

COMMENT LETTER No. 29

James Campbell
4651 Galendo St.
Woodland Hills, CA 91364
August 4, 2001

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 29.1

I am writing to comment on the DEIR of the Hillcrest Christian School and Church West Campus Expansion Plan. I hope that the considerations I have discussed will be addressed before approval is granted to go ahead. I opposed the project as it now stands.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 29.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT 29.2

I Birds There is almost no mention of birds on p. 100 of the DEIR. There is no bird census nor baseline study to compare future bird populations against the present. At present there should be numerous potential bird nesting sites in existing trees even if no nests were seen. One feather from a burrowing owl was found on the West Campus. Since this species lives in a burrow it may well be living on the property though its presence would not be obvious. Any trees planted in the future may be helpful to birds but it will take several years before they are large enough to provide nesting sites for birds.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 29.2

The West Campus project site was previously surveyed by Ruiz and Reed ecologists during a preliminary field assessment in September 1998 to determine the biological value of the site and determine the scope of the required oak tree survey, later prepared by Teracor Resources. As a result of this assessment, it was determined that the site offered little to no biological value with the exception of the presence of oak trees on site. During this preliminary assessment staff ecologists noted the following bird species on site: mourning dove, rock dove, common sparrow, house finch, and California towhee. No sensitive species were observed incidentally during this site visit. As such, specific sensitive biological surveys were not warranted.

Furthermore, due to the residential nature of the project site and surrounding area, and the level of human disturbance on the site, (i.e., routine disking of vegetation for fire control measures), the presence of burrowing owl is low to non existent. For these reasons, and for the fact that no burrowing owls have been observed nesting (burrows) or foraging on the project site, sensitive species surveys are not warranted.

COMMENT 29.3

The tamarisk trees (probably Tamarix aphylla), erroneously listed as Casuarina equisetifolia (Horsetail Trees) (see p.1 of Tuckers Tree Works Letter in Technical Appendices and the 14th and 15th pages of the same letter where they are labeled as pines and multi pines) along the West Campus' north boundary, the south side of Ridgeway Rd. It may be necessary in such a case to build a the 20 foot retaining wall two or three feet further south.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 29.3

The commentator asserts the casuarina equisetifolia (horsetail trees) were improperly identified and their true identification is *Tamarix aphylla*. We believe the pine trees were correctly identified in the Draft EIR and Technical Appendices. Furthermore, from an ecological and landscape design perspective, *tamarix* or salt cedar trees are generally known as an undesirable and invasive species throughout the southwest. Tamarix trees have the effect of increasing the soil salinity once they become established. The presence of salt cedar in an area tends to increase the salinity of the soil and thus prevent the presence of many native species. Salt cedar trees also are undesirable in the southern California landscape because they consume more water than other xeric or "drought tolerant" species. As such, and for the fact that neither pine trees nor tamarisk trees are not protected under any state local or federal regulations or conservation plans, the point is moot.

Upon further review of the proposed site plan design, the applicant has modified this feature of the project in order to reduce grading excavation and cuts into the slope and allow approximately 22 trees to be retained in place. (See Topical Response No.1)

COMMENT 29.4

The owls, jays, finches, towhees and other common birds which inhabit this area may not be endangered species but their survival is still important and depends of preserving as much of the original vegetation as possible. See III Trees Below.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 29.4

Upon final buildout of the proposed project, the site will be substantially landscaped with over 118 replacement trees through out the parking area, the side yard along Shoshone and in the upper slope area above the proposed athletic field. The common bird species mentioned above are adaptable to the

human built environment and will continue to re-establish themselves within the project area once the landscape plans are realized.

COMMENT 29.5

II Grading and Air Quality Very little is said about grading the West Campus. No data is given on how many cubic yards are to be removed. Where this soil will be disposed of and the truck route to be taken.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 29.5

This data is disclosed in the geotechnical Section of the Draft EIR (See Section IV.D). The Initial Phase grading would require approximately 35,000 cubic yards (cy) of cut and 7,000 cy of fill with a total soil export of 28,000 cy. The final phase was reported to involve 62,000 cy of cut and 12,500 cy of fill with a soil export of 49,500 cy. In addition, the project applicant will be required to submit a grading plan to the City Building and Safety Engineer for review and approval. A designated haul route will be determined in consultation with the City Engineer as part of the standard grading plan review process.

COMMENT 29.6

Not enough data is given to enable one to determine an alternative way to design the campus with less severe grading or to evaluate other aspects of the plans on a more quantitative basis. For example, see DEIR p. 40 where a scale is lacking and some of the geological maps of the Technical Appendix which lack a legend or a scale or both.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 29.6

More than sufficient information is presented in the Draft EIR with regard to the proposed site plan and geotechnical maps to allow the Decision-Maker to make an informed decision about the project. While the site plans are conceptual and subject to minor modifications during the final approval phases of the site plan review, the detail in the architectural site plans are designed and depicted to scale. The original site plans, which were drawn to 1" = 30' scale, were reduced in size so they could be presented in the Draft EIR. The referenced map on page 40 is accurate and is legible in the format provided in the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 29.7

A neglected aspect of air pollution and soil grading is pathogenic fungi and possibly bacteria in the soil whose spores would be widely dispersed with the dust which results from grading despite the dust control measures proposed. Pathogens include Coccidioides immitus of valley fever notoriety, Aspergillus fumigatus, and possibly Histoplasma plasmolytum which has been found in AIDS patients

in Southern California. These are all fungi but there might conceivably be pathogenic soil bacteria. After the 1994 Northridge quake there was an increase in valley fever cases due to widespread soil disturbance.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 29.7

The air quality analysis includes an analysis of the five criteria pollutants in accordance with the rules and procedures outlined by the SCAQMD Air Quality Handbook (1995). The evaluation of various fungi and other airborne contaminants beyond those identified by the SCAQMD's standard reporting requirements would be excessive and unwarranted unless substantial evidence was provided that otherwise warrants additional evaluation. No such evidence is presented, thus this issue is not required to be addressed. It is acknowledged that broad occurrences of valley fever may have been invoked by the 1994 Northridge earthquake, when a rather large area within the greater San Fernando Valley and outlying areas was subject to severe (magnitude 7.2) ground disturbance. Typically, grading activities for construction projects on the scale of the proposed project (i.e., a total of approximately 5.5 acres) do not pose a threat to nearby residents or construction workers with regard to valley fever.

COMMENT 29.8

Particulate contamination from diesel engines is also not mentioned in the DEIR. Diesel particulates are well known as serious carcinogenic hazards due to their extremely small size which allows them to be carried far into the alveoli and air sacs of the lungs. With so much truck and tractor traffic required by the extensive grading, large amount of diesel particulate contamination will be inevitable in the surrounding air, to say nothing of pollutants already mentioned in the DEIR – CO, Nox, Ozone, etc.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 29.8

Diesel emissions and other pollutant emissions commonly associated with construction equipment were discussed and analyzed in the air quality assessment section of the Draft EIR. All emissions were analyzed in accordance with the SCAQMD and SCAB protocol. The daily construction related emissions for all 5 criteria pollutants were well below SCAQMD threshold levels. The reader is referred to Section IV.B, Air Quality, pages 89 and 90.

COMMENT 29.9

The acronyms ROC, p. 92 and ROG, p. 91 are not explained making it difficult for one to fully evaluate air pollution considerations.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 29.9

The acronym ROC stands for reactive organic compounds. Reactive organic compounds (ROC), are species of organic compounds that undergo photochemical reactions. ROCs are hydrocarbon emissions which combine with other atmospheric chemicals in the presence of sunlight to produce ozone, which is identified as a criteria pollutant. Since ozone is produced through this secondary reaction process, monitoring and regulation relative to ozone is actually accomplished through the monitoring and regulation of “ozone precursors”, such as ROC.

The acronym ROG stands for reactive organic gasses. ROG (Reactive Organic Gasses are reactive chemical gasses composed of hydrocarbons that may contribute to the formation of smog. Also sometimes referred to as Non-Methane Organic Compounds (NMOCs).

In South Coast Air Quality Management District documents, the inclusive term “reactive organic compounds” (ROC) is gradually replacing the separate terms reactive organic gasses (ROG), volatile organic compounds (VOC) and hydrocarbons (HC), except in cases where such separation is useful.

COMMENT 29.10

For the major reasons cited above the plans should be altered to reduce grading as much as possible.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 29.10

It should be noted that with respect to grading and air quality impacts, the project is far below the thresholds of significance that have been established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. As noted on page 91 of the Draft EIR, the project’s daily construction-related emissions for ROG, CO, PM₁₀, and SO_x, are 8%, 3%, 2% and 4% of the threshold emissions level. Construction related emissions for NO_x emissions were 86% of the threshold value. As such no significant impacts with regard to air quality will occur. Furthermore, the Draft EIR recommends additional dust and emission control techniques in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 403 to further reduce project emissions during the construction period.

COMMENT 29.11

III Trees – The misidentification of tamarisk trees has been mentioned under I Birds above. These tamarisks should be save, either all or in part, and interspersed with native trees such as Calif. Holly. (Photinia arbutifolia) and Elderberry (Sambucus sp.) which require no irrigation and help support native birds. By planting so many oaks and only two species of shade trees, Chinese Pistache and Southern Live Oak, in the lower area a semi-monoculture situation will be created which is detrimental for native birds and possibly one which could lead to problems of plant disease and pest control later, as monocultures often do. It would be better to intersperse some other shade trees, native species if possible.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 29.11

The oak trees that will be planted throughout the West Campus are required replacement trees mandated under the City’s Oak Tree Ordinance. It is estimated that 22 coast live oak trees will be planted as mitigation. The recommendation to intersperse California Holly and Elderberry trees as part of the remaining non-oak trees will be forwarded to the applicant and the project landscape architect. However, the Draft EIR identified Chinese Pistache and Bougainvillea Goldenraintree as a suitable and desirable tree for the project site. In addition, as discussed under the Topical Response 1 on page 26, modifications to the proposed retaining wall will leave intact approximately 22 mature trees in the northern portion of the project site. Thus, the proposed project site will not result in a monoculture situation that will be detrimental to the environment.

COMMENT LETTER No. 30

(Sent in Duplicate)

Alyce and Jim Caskey
11912 Shoshone Avenue
Granada Hills, CA 91344
August 5, 2001

RE: Draft EIR #99-0421-CU-ZV-ZAA

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 30.1

We are writing to express our opposition to the proposed expansion of the Hillcrest Christian School in Granada Hills. We are 14-year residents of the community who frequent Rinaldi St. on a daily basis to drive children to school and travel to and from work.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 30.1

The commentator's opposition to the proposed project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration.

COMMENT 30.2

The area around Rinaldi Street and Shoshone Avenue in this otherwise pastoral residential community is already saturated with at least 5 schools. Traffic congestion on Rinaldi, Shoshone, and nearby streets for much of the day and on Sunday morning has reached intolerable levels, posing a danger to motorists and pedestrians alike. Children are especially vulnerable. The eastbound left-turn lane for cars turning left from Rinaldi to Shoshone on a typical school morning is already extremely crowded. Our understanding is that traffic studies have been done while school was not in session. Moreover, in your notice of June 21, 2001, you mention 11 anticipated significant effects on the environment. The draft EIR, as submitted, does precious little to mitigate these effects.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 30.2

The presence of four other area schools within the project vicinity is noted and was taken into consideration with regard to the traffic impact analysis prepared for the proposed project. As discussed on page 203 of the Draft EIR, an observation and analysis of school-related traffic patterns was provided. The applicant has proposed a set of optional voluntary traffic improvement measures to further improve roadway circulation in the project vicinity. Please see the discussion under the subheading "Proposed Voluntary Improvements" on page 232 of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 30.3

Let's not destroy another neighborhood and additional open space. We urge the City of Los Angeles to deny the Hillcrest Christian School a conditional use permit, parking variance, zoning administration adjustment and oak tree permit. Please place this letter of objection concerning the Hillcrest Christian School Proposed Expansion into the official records of the County of Los Angeles. Forward copies to all applicable city and county departments, and keep us informed of any and all variations and notices regarding this matter.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 30.3

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for their consideration.

COMMENT LETTER No. 31

Ivor Cherry
11740 Shoshone Avenue
Granada Hills, CA 91344

Date: August 23, 2001, Received Sept 4, 2001

RE: Hillcrest Christian School Expansion at Shoshone & Rinaldi in Granada Hills EIR Case
Number: 99-0421(CUZ)(ZU)(YV)

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 31.1

I am writing this letter, to express my concern over the proposed expansion of the Hillcrest Christian School. As a long time resident of the area (over 25 years), I have seen this quiet unobtrusive neighborhood change. Where once Shoshone was a quiet street with horse trails, it has become a highly traveled thoroughfare. Traffic in the mornings and afternoons is non-stop, with parents taking their children to St. Euphrasia Church and school, and to Robert Frost Jr. High, and Hillcrest Christian School.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 31.1

The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration.

COMMENT 31.2

Additionally since Shoshone and Louise, are the only direct routes to Rinaldi from the homes north of Rinaldi, there is the added; traffic of people leaving for and coming home from work. This route has also become an alternate for commuters from Newhall and the Santa Clarita Valley, who do not want to use Balboa, or the 405 Freeway, (this was discovered after the Northridge Earthquake).

Adding an additional school structure at this site is only asking for an accident to happen. Currently east bound traffic on Rinaldi in the mornings is backed up to White Oak, with cars trying to make the left hand turn onto Shoshone, while traffic on Shoshone is often backed up to Flanders, with cars trying to go right and left on Rinaldi in addition the Hillcrest school already blocks traffic on Rinaldi going west to allow parents to debark their children.

As far as I know no traffic studies have been performed during the normal school year. I have seen electronic counters midway down Shoshone during the summer time and over weekends, but these would not account for daily, traffic.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 31.2

The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. With regard to the commentator's assertion that the traffic analysis did not conduct traffic counts during the school year, the commentator is incorrect. As discussed on page 203 of the Draft EIR:

“Automatic, 24-hour counts were conducted at six locations on two different weekdays. Counts were conducted on Tuesday, August 29, 2000 and Wednesday, September 13, 2000. On August 29, 2000, none of the four public and private schools in the neighborhood area were in session-Frost Middle School, St. Euphrasia School, Hillcrest Christian School and Rinaldi Adult School. On September 13, 2000, all four schools were in regular session.”

Later, page 206 of the Draft EIR noted:

“Turning movement traffic counts for the study intersections were conducted during the weeks of September 11, 18 and 25, 2000 after all local area schools were in session for the fall schedule. Public and private schools in the area were in session during the period the traffic counts.”

COMMENT 31.3

The proposed site is also on an earthquake fault. When the city was going to move Rinaldi St School from its present site to the corner of Shoshone and Mayerling, that idea was rejected because of this same fault. If it is not safe for a Public School, what exempts a private school?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 31.3

This issue was thoroughly addressed in the Draft EIR. See Section IV.D, beginning on page 111 of the Draft EIR. A Fault Rupture Hazard Investigation for the Proposed Hillcrest Christian School Expansion Project, Hillcrest Christian School, Lots 1 & 2, Tract 10422 Northwest Corner of Rinaldi Street and Shoshone Avenue Granada Hills California, was prepared by GeoSystems dated September 29, 2000. The entire Fault Rupture Hazard Investigation report is included in Appendix D to the Draft EIR.

Section IV.D of the Draft EIR addresses the project's compliance with the Private Schools Building Safety Act of 1986 (i.e., California Education Code Section 17320-17336), which provides that children attending private schools be afforded life safety protection similar to that of children attending public schools. See page 116 of the Draft EIR.

Furthermore, as documented on page 125 of the Draft EIR, no evidence of active faulting was observed during field exploration. The Fault Rupture Hazard Investigation concluded that an active trace or

potentially active strand of the Mission Hills fault, or any other fault, does not lie between the site's southern property line and 50-feet north of the proposed building limits. As such, no setback restriction zones with regard to active faults are applicable to the proposed project site.

COMMENT 31.4

From my understanding this campus will share its facilities with the existing school. This means that students will be crossing an extremely busy street. Although there is a light at the corner, trying to escort twenty to thirty preteens across this juncture would be extremely taxing. Does the school intend to build an overpass sometime in the future to eliminate this hazard?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 31.4

A pedestrian overpass over Shoshone Avenue is not proposed as part of the proposed project. Upon completion of the final phase of the proposed project, the two campuses are proposed to function as separate school sites. Both campuses will be served by their own cafeteria, play area, gymnasium, library, and administrative offices. While some special events may involve students from one campus visiting the opposite campus, that would not be a part of normal day to day operations. Such occurrences would be limited to special assemblies and similar events held in the auditorium. See Topical Response 5, Student Parking Plan on page 31.

Section IV.J.1, Traffic of the Draft EIR addresses potential impacts associated with increased student activity at the corner of Shoshone Avenue and Rinaldi Street. As stated in the Draft EIR, Hillcrest School will incorporate pedestrian safety measures into their standard daily operating procedures. These safety measures are addressed on pages 230 and 231 of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 31.5

What will the environmental impact be, with the increase of traffic?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 31.5

Traffic impacts are discussed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. As concluded in the project traffic study, traffic impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of the required traffic mitigation measures.

COMMENT 31.6

Already the school has begun to remove trees from the vacant lots on the west side of Shoshone. I do not know whether this was done with a permit and an environmental impact study but in any case the damage has already been done.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 31.6

The Oak Tree Report, prepared by Teracor Resources in 1999, documented that eight of the ten oak trees were excessively cut to the soil profile by brush removal crews during the 1998 weed clearance season. The eight removals resulted in substantially reduced scores in aesthetic appearance, health and overall condition. As these trees have begun to crown sprout and were of ordinance size prior to being cut, they were considered protected under the ordinance and they will be replaced at a 2:1 ratio. (See page 100 of the Draft EIR). As these trees were trimmed without an oak tree permit, they were noted in the Draft EIR as being impacted by the proposed project and will be mitigated in accordance with the City's Oak Tree Ordinance.

COMMENT 31.7

Parking in this area has also become a problem. Cars are already parking on Shoshone across from the existing school, and with the recently built new homes, this makes it even harder for parents coming to Hillcrest for conferences to find a convenient place to park except in front of someone's home.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 31.7

The parking impacts of the project are discussed in Section IV.J.2 of the Draft EIR. The project will include 124 space parking lot on the West Campus and will include the use of an overflow parking lot, to be made available on an as need basis, on the East Campus play field. The use of this overflow parking lot will provide an additional 130 parking spaces during peak parking demand times for special events.

COMMENT 31.8

As a member of the Shoshone Neighborhood Preservation Association, I would like to have this letter included as a LETTER OF OBJECTION re: Hillcrest Christian School Proposed Expansion west of Shoshone at Rinaldi, in Granada Hills into the official records of the County of Los Angeles. I would also like to be informed of any and all variations and notices concerning this proposal. When such number is assigned, please notify me so that any future correspondence will contain said number for reference.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 31.8

The commentator's objection to the project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. The commentator will be added to the project mailing list and will be notified of any and all future variations and notices concerning this proposal.

COMMENT 31.9

The reason that I am asking to be informed is because all other expansions of the school were done without notification to the neighbors. My home is less than a tenth of a mile from their property line, and either they or the city should have notified me.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 31.9

Proper notification of the project and environmental review process (i.e., Notice of Preparation and Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR) was provided in accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines. The availability of the Draft EIR was provided on the City's internet site, mailed to the residents and homeowners within a 500-foot radius of the proposed project, published in the Los Angeles Times, and posted on site. All procedural requirements of CEQA have been met. The commentator was not listed on the project's mailing list, but will be added to the project mailing list and will be notified of any and all future variations and notices concerning this proposal.

COMMENT LETTER No. 32

(Sent in Duplicate)

Adrienne Chapman
11975 Vara Place
Granada Hills, CA 91344
August 3, 2001

RE: Draft EIR #99-0421-CU-ZV-ZM

Dear Mr. Liao:

Comment 32.1

We are writing to express our opposition to the proposed expansion of the Hillcrest Christian School in Granada Hills. We are 6-year residents of the community who frequent the Shoshone and Rinaldi intersection on a daily basis. It is our main source of egress and ingress from our home.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 32.1

The commentator's opposition to the proposed project is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration.

COMMENT 32.2

The area around Rinaldi Street and Shoshone Avenue in this otherwise countrified residential community is already saturated with eight schools and four religious institutions. Traffic congestion on Rinaldi, Shoshone, and nearby streets for much of the day and on Sunday morning has reached intolerable levels. There are 39 more homes being built behind us, which will already add to the traffic and congestion. The heavy traffic poses a danger to motorists and pedestrians alike.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 32.2

This comment will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. It should be noted that four schools were identified as having the potential to contribute to a.m. and p.m. peak hour traffic congestion. The four public and private schools in the neighborhood area were identified as Frost Middle School, St. Euphrasia School, Hillcrest Christian School and Rinaldi Adult School.

The 39-homes the commentator is referring to is believed to be the 59-unit residential subdivision called Bridlewood Estates. This development was identified as a related project and is analyzed as part of the cumulative impacts. See Table III.F-1, Related Project List, on page 55 of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 32.3

Children and elderly persons are especially vulnerable. If you had undertaken a traffic study, we are sure you would agree with the above statements.

Moreover, in your notice of June 21, 2001, you mention 11 anticipated significant effects on the environment. The draft EIR does very little, if anything, to mitigate said effects.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 32.3

The project's impacts with regard to each of the eleven environmental issue areas identified previously in the NOP were analyzed in the Draft EIR. Mitigation measures were recommended to reduce the project's impacts for each issue area. Please see the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Section of this Final EIR.

COMMENT 32.4

We are especially concerned about a number of factors:

1. Adding to the congestion and traffic, by substantially increasing the number of people going to and from Hillcrest, at the only main traffic artery for hundreds of homes.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 32.4

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. Traffic impacts are addressed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. As discussed in the EIR, all of the project's traffic impacts can be mitigated to a level that is less than significant with implementation of required mitigation measures.

COMMENT 32.5

2. The danger to children and their families crossing Shoshone (Sic) to go between campuses.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 32.5

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. Impacts with regard to pedestrian safety are addressed in Section IV.J.1, Traffic, of the Draft EIR. As discussed in the EIR, all of the project's impacts with regard to pedestrian safety can be mitigated to a level that is less than significant with implementation of required mitigation measures.

COMMENT 32.6

3. The utter lack of adequate parking proposed. It is completely unreasonable to waive the number of parking places normally required. There is a reason there is a minimum number of parking places required. People attending Hillcrest will have no choice but to park in the surrounding neighborhood, causing more congestion to those of us who live in the area.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 32.6

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. Parking impacts are addressed in Section IV.J.2, Parking, of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR concluded that because the demand for parking during special events may exceed the available on-site parking capacity, a significant parking impact could occur. The Draft EIR further concluded a significant and unavoidable parking impact may occur as a result of school-related special events on an occasional basis throughout the school year.

COMMENT 32.7

4. Noise pollution. We lived more than 5 blocks away from Granada Hill High School. We picked our present home, in order to avoid the noise pollution of a high school with a marching band, sporting events, etc. It is not right to allow the destruction of our peace and quiet enjoyment of home. That is what you are proposing to do.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 32.7

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. Noise impacts are addressed in Section IV.H, Noise, of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 32.8

5. It is horrible for you allow Hillcrest to destroy Oak trees. We have far too few mature oak trees left.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 32.8

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. All oak trees will be mitigated to less than significant levels as they will be replaced at a ratio of 2:1 in accordance with the City's Oak Tree Ordinance. Impacts to oak trees are addressed in Section IV.C of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 32.9

Please do not destroy our neighborhood and loose what little open space is left. They should be converting the open land to a park for all to enjoy.

We urge the City of Los Angeles to deny the Hillcrest Christian School a conditional use permit, parking variance, zoning administration adjustment and oak tree permit. Please place this letter of objection concerning the Hillcrest Christian School Proposed Expansion into the official records of the County of Los Angeles. Forward copies to all applicable city and county departments, and keep us informed of any and all variations and notices regarding this matter.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 32.9

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. The commentator will be added to the project's mailing list and will be kept informed of all future notices pertaining to the proposed project. It should be noted that the proposed project is consistent with the underlying zoning for the property, as schools are conditionally permitted uses in the A1-1 Zone. The project site is not zoned or designated as open space or for public recreational uses.

COMMENT LETTER No. 33

Ming Li Chin
9534 Saloma Ave.
North Hills, CA 91343
July 25, 2001

Ref: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Jimmy Liao,

COMMENT 33.1

As a parent of a student of Hillcrest Christian School, I would like to express my support for the proposed project of the Case #CPC 2001-2608 at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, CA 91344.

Furthermore, we have heard that the draft of the EIR has been completed and we believe that the project must proceed to establish a new facility for quality education in the north end of the San Fernando Valley. Hillcrest has been on good terms as a neighbor by working with the community to resolve problems. Also, the traffic mitigation endorsed will also improve the traffic flow of cars during the pick up and drop off times.

The inhabitants of this area of our community continue to develop and our motive is that Hillcrest Christian School will aid in meeting this important need This school is a great advantage to the area because of the fine students that attend.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 33.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 34

Frank and Lesley Clack
8631 Lurline Avenue
Winnetka, CA 91306-1224
July 30, 2001

Ref: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 34.1

We are parents of a student entering 9th grade at Hillcrest Christian School. We would like to voice our support of the proposed expansion project referenced above.

We understand that the draft EIR is completed, and the next steps need to be taken in order to get the expansion underway. Hillcrest is successfully serving hundreds of families now, but could surpass that by providing excellent education to many, many more families throughout the San Fernando Valley. The school does everything it can to ensure that its student body family complies with all traffic laws, and they constantly reinforce the ideas of being a good example to all within the immediate vicinity.

Please consider our letter to be a vote of support for this project. Thank you.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 34.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 35

Stanley and Inger Colton
11532 Encino Avenue
Granada Hills, CA 91344
July 29, 2001

Subject: Reference Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU
Hillcrest Christian School

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 35.1

As a homeowner and neighbor (and grandparent of a former student), I whole heartedly support the proposed project #CPC 2001 - 2608 CU, the expansion plans for Hillcrest Christian School at 17351 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, California

With the draft Environmental Impact Report completed, I believe the said project must move forward to fill a need for quality education in this area of the San Fernando Valley. Hillcrest has been a very considerate and good neighbor of all the homeowners in the area, and the added campus area will definitely be a major improvement to the older real estate (sic) condition of what currently exists on the desired property. The traffic mitigation recommended will also improve the traffic flow at the existing campus during the peak travel times, which is really only about a half hour in the morning and a similar time amount when school lets out in the afternoon. We don't feel the traffic will be any type of problem or inconvenience for the surrounding homeowners.

The quality of the fine students that Hillcrest produces and the mixture of all the ethnic families in the area that Hillcrest attracts to attend, creates a wonderful environment with a disciplined structure for students from all backgrounds to learn and commingle, which unfortunately is not always achieved by the Public Schools in the area.

Thank you for your timely consideration and expediting of the process,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 35.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 36

John and Margaret Crayton
14738 Hesby St.
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
July 28, 2001

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 36.1

Our grandson attends Hillcrest Christian School in Granada Hills, and therefore, we wish to write in support of proposed project #CPC 200-2608 CU at 17531 Rinaldi St., Granada Hills, CA 91344.

We feel our grandson benefits greatly from the fine education he is receiving at Hillcrest, and hope that he will continue to attend this school until his graduation. He, and many others, would certainly benefit from this expansion of the school

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter of support.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 36.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 37

Mr. & Mrs. D'Amico
13570 Via Santa Catalina
Sylmar, CA 91342
August 23, 2001

Ref: Case # CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 37.1

Our children will be attending Hillcrest Christian School as new students and we are very much looking forward to being part of a great community of dedicated and loving educators.

Several years ago, Hillcrest Christian School was highly recommended to us by other attendees and we were most grateful for this recommendation.

My children have been attending Hillcrest Camp and Summer School for several years now. We are very happy to report that the experience has been wonderful and we are very pleased at the attentiveness to safety and the great consideration given to traffic flow at peak times of the day.

The teachers and staff members do an excellent job in assisting all students for their safety during the drop off and pickup times.

The best news... proposed plans to build a fabulous high school across the street. The high schoolers of today and future high schoolers need more schools like Hillcrest Christian School.

We strongly feel the community will benefit from such a value added school. The surrounding residents of the proposed site should consider this development as a positive enhancement which will increase property values and in turn will benefit upcoming students and prepare them to be fine adults.

We would appreciate and be most grateful for the cooperation in working together to create a dynamic and outstanding campus for the future children. The school is an important need and a great asset. It is very exciting to have plans to expand the vision and horizons for young students.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 37.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 38

Glenn A. Darrow
Darrow Heating & Air Conditioning Corp.
11944 Valerio Street
North Hollywood, CA 91605
August 1, 2001

Re Case #CPC 2001-2608CU

Dear Mr Liao,

COMMENT 38.1

As a grandparent and business owner I am in complete support for the proposed project #CPC 2001-2608CU for the Hillcrest Christian School located at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, CA 91344.

With the draft EIR completed, we believe the said project must wove forward to fill a need for quality education in the north end of the San Fernando Valley. Hillcrest has established itself as a good neighbor, working with the community to solve problems as they might arise Additionally, the traffic mitigation recommended will also improve the traffic flow at the existing campus during peak travel times.

The population of the area has continued to grow and to allow the expansion of housing and retail without the acceptance of this school is ludicrous This area has the need of a school like Hillcrest not another super shopping center.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 38.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 39

Harry Day
14940 Harvest St.
Mission Hills, CA 91345
July 31, 2001

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 39.1

In this day and age of inadequate and mismanaged school systems it seems to me that we, as parents and concerned citizens, would like to see schools such as Hillcrest Christian School expand their current operation to include a wider range of academia available to all that want to better their children's education.

With preliminary work having been completed it is time for Hillcrest Christian School to begin construction. I am sure that Hillcrest Christian has taken into account any and all of the proposed problems that may arise.

Problems such as traffic congestion and children on the streets before and after school.

I am totally in support of the proposed project #CPC 2001-2608 CU currently under consideration in Granada Hills. If it is to benefit children and their families, let this asset to the community begin their work now.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 39.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 40

James and Sandra Dieter
8446 Langdon Ave.
North Hills, CA 91343
Received August 3, 2001

Ref: Case# CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 40.1

As friends of Hillcrest Christian School, I would like to express my support for the proposed project at 17531 Rinaldi, Granada Hills, California 91344.

My wife and I believe that this project must move forward to fill a need for quality education with an emphasis on building strong, moral and Christian individuals in the San Fernando Valley. In the past, Hillcrest has proven itself to be a good neighbor and will continue to be an asset for the community and the entire valley. With the expansion and growth in our community, Hillcrest would meet the important need, especially of the youth of our neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 40.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 41

Richard Dreyfus
12362 Bradford Place
Granada Hills, CA 91344
July 5, 2001

Re: Site Location - 17531 Rinaldi Street
along Shoshone Avenue between White
Oak Avenue and Encino Avenue, Granada Hills
DEIR Report No. 99-041- CU-ZV-ZAA

To Whom It May Concern:

COMMENT 41.1

I have read the above-referenced Draft Environmental Impact Report, and particularly concentrated on the section dealing with traffic and congestion.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 41.1

This comment is noted and all of the issues are addressed below in response to comments 41.2 through 42.6.

COMMENT 41.2

I have several major problems with the traffic study upon which the evaluation and recommendations were made, and with the ameliorative recommendations made in the Report.

1. The traffic study did not seem to adequately take into account the additional congestion that would be created, both at the intersection of Rinaldi and Shoshone, and on Rinaldi itself when the students were arriving at the new high school. If the new school is going to limit student parking to approximately 60 cars, are large number of other students going to be bussed in or dropped off by their parents? The answer to that question is not dealt with in the study or evaluation, as far as I could tell.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 41.2

Trip generation rates were obtained from LADOT's data files and the Institute of Transportation Engineers' Trip Generation, Sixth Edition, and applied to the proposed project uses to estimate future project traffic volumes. Project traffic was assigned to the local street system based on the student demographic data provided by Hillcrest Christian School, and on area traffic patterns, site access and general demographic distributions. All assumptions for trip generation were based on a private school

use with no buss transportation. It is assumed that all persons arriving to the site will arrive via private vehicle. The traffic study and Draft EIR clearly explain that all students are currently dropped off and picked up via private automobile. The Draft EIR also provides a recommended traffic pattern for parents arriving at the site during pick up and drop off periods.

COMMENT 41.3

2. If the students who cannot park in the school lot aren't going to be bussed in or dropped off by their parents, where are they going to park. Since it is recommended, rightly that parking be prohibited along Shoshone, will not the students park on the adjoining streets, causing increased congestion along the feeder streets, the intersection immediately to the north of Rinaldi and Shoshone, the intersection of Rinaldi and Shoshone, and the surrounding feeder streets?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 41.3

It is assumed that all students who do not have a student parking pass would be brought to and picked up from school by either (a) their parents, or (b) another student with a parking pass. Hillcrest School will be responsible for enforcing the student parking pass program and will encourage students not to park on adjacent streets. However, due to the size of the classes that will have students of driving age, and the amount of those students who will have obtained a driving license and have access to a private vehicle, it is estimated that no more than 56 students will be driving a vehicle to the campus. As stated in the Traffic Study and the Draft EIR:

“School administrators have indicated that at full student capacity approximately 168 students will be of driving age including most seniors (12th graders) and some juniors (11th graders), and based on other similar (comparable private school) campuses, that about one-third of those will actually drive. With 168 projected students of driving age, approximately 56 are expected to drive to school.” (see page 237).

COMMENT 41.4

3. Although the traffic counts and traffic patterns were checked during the peak morning hours. The use of the period between 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. for the second test period is totally irrelevant. Both the Catholic day school on Shoshone and Frost Junior High have a large number of students both picked up by their parents during the period between 1:00 p.m. and 3:30 pm. That is the period during which a traffic count should have been taken, and a traffic pattern/flow should have been evaluated.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 41.4

The p.m. peak hour occurred between 5:00 and 6:00 p.m. with a total of 566 vehicles--359 vehicles northbound and 207 vehicles southbound. It was noted that a second afternoon peak occurs during the time area schools are letting out between 2:00 and 3:00 p.m. with a total of 640 vehicles--396 vehicles northbound and 244 vehicles southbound and between 3:00 and 4:00 p.m. with a total of 691 vehicles--338 vehicles northbound and 353 vehicles southbound. (See page 204 of the Draft EIR).

COMMENT 41.5

4. Just as parents, who want to drop their children off for the primary school that is presently operated on the northeast corner of Rinaldi and Shoshone either make u-turns or have to traverse adjoining streets to the northeast of the site to come out on Rinaldi so they can enter the drop-off lot for the school, so will parents wanting to drop their children off at the proposed high school either make a u-turn or drive north on Shoshone and then traverse around the adjoining streets to come back out on Shoshone and make a right turn on Rinaldi to get to the drop-off/parking lot that is to be west of Shoshone on Rinaldi. (I have presumed, even though the Report does not so state among its recommendations, that no left turns will be permitted for east-bound Rinaldi traffic into the high school's parking lot. If my assumption is incorrect, the people waiting to make left turns will congest the eastbound traffic on Rinaldi in the mornings and 1:00 to 3:30 p.m. periods.) The report does not take into account this additional congestion on Rinaldi or on Shoshone and the adjoining feeder streets.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 41.5

As stated on page 227 of the Draft EIR, access to the proposed parking lot on the West Campus will be provided via one ingress/egress driveway located approximately 250 feet west of Shoshone Avenue on Rinaldi Street. This driveway will permit full access to the West Campus with left and right turn entry and exiting onto and from Rinaldi Street. It is anticipated that the Hillcrest-related traffic that enters the West Campus site will alleviate traffic congestion at the Shoshone/Rinaldi intersection and will not have to make either a u-turn on Rinaldi Street or enter the neighborhood to the north of the school site via Shoshone. It should be noted that LADOT's determination does not include approval of the project's driveways, internal circulation and parking scheme. In order to fully evaluate these terms, a site plan with a minimum scale of 1"= 40' will be required to be submitted to LADOT Valley Development Review, prior to submittal of building plans for plan check by the Department of Building and Safety.

COMMENT 41.6

In my opinion, the Report is woefully inadequate and the recommendations do not deal with the problems I have outlined above I expect all of the foregoing to be dealt with in a comprehensive manner before any final environmental impact report and recommendations are made.

As before, I wish to be kept advised of developments in this process. Thank you for your consideration and cooperation.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 41.6

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. The commentator will be placed on the project's mailing list and will be provided notices for all future hearings for the proposed project.

COMMENT LETTER No. 42

Stephanie Durruty
28085 Whites Canyon #91
Canyon Country, CA 91351
Received August 3, 2001

Ref: Case # CPC 2001-2608

Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 42.1

As a teacher at Hillcrest Christian School I see how important we are in the community. Not only do we provide a good education to the youth of Granada Hills and neighboring communities but we are also able to give them great extra-curricular activities, spur them on to be good law abiding citizens, and instill discipline and moral character. Many of these things have lacked in the last few generations but they are intrinsically a part of the education students will receive from our school.

I believe that there are many more parents that desire to send their children to our school because they know that their children will receive a great education from us. To be able to accommodate these families, the said project above needs to continue so we can meet the needs of our community and even the greater need of building up this generation's overall character.

Thank you for taking the time.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 42.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 43

Roberto & Theresa Emerick
15247 Chatsworth St.
Mission Hills, CA 91345
July 26, 2001

RE: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 43.1

This notice is sent in support of the above referenced proposed project at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, California, 91344.

As long time citizens of the north end of the San Fernando Valley, we recognize the growth of our communities. With this continued growth, we also recognize and feel the need for quality educational establishments. With the project of Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU, the desire is that Hillcrest Christian School will assist in bridging the gap between the community and its needs.

Having a school-aged child in attendance at Hillcrest Christian School, we have felt the effects of what the school has to offer and have witnessed its passion to partner with and assist its community. Hillcrest Christian School assists parents with the intellectual, emotional, physical, social, and cultural development that our children need in becoming wholesome individuals. Regarding its neighbors, it has been considerate of, abreast of and cooperative in addressing any matters of concern. It has also been an active partner in other affairs, assisting to enrich and preserve community vitality.

Hillcrest Christian School is an asset to the community because of the services it provides and the productive citizens it helps to create. Please consider the forward movement of Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU so that the community need for quality education is filled.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 43.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 44

Joe and Lorena Escobar
19857 Brasilia Dr.
Northridge, CA 91326
Received August 17, 2001

Ref: Case # CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 44.1

As parents of Hillcrest Christian School, we will like to take this opportunity to express our support for the above-mentioned project at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills. Ca. 91344

With the draft EIR completed, we believe the said project must move forward to fill a need for quality education in the north end of the San Fernando Valley. Hillcrest has establish itself as a very good neighbor who works with its community to solve any problems as they may arise.

The area's population continues to grow and it is our desire that Hillcrest Christian School will contribute assisting the needs of our community. The Excellency of Hillcrest Christian School and the students that attend are great assets to the area.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 44.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 45

Curtis and Susan Etheredge
25419 Fortuna Drive
Valencia, CA 91355
August 2, 2001

Re: Case No. CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 45.1

This letter is to inform you that as parents of a first grader attending Hillcrest Christian School (“Hillcrest”), located at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, California 91344, we are in full support of the above-referenced project.

Since the draft EIR has been completed, we feel that the above-referenced project must proceed to fulfill a need for high quality education and we feel Hillcrest provides that education. We drop off and pick up our daughter during high peak travel times and we believe the school does a great job directing traffic. Furthermore, the traffic mitigation proposed will improve the traffic during campus peak hours.

We have attended several functions and sports events at Hillcrest and have had first hand contact with the students and we believe hillcrest is a wonderful benefit to this community because of the excellent students attending.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 45.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).

COMMENT LETTER No. 46

Dianne Ewing
10528 Valjean Ave.
Granada Hills, CA 91344
July 27, 2001

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 46.1

My children attend Hillcrest Christian School in Granada Hills, CA. As a concerned parent, I am writing this letter in support of the construction project the school has planned at 17531 Rinaldi St., Granada Hills, CA.

It is my understanding that the greatest concern involving this project is traffic in the community. We have always been amazed at how well Hillcrest has managed the flow of traffic in and out of the school, considering the number of families they serve. They have organized the traffic flow so well, there is rarely (if ever) gridlock. I understand that there have been additional traffic mitigation recommendations that will make it even better.

Hillcrest is one of very few academically progressive Christian schools in our community. As the community grows, the choices for quality Christian education get even smaller. It is my prayer that the City will recognize the need that is filled by Hillcrest and how they can reach even more families with their planned growth.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 46.1

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines (see Topical Response 9 for a discussion of Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines).