESS LESS LESS
Cultural Resources Historic Archaeological Paleontological	L-T-S L-T-S L-T-S	LESS LESS LESS	SIMILAR LESS LESS	SIMILAR LESS LESS	SIMILAR LESS LESS	GREATER GREATER GREATER	LESS LESS LESS	LESS LESS LESS
Geology and Soils Seismic Hazards Soils	L-T-S L-T-S	LESS LESS	LESS LESS	LESS LESS	LESS LESS	GREATER GREATER	LESS LESS	LESS LESS
Greenhouse Gas	--	--	--	--	--	L-T-S	L-T-S	L-T-S
Hazards	L-T-S	LESS	SIMILAR	SIMILAR	SIMILAR	SIMILAR	SIMILAR	SIMILAR
Hydrology Stormwater Runoff Stormwater Water Quality	L-T-S L-T-S	LESS LESS	SIMILAR SIMILAR	SIMILAR SIMILAR	SIMILAR SIMILAR	SIMILAR SIMILAR	SIMILAR SIMILAR	SIMILAR SIMILAR
Land Use Plan Consistency Community Division	L-T-S L-T-S	LESS LESS	SIMILAR SIMILAR	GREATER SIMILAR	GREATER SIMILAR	SIMILAR GREATER	SIMILAR SIMILAR	SIMILAR LESS
Noise Construction Operational	L-T-S L-T-S	LESS LESS	SIMILAR SIMILAR	SIMILAR SIMILAR	SIMILAR GREATER	SIMILAR SIMILAR	SIMILAR LESS	SIMILAR LESS

Table 1

Impact Area	Proposed Project Impact with Mitigation	Alternative 1 No Project (No Construction)	Alternative 2: All Residential Townhomes	Alternative 3: Mixed Use Residential and Retail	Alternative 4: Mixed Use Residential/Retail/Office	Alternative 5: Existing Zoning/Equestrian Estates	Alternative 6: Walkable Village	Alternative 6(a): Reduced Walkable Village
Population/Housing								
Population	L-T-S	LESS	SIMILAR	GREATER	SIMILAR	SIMILAR	LESS	LESS
Housing	L-T-S	LESS	SIMILAR	GREATER	SIMILAR	LESS	LESS	LESS
Public Services								
Fire Protection	L-T-S	LESS	GREATER	LESS	LESS	LESS	LESS	LESS
Police Protection	L-T-S	LESS	GREATER	GREATER	GREATER	LESS	LESS	LESS
Schools	L-T-S	LESS	GREATER	GREATER	LESS	LESS	LESS	LESS
Libraries	L-T-S	LESS	GREATER	GREATER	LESS	LESS	LESS	LESS
Recreation								
Park Facilities	Significant	LESS	LESS	LESS	LESS	GREATER	LESS	LESS
Transportation/Traffic								
Intersections	L-T-S	LESS	GREATER	GREATER	GREATER	LESS	SIMILAR	LESS
Parking	L-T-S	LESS	SIMILAR	SIMILAR	SIMILAR	LESS	SIMILAR	SIMILAR
Utilities								
Wastewater	L-T-S	LESS	LESS	LESS	LESS	LESS	LESS	LESS
Water	L-T-S	LESS	GREATER	GREATER	GREATER	LESS	LESS	LESS
Solid Waste	L-T-S	LESS	GREATER	GREATER	GREATER	LESS	LESS	LESS
Energy	--	--	--	--	--	L-T-S	L-T-S	L-T-S
<i>L-T-S = Less than significant impact</i>								