

COMMENT LETTER No. 77

Anthony Lewis
17144 Lorillard St.
Granada Hills, CA 91344
August 1, 2001

Honorable Gentlemen and Ladies.

COMMENT 77.1

I am writing in reference to the above-listed EIR file, relating to the expansion of the Hillcrest Christian School in Granada Hills, CA. I communicated with Councilman Bernson on several occasions over the past three years re: this issue. I will be brief with my reiteration on this subject. My goal is to convey with fierce resolve the following opinions and feelings:

The expansion of Hillcrest Christian School at the Rinaldi/Shoshone campus in Granada Hills, California is a profoundly horrible idea. This is yet another blinding example of subjective agendas, benefactor self-service, and mercenary disregard for the greater good of the surrounding community. I have lived in Granada Hills since 1982, and I have a keen understanding of what is best for our area, I would be the first one to endorse the expansion of a school, IF there were ample space in which to expand; and IF it did not pose new problems, and exacerbate existing ones.

One would have to be under the influence of a powerful intoxicant to not notice the pervasive impact that the EXISTING vehicle flow problems directly relative to the school, are having on traffic transiting Rinaldi in the immediate vicinity. Others have documented many of the specific issues, so I will not go into them again. The situation AS IT STANDS TODAY is entirely egregious, and not one shovel-full of ground has been broken. Who is it who thinks that the situation on Rinaldi will remain at least the same with expansion to say nothing about getting better? The frequent sight of post-collision debris in the roadway tells the more accurate story. Is anyone paying attention to that, or does that get filed under "oh these things happen"...?

Well guess what... they're going to continue to happen; and they will get several orders of magnitude worse if this expansion is allowed to continue. What I'm telling you is well beyond something that can be easily passed off as "an emotional resident", or some other kind of patronizing nomenclature. It's a simple equation of having too many bodies, too many cars, and too much combined activity in a compact space, with one way in and one way out That all adds up to cars hitting cars, and cars hitting people. It happens frequently TODAY. Who are we kidding here?

If I were the governing body evaluating the viability of this kind of project, I'd look well beyond the 'mother and country" aspect of expanding a school, and focus on the liability and legal exposure associated with human beings being plowed over in the street. Rinaldi is a favored stretch of road for

runners, cyclists, inline skaters, and people walking their dogs. Also equestrian riders. It's a recipe for disaster.

If this expansion were to continue as outlined, the car accidents will increase, the damage to persons and property will increase, and I am left wondering just how much financial liability the City of Los Angeles considers "acceptable", as a result of a project like this; and at what level does liability exceed benefit? Every personal injury attorney in Los Angeles will be salivating at the chance to take down the City for approving a plan that has a ten mile long paper-trail of protest and absolutely factual testimony advising against its approval. The community is so angered by this whole thing already; the very idea of taking an already bad situation, and making it exponentially worse. If the plan is approved, the populace will be positively spring-loaded to litigate. This could be a real flash-point for City Hall.

I'm a native Angeleno, and I love my home city. This is not about bashing municipal leadership. It's about making the best decision for a suburban community, and for the City at large. In a perfect world, even I would go along with the idea of the handful of wealthy benefactors getting their names displayed in bronze on the wall of the new gymnasium. But the world isn't perfect; and made even less so by the approval of a plan that compromise the safety and sanctity of our residents. In my view, it is a maximum of lip service to a small minority of deep pockets, who are driving the process for personal gain. For the sake of the humanity involved, I only hope that it doesn't take the first wrongful death lawsuit against the City to drive the point home.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 77.1

The existing conditions in the project area were taken into consideration and documented for each environmental issue area throughout the Draft EIR. No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines

COMMENT LETTER No. 78.1

Lorraine Long
11866 Doral Ave.
Northridge, CA 91324
August 1, 2001

Re: Case No CPC 2001—2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 78.1

As a supporter and neighbor of Hillcrest Christian School I want to register my unqualified support for the school expansion at the Hillcrest campus. We have lived in this area for over 25 years and in that time have seen a lot of building and expansion, both good and bad. Along with our community churches, there is not a more important private facility in our area than Hillcrest Christian School. Hillcrest produces the kind of student and young adult we want in our community. The environment created by them is essential to the integrity and continued healthy growth of our area.

The negative impact of this project is non existent. The traffic mitigation will actually improve traffic flow in the area and all of the other environmental factors you will consider have little or no real impact at all. The desire of us “long time residents” to keep our community as we found it, with no additional growth, is unrealistic. Our community will grow. The real question is what kinds of institutions we will insist on being part of that growth. Hillcrest Christian School and its proposed expansion project are essential to the continued vibrant growth in our area.

Thank you for considering my views.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 78.1

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. 79

Pamela Loomis
17817 Kingsbury Street
Granada Hills, CA 91344
July 31, 2001

Ref: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 79.1

I am the parent of a child attending Hillcrest Christian School and would like to express my strong support for the proposed project, #CPC 2001-2608 CU, at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, CA 91344.

Since the draft EIR has been completed, I believe this project must move forward as it will fill a great need for quality education in the north end of the San Fernando Valleys Hillcrest has established itself as a good neighbor, working with the community to solve problems as they might arise. Additionally, and of great concern, the traffic mitigation recommended will also improve the traffic flow at the existing campus during peak travel times.

I believe that Hillcrest Christian School has a very positive influence on our community and, as the population of this area continues to grow, will assist in meeting this important need. The high quality of education provided by Hillcrest and the fine caliber of students attending the school, have made it a great asset to the community.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 79.1

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. 80

Robert H. Mac Lean
10325 Oso Ave.
Chatsworth, CA 91311
July 31, 2001

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 80.1

It has been my pleasure to watch Hillcrest Christian School grow during the years. The community — students, parents, neighbors have benefited from its presence. Students have been provided a quality education from a biblical point of view. They have matriculated from the school to take their place in colleges, universities, and in the work force.

Throughout the years, Hillcrest Christian School has worked with the community to solve problems. The school recently completed the EIR for proposed development of the site. With the completion of the recommended traffic mitigation, the flow of traffic at the existing campus will improve during peak travel times.

Please consider a positive action in allowing the high school to be built and assist in meeting the educational needs in this part of the San Fernando Valley.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 80.1

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. 81

Cherry Mann
No address provided
(323) 956-5542
(213) 978-1343

Re Hillcrest High School

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 81.1

Although I do not live in the area, I drive Rinaldi as it is the last uncongested East-West street in

existence in the North Valley. I avoid mornings, however, as the congestion near Rinaldi and Encino/Shoshone is already dangerous with all the car poolers pulling in and out of traffic on Rinaldi.

Most students do not live within walking distance of the school. It is a private school, Now consider another 300-400 cars to accommodate 600 new students being carpooled. Another 150 seniors will probably drive their own cars.

I implore you - a high school would pose a danger and unbearable congestion on Rinaldi at Encino/Shoshone. Why not build their high school at their other site in Porter Ranch? There's plenty of room for school, stadium, students and parking in that big wide beautiful open space they've already besmirched. With all those big box stores already there, it'll be good for business as well.

The Valley needs some help here. Thank you

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 81.1

Traffic impacts are discussed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. As concluded in the project traffic analysis, with implementation of the required traffic improvements mitigation measures, traffic impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. The Shepard of the Hills property at 19700 Rinaldi Street was evaluated as a potential alternative site. However, it was dismissed as a viable alternative for the reasons outlined in the Draft EIR. As stated in the discussion on page 259 of the Draft EIR, the Shepherd of the Hills Church site is not owned by the Hillcrest Christian School and the Shepherd of the Hills organization is not interested in dividing or selling any property to the Hillcrest Christian School and Church. The Hillcrest Christian School and Church inquired with the Shepherd of the Hills organization regarding the future use of that site. Shepherd of the Hills indicated that any division of their property would preclude any future plans for their expansion of services. Therefore, they are not interested in selling any of their property to the Hillcrest Christian School and Church. For these reasons, this alternative site location was dismissed since it is not a potentially feasible site.

COMMENT LETTER 82

Mr. and Mrs. Phil Marcoe
19001 Vintage St.
Northridge, CA 91324
No Date

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 82.1

We would like to take this opportunity to share with you our thoughts on project #CPC 2001-2608 CU in regards to Hillcrest Christian School at 17531 Rinaldi Street, in Granada Hills.

We have been a part of this school for the last 6 years and hope to have all three of our children continue their education at Hillcrest through High School. We have always supported and still do support the proposed project. We believe that the Administration has completed all that has been asked of them and will continue to work with the City and Community in a positive way to solve any concerns that may arise. Please allow the school to move forward with this wonderful project that will benefit many young people.

My husband and I grew up in the San Fernando Valley and did not have many options of affordable private schools to choose from. We believe that Hillcrest provides this for many others like us who wish to give their children this loving education. Our community has recently grown leaps and bounds and could benefit from the schools expansion. It is our opinion that this project could only enrich the community it strives to serve.

Thank you for listening to our support for Hillcrest Christian School's project.

God Bless,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 82.1

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. 83

Katrina McKnight
16812 Sherman Way #G2
Van Nuys, CA 91406
July 30, 2001

Ref: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 83.1

I am writing this letter to provide my support for proposed project #CPC 2001 -2608 CU at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, California 91344.

As a parent Hillcrest Christian School, I strongly believe in and stand by this project because it will help provide a higher quality of education for the students, It will assist with the rapid growth of the population in the area, and aid in the traffic flow problems during rush hours.

Hillcrest Christian School has been and continues to be a great contributor to the community by providing a high quality of education for students and parents, for always working to improve the community, and for being a positive and inspirational neighbor in the community.

Your consideration in this matter is appreciated.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 83.1

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. 84

Jan and Netty Meertens
11541 Encino Ave.
Granada Hills, CA 91344
August 6, 2001

Re: EIR Case Number: 99-0421(CUZ)(ZU)(YV)
Hillcrest Christian School Expansion

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 84.1

My husband and I have lived on 11541 Encino Ave G.H. for 37 years, for 25 of these our property has abutted the playarea [sic] and parking lot of Hillcrest Christian School.

We have not resented the invasion of first a church, then a school and the sounds of children at play.

But we are strongly opposed to further expansion onto the N.W. corner of Rinaldi and Shoshone. We do not think that a 3-story boxy building would enhance our neighborhood.

The traffic is already bad in the morning and in the afternoon since there are already 4 other schools in the area. Traffic studies were made on days that the school was closed for vacation, so they do not reflect a true picture.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 84.1

The traffic impacts of the proposed project are discussed in Section IV.J.1 of the Draft EIR. The traffic impact report includes an analysis of existing traffic conditions, future traffic conditions without the proposed project and future traffic volumes with the proposed project. The comment is incorrect in its statement that traffic counts were taken when school was not in session. As stated on page 206 of the Draft EIR:

“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 were

conducted.”

COMMENT 84.2

Trees on the property are beautiful and hard to replace, many of them over 50 years old. The school has not maintained it's new trees on this side very well, so we don't hold much hope for any new plantings.

The area left open for a “sportfield” is of real concern to us, because it is exactly the size of a football field and we know that H.C.S. wants to convert it into a stadium with lights and audio. This would really intrude on our peaceful neighborhood.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 84.2

The Draft EIR is based on the present application that Hillcrest Christian School and Church has submitted to the City of Los Angeles Planning Department. The Project Description is stated in Section III of the Draft EIR. There is no current plan for the proposed athletic field to function as a regulation football stadium. The size and the configuration of the project site precludes the development of such a stadium on the property. Should the current plans change, or should the project applicant submit additional plans for development in the future that are not covered under this project proposal and/or EIR, such plans will be subject to additional environmental review in accordance with CEQA.

The West Campus project site does not contain any new trees. Any trees presently located on the West Campus are associated with its past residential uses. The proposed project includes an initial phase and final phase landscape plan to mitigate the loss of existing trees for each respective phase. With regard to tree removal and replacement, please see Section IV.C, Biological Resources of the Draft EIR. The modifications to the proposed retaining wall (see Section II, Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR) would avoid the complete grading of the site and will retain approximately 22 trees in place in the northwestern portion of the project site. Additionally, the tree replacement program is consistent with the City's Landscape Ordinance and will include replanting all desirable non-oak trees on a 1:1 ratio. A total of 162 trees are proposed to be planted on and adjacent to the West Campus as part of this mitigation effort. As stated on page 109 of the Draft EIR, replacement trees will be required to be a minimum of 24-inch box trees. Oak trees are protected under the City's Oak Tree Ordinance and they will be transplanted or replaced on a higher ratio of 2:1 in accordance with the Ordinance.

COMMENT 84.3

This is a rural residential area, with horse trails, any additional parking would spill over in the neighborhood with added noise and danger for the children living here. The plan for the school does not provide for enough parking spaces.

The school is closely affiliated (sic) with the Shepherd of the Hills church on Rinaldi and Corbin.

There is plenty of space there for a High School and parking that would not bother anybody.

Please consider us residents and taxpayers in this area.

WE DO NOT WANT A HIGH SCHOOL TO BE BUILD ON THE CORNER OF RINALDI AND SHOSHONE!!!!

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 84.3

The project site is zoned A1-1-K, indicating it is in an equine keeping district. However, the zoning of the property indicates allowable uses, not required uses. The project site is not located contiguous to any other equine zoned properties and no horses are kept on the project site. Moreover, all of the immediately surrounding properties are zoned residential (RA-1), agricultural (A-1), and public facilities (PF-1) and are not associated with horse-related uses. Therefore, the use of the site as a school campus will not effect any properties with respect to keeping horses. As discussed previously, the Shepard of the Hills property at 19700 Rinaldi Street was evaluated as a potential alternative site. However, was dismissed as a viable alternative for the reasons outlined in the Draft EIR. As stated in the discussion on page 259 of the Draft EIR, the Shepherd of the Hills Church site is not owned by the Hillcrest Christian School and the Shepherd of the Hills organization is not interested in dividing or selling any property to the Hillcrest Christian School and Church. The Hillcrest Christian School and Church inquired with the Shepherd of the Hills organization regarding the future use of that site. Shepherd of the Hills indicated that any division of their property would preclude any future plans for their expansion of services. Therefore, they are not interested in selling any of their property to the Hillcrest Christian School and Church. For these reasons, this alternative site location was dismissed since it is not a potentially feasible site.

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 LETTER No. 85

Peter and Teri Meichtry
17916 Mayerling Street
Granada Hills, CA 91344
August 13, 2001

To Whom It May Concern,

COMMENT 85.1

It is still disturbing that after all the input you have received regarding our neighborhood's stance on the expansion of Hillcrest School, the city of Los Angeles has chosen to ignore our pleas and push through the requests of Hillcrest (one more good reason for seceding [sic]). You have had city Deputies at our neighborhood meetings who heard our opinion of this proposed project, we've presented evidence supporting the negative impact of this expansion (see attached), and yet all along, both councilman Bernson's office and Hillcrest denied any knowledge as to the status of this proposed expansion. There is something suspect going on here when Hillcrest is admittedly willing to spend several million dollars to purchase a piece of property not knowing if they will be able to fulfill their intended use for it. Let's not forget that Richmond-American is building 60-70 homes at the end of Mayerling Street which will only add that much more traffic into this affected area. Let's use some common sense in this case and not compromise the safety and integrity of this neighborhood.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 85.1

The residential development by Richmond American is a 39-home 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 LETTER No. 86

Joy and Robert Ming
17968 Mayerling St.
Granada Hills, CA 91344
July 31, 2001

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

Dear Mr. Liao:

COMMENT 86.1

As we did last year, we are again writing to express our opposition to the proposed expansion of the Hillcrest Christian School in Granada Hills. We are 16-year residents of the community who frequent Rinaldi St on a daily basis to travel to and from work, as well as for other purposes.

The area around Rinaldi Street and Shoshone Avenue in this otherwise bucolic 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, posing a danger to motorists and pedestrians alike. Children and elderly persons are especially vulnerable. If you had undertaken a traffic study, we're sure you would agree with our observations. 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 86.1

A traffic study was conducted for the Draft EIR. Please see Section IV.J.1, Traffic, and Appendix H.

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 86.2

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 alt applicable city and county departments, and keep us informed of any and all variations and notices regarding this matter.

Thanks for your consideration.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 86.2

This comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the Decision-Maker for his consideration. The commentator has been added to the project mailing list and will be notified of future hearings with regard to this project.

COMMENT LETTER No. 87

Joy and Robert Ming
17968 Mayerling St.
Granada Hills, CA 91344
August 5, 2001

RE: DEIR# 99-0421-CU-ZV-ZAA

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 87.1

We again CONTINUE TO OPPOSE the expansion of Hillcrest School. I have reviewed the above referenced DEIR and have several comments, in the appropriate format that I believe is acceptable to city planning. Due to factual omissions, misrepresentations and errors, I feel the DEIR does not comply with CEQA. Although this letter is lengthy [sic] and very detailed, it is my hope that the city will fulfill their legal responsibility to the citizens of LA and read carefully each item and accompanying questions and comments. Then I would respectfully ask and expect the city to respond to each issue as necessary and required.

The following are issues that I think either need further clarification, explanation and/or examination by either city planning and/or the school. I will attempt to list the issues by page number when possible.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.1

The City of Los Angeles is the Lead Agency for the project and is responsible for the environmental review of the proposed project in accordance with CEQA. All procedural CEQA requirements have been met with regard to environmental analysis, and public circulation. All comment letters submitted in response to the Draft EIR public review period are included herein. All comment letters are being addressed in writing.

COMMENT 87.2

1) Nowhere is the energy issue addressed on page 2 or anywhere else in the DEIR. How much energy will the FINAL PROJECT consume? Will the exceed their fair share? With the 75,000 sq. ft. concrete building, gymnasium, classrooms and land denuded of mature large trees, how much energy will be required to keep the facility cool during the hot summer months, especially if there is planned year round activity on the West campus?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.2

The energy demands of the proposed project were addressed and properly disclosed in Section V.A, Impacts Determined to be Less Than Significant. As stated on page 252 of the Draft EIR, the electricity demands of the proposed project were estimated at approximately 2,158 kWh per day. Based on the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power's current supply of electricity and the projection estimated contained in the City's General Plan Framework Element, the electricity demands of the project were identified early on in the environmental review process as a less than significant issue. As such additional analysis was not warranted. Additionally, the project's impacts on the loss of trees and effects of heat attenuation are addressed in the Biological Resources Section of the Draft EIR. Specifically, the Draft EIR states:

“In addition to meeting the tree replacement requirements, the proposed Landscaping Plan will meet all of the general goals of the Landscape Ordinance. Such goals include conserving energy and reducing heat attenuation in the parking lot.” (See Draft EIR Page 104).

“The Chinese Pistache is a deciduous species that typically grows to a height of 25 to 35 feet. As such, these species are suitable to provide ample shading and heat attenuation in the parking lot.” (see Draft EIR, page 106).

The proposed tree replacement program and mitigation measures presented on pages 108 to 109 of the Draft EIR will provide adequate tree cover to provide shade attenuation in the parking lot area and along side the proposed education building. As such, shade will be provided and a less than significant impact would occur.

COMMENT 87.3

2) pg. 5, Under Project Summary, it is stated that the “Hillcrest Christian School and Church”. For the sake of accuracy, please strike out “church” in future references as there is no longer a Hillcrest Church and there should be NO implication this expansion has anything to do with such an entity.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.3

The history of Hillcrest Christian Church and its association with the school function is discussed on page 34 of the Draft EIR. Hillcrest Christian School is a California non-profit religious corporation. The ministry has always included a church located at the school site and has conducted church services at the site weekly since 1954. Because church worship services are a part of the original purpose of the ministry, the church sanctuary has not been altered for class use nor has a request been made to alter the building in any past, present or future conditional use request.

When the school corporation was founded the school covenanted with the church leadership that the church sanctuary would always remain intact specifically for church usage.

COMMENT 87.4

3) pg. 5, Under Project Summary, it is stated, “Approximately 114 parking spaces would be provided in a surface parking lot, located to the west of the proposed education building with vehicular access along Rinaldi Street” yet on page 26 (and page 52), under Parking, it states “Parking for the West campus will be provided in a 124 space surface parking lot”. Which is it? Is it the school’s actual attempt to eventually get a variance for only 114 spaces rather than the REQUIRED 286 spaces?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.4

As correctly noted by this comment, the Draft EIR incorrectly states that “approximately 114 parking spaces would be provided...”. The correct number of parking spaces to be provided in the surface parking lot on the West Campus is 124. The sentence on page 5 of the Draft EIR, discussing 114 parking spaces, is a typographical error and will be noted in the additions and correction section of the Final EIR. With regard to the Traffic and Parking analysis, the correct number of parking spaces to be provided on the West Campus site (i.e., 124) was assumed throughout. This correction does not affect the conclusions of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 87.5

4) pg. 8, Under Summary of Environmental Impacts, it states “Traffic (a.m. peak hour traffic at the intersections of Rinaldi Street and Balboa Blvd., Rinaldi Street and Louise Ave, and Rinaldi Street and Shoshone Avenue)”, but you forgot the traffic at Andasol Street and Rinaldi AND the peak p.m. traffic hours. The school’s morning and afternoon carpool lines very often obstruct the intersection of Andasol and Rinaldi, AND the parents will make U-turns at Andasol from the East bound Rinaldi in order to get into the carpool lane with can only be accessed from the west bound lanes. Therefore all this activity at Andasol/Rinaldi NEEDS to be addressed.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.5

Traffic impacts at the intersection of Rinaldi Street and Andasol Avenue were not listed on page 8 as being significantly impacted because the project's impact to this intersection did not exceed the threshold criteria for creating a significant traffic impact. As shown on page 223 of the Draft EIR, the intersection of Andasol Avenue and Rinaldi Street is expected to operate at LOS A under post-project conditions. The project's impact to the VC ratio at this location is .034 and .016, during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour, respectively. In fact, as noted on page 2210 of the Draft EIR, there is no significance threshold established for intersections operating at LOS A. Similarly, none of the intersections exceeded significance criteria during the p.m. peak hour. Thus, the p.m. peak hour was not listed under the discussion on page 8 of the Draft EIR, which identified only those intersections with significant traffic impacts.

COMMENT 87.6

5) pg.8, Under Summary of Environmental Impacts, it states "Parking (on an occasional basis during special events)". HOW occasional is "occasional"? How often will the athletic field hold events? What is the definition of special events? If the school leases/rents out the field on weekends for other teams to practice/play, or other sporting events, or for holiday celebrations etc., is that a special event and how frequent will this rental period occur and will it be year round? What is the anticipated times of use? What happens if there is NOT enough on site parking?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.6

The type of special events that are planned for the West Campus are inherently similar to those that currently occur on the East Campus. Such events were discussed in detail in Section III.B, Overview of Environmental Setting, on pages 34 and 35 of the Draft EIR. These events were described as follows:

Hillcrest Christian School (HCS) has a variety of events scheduled throughout the school year, which are not only designed for student/faculty and associated family involvement but also for the benefit of the surrounding community. Special events on the Hillcrest campus are generally grouped into three categories: community events, school events (non-sport related), and school events (sport-related).

From August through May (with an occasional event in July), scheduled community events are comprised of: a community dinner; community meetings; open houses; a town hall meeting; special community events; and the availability of the site as a designated Red-Cross Emergency Center. While most of these events are scheduled as daytime or evening occurrences, a few events take place during both times of day.

As with the community events, school events are scheduled to begin in August and end in May. Examples of such school events include: "meet the teacher" nights; pep rallies; grandparents' days;

special events; a jog-a-thon; and special event banquets. Approximately one-third of these events are scheduled as daytime occurrences. The remaining two-thirds are planned as evening events.

School-related sporting events occur throughout the school year from August through May. Approximately one-third of these events are associated with elementary school sports and the remaining approximate two-thirds are divided between middle and high school sports. While some of these events occur on the outdoor play area on the existing campus, most of the school-related sporting events take place within the existing gymnasium building. School sporting events are typically scheduled outside of school hours. It is assumed that the average event schedule would occur from when school lets out until dusk. Use of the athletic field after dusk would be precluded as stadium lighting will not be provided for the athletic field.

COMMENT 87.7

On pg. 26-27, Under Special Events parking, it states "Utilizing the overflow parking area, which provides 130 additional spaces, a total of 402 parking spaces would be available during special events." The athletic field has an estimated seating for 1000 people (and an attempt to get some variance on that number might occur in the future), how can 402 spaces be enough?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.7

As stated on page 238 of the Draft EIR, events scheduled for the gymnasium building would be limited to an average occupancy load of approximately 666 persons. The City of Los Angeles parking code estimates the demands for a 10,000 square foot gymnasium at 285 parking spaces. Using a more conservative estimate for events utilizing outdoor areas (such as graduation ceremonies and athletic events), an average attendance of 1,000 is anticipated. Assuming a typical auto occupancy of 2.5 persons per vehicle, a demand of approximately 400 parking spaces would be needed.

COMMENT 87.8

On pg. 241, fig. IV.J.2-2, there is a depiction of the location for this 130 overflow parking, and it is the grassy field located on the east campus on Shoshone. First, the diagram shows in order to get 130 cars (this cannot possibly include current SUV size vehicles) on this grassy field (I expect they will also remove the viewing stands that are on the field) cars would have to be parked back to back 10 deep and side to side 13 wide, like sardines! REALISTICALLY this will NOT happen. I know of NO ONE who would willingly park on this field in such a parking configuration There is currently a very tall 20 ft. (?) chain link fence that protects loose balls etc., from entering the parking lot, which supposedly has 100 parking spaces. THE SINGLE driveway that leads into the Shoshone Ave. Parking lot and grassy field is currently ONLY 28 feet wide at the street curb and 28 feet wide at the lot entrance. The internal lanes are quite narrow and would prohibit easy movement within the current parking lot. HOW can it be feasible to get 130 cars (SUV size included) parked like sardines on the grassy field (after removal of a permanent chain link fence) and another 100 cars on the current lot? With the current street width

and driveway width, there would be no way to have 2 autos simultaneously leave the single lane driveway, and traffic on Shoshone before and after events would be totally congested!

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.8

The use of the overflow parking area would require cars to be parked in tandem in order for the area to fit 130 cars. This area has in the past been used by Hillcrest as a reserve parking area to accommodate overflow parking for special events. The parking calculations are based on an average vehicle fleet of compact and mid-sized cars. During special events, Hillcrest staff directs cars into and out of the parking area and the tandem stacked parking approach has been implemented effectively.

COMMENT 87.9

One issue I did not see addressed is the virtual negation of the bike lanes on the north side of Rinaldi during the morning and afternoon carpool times due to the total occupation of the bike lanes by the schools cars.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.9

Designated striped bike lanes are provided along the south and north sides of Rinaldi Street in proximity to the proposed project site. On street parking is allowed on a restricted basis along the north side of Rinaldi within the parking lane. The proposed project does not propose to reduce the roadway width along Rinaldi Street and will not have any impact on the existing bikeway or parking lane.

COMMENT 87.10

6) pg. 11, Under Emissions, #4, and Under Off-site Impacts, #7. There are nothing but residences around this project. #4, The only non residential areas are directly in front of the Hillcrest on the east side and the Rinaldi Adult school on the south side of Rinaldi. BOTH locations have students during the daylight hours and the Adult school has a Mommy and Me program 5 days a week, whose play yard is located just behind the chain link fence On Rinaldi! You can see the play yard from the street. The Rinaldi Adult school also has night school. Where will the truck park during construction? #7 Parking the construction vehicles off traveled roadways? Where do you think that is? (I HOPE THEY DO NOT CONSIDER RIDGEWAY a potential roadway for construction. It is an unpaved uphill sloping DIRT road.) We have so few street here in the area (one of our primary concerns!) that EVERY STREET is traveled all the time by all the residents! Parking construction anywhere near the construction site would be hazardous to children and adults who attend classes and needless to say the residents would MUST travel the same roads as construction vehicles.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.10

All construction traffic will be required to park on-site. As referenced by the mitigation measure, no construction-related parking will be allowed to park on adjacent roadways in front of residences or in front of the LAUSD Adult School. Parking will not be allowed on Ridgeway Road, because Ridgeway Road is a private driveway easement that is owned by more than one entity. As part of the project approval process, the applicant will be required to submit a haul route plan for approval.

COMMENT 87.11

pg. 11, #6, If you know the area, there is really no such thing as Off-peak travel periods. Rinaldi has a constant flow of traffic, especially now that it has opened all the way through Porter Ranch to Mason St. to the west. Shoshone is too narrow to park large construction vehicles. If there were ANY lane closures, it would create a nightmare, as evidenced by the recent lane closure on Rinaldi 2 weeks ago when there was tearing up and repaving of Rinaldi between Reseda and Wilbur! A complete nightmare and this is the SUMMER!

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.11

The project area is characterized by peak hour traffic periods. As noted in the project Traffic Study, the 24-hour automatic traffic count conducted on Shoshone between Flanders and Mayerling was 7,652 vehicles--3,949 vehicles northbound and 3,703 vehicles southbound. The a.m. peak hour occurred between 7:00 and 8:00 a.m. with a total of 1,104 vehicles--397 vehicles northbound and 707 vehicles southbound. 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. 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. In accordance with the mitigation measures provided in the Draft EIR, construction haul trips will be scheduled outside of the a.m. and p.m. peak hour periods.

COMMENT 87.12

7) pg. 13, Under Geotechnical Hazards, there will be a total of 77,500 cy of dirt that will need to be hauled away for the two phases of construction. Phase I will require hauling away 28,000 cy of dirt which roughly equals 2800 truck trips (if the projected figures are too low, then of course that will be even more truck trips). How long will these trucks have to sit on site to be filled? On which roadway will the truck access the site? If during the time frame between Phase I (est. to begin in 2002 pg. 38) and Phase II (est. year 2005 pg. 23, requiring an estimated 4950 truck trips for the 49,500 cy of dirt

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.12

The project applicant will be required to submittal 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 87.13

pg. 13) there is significant erosion due to malabsorption of rain by compacted soil (Another issue not addressed in this DEIR: To what degree will the soil be compacted?) and potential heavy rain in the upslopes (Check with ANY meteorologist, this is very common during the winter rainy season) significantly erodes the site, how many more truck trips will be necessary to fill the land? And during the heavy rains, will the current storm drains be overwhelmed since the site will be compacted and or/covered in concrete?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.13

The projects impacts with regard to grading activities, soil erosion and storm drain infrastructure are addressed in Section IV.F, Hydrology, in the Draft EIR. As stated on page 146 of the Draft EIR, an analysis of hydrologic conditions for the proposed project was created for a hypothetical 50-year storm event. The West Campus project site will include a drainage system with pipes that vary in size from 12" reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) up to 30" RCP that will adequately convey surface water runoff into the existing 69-inch storm drain that is currently within Shoshone Avenue. The runoff will be directed down slope towards Ridgeway Road and into a storm drain system. Excess runoff from upslope of the project site will be directed towards the grass play area and continued down to Shoshone Avenue. Therefore, the project will not exceed capacity of the existing or planned storm water drainage systems.

In addition, a number of mandatory mitigation measures have been prescribed to reduce on site erosion and protect water quality during the construction phase. Such measures will be in effect through out the duration of the construction phase until the final phase is completely built out. The level of soil compaction planned during and after cut and fill work was not provided and is not applicable to the discussion on geotechnical feasibility or hydrology.

COMMENT 87.14

8) Regarding construction phase, there will be much dust and truck emission pollutants in a concentrated area surrounded by homes. Because the site will be denuded of trees and vegetation, there will be no natural way to lessen the pollution and control construction dust. pg. 10-11, Under Dust control. there is a listing of all mitigation measures. WHO will monitor if in fact all these measure are carried out? Who will be sure the watering Is sufficient? Will work come to a complete STOP when a dust cloud is visible? If truck get mired in the mud created by constant watering of the site to abate the

dust, will that mean longer idling and more emissions? Has this potential yet VERY realistic hazard been addressed anywhere? There is a Kindercare on the south side of Rinaldi one block west of the site. There is a “Mommy and Me” site at the Rinaldi Adult school on the south side of Rinaldi and one block east of the site. WHO will ensure all these health related, negative impact conditions are controlled? Who will be responsible if these emissions, dust clouds are not controlled and result in impairing the health of the IOOs of young children in the VERY near vicinity! This of course does not include the numerous elderly who have lived here for years, many who take daily walks right past the construction site!

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.14

With regard to air quality impact, the commentator is referred to Section IV.B of the Draft EIR. 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 thresholds levels. 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. The reader is referred to Section IV.B, Air Quality, pages 89 and 90.

The City of Los Angeles is the lead agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR. A more specific account of the required mitigation measures and the enforcing City Department is provided in Section IV, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

COMMENT 87.15

WHERE is the issue of “Valley Fever” (Coccidioidomycosis caused by the pathogenic *Coccidioides* fungi found naturally in the soil in this valley) addressed? Everyone is susceptible especially the young, the elderly and those with respiratory ailments?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.15

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 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 87.16

9) pg.14, Under Fault Rupture, you should be aware that after the 1994 Northridge earthquake, I believe CSUN in conjunction with CA Dept. of Mines and Geology, conducted a detailed study of the area regarding fault line and the liquefaction dangers of the area. As recently as 2 years ago, you were sent a copy of this study and therefore made quite aware of the well known and exhibited evidence of fault lines and potential liquefaction dangers, The expansion site is VERY near an area prone to liquefaction. There is not only a perceived danger but a real potential danger to the school's students and faculty. Trying to mitigate such dangers in the construction of such a large multi-building facility simply following current building codes, I feel does not address the liquefaction problem sufficiently.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.16

The issue of geotechnical safety 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 87.17

10) pg. 19, Under Land Use, it states "The proposed project will be an extension of an existing use and will not introduce an incompatible use to the area." The site was previously a typical ranch style HOME representative of early California ranch life, not a school, therefore the expansion is NOT an "extension of an existing use". If this argument were true, then any entity, business or school looking for expansion could buy any parcel and "extend the use".

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.17

The Draft EIR correctly noted that the existing land uses on the West Campus project site includes single family residential homes. The description that the project is an extension of an existing land use is correct in the fact that the West Campus is directly associated to the existing East Campus, which has existed at this location since the site was first developed by the Hillcrest Christian Church in 1965. Since that time, Hillcrest has expanded its facilities on the East Campus to support its school operations. To the extent that the Hillcrest Christian School and Church has been located at its current location, and the West Campus is located immediately adjacent to the existing East Campus (across Shoshone Avenue), the project is considered an extension to, and expansion of, an existing land use.

COMMENT 87.18

11) pg. 19, Under Noise, there will be NO reasonable way to mitigate the noise this project will inflict and the pain will be over several years With the potential for a total of 7750 truck trips (see item 7 above) or more, and the actual construction phase of several years, NOISE during construction cannot be mitigated to any satisfactory level. Any noise from the athletic events, potentially 7 days a week, cannot be abated by a simple wall, and the wall is NOT aesthetically acceptable for the neighborhood. THERE IS NOT ONE RETAINING BLOCK WALL located an Shoshone. There is no way to mitigate the ensuing traffic noise, continued cheering after athletic events because no one can predict the behavior of the participants !

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.18

The construction of a concrete block wall is an effective way to abate increased noise levels form a parking lot within a residential zone. The 6-foot solid concrete wall is proposed to be constructed along Ridgeway Road, separating the parking lot area from the residence bordering the site to the west. The wall will be set back a few feet from Ridgeway Road to allow an attractive landscape with ivy cover and trees on the west side of the wall to buffer the views from the residence to the west. The primary purpose of this wall is to buffer noise impacts generated by the daily use of the parking lot. However, the wall has been integrated into the landscaping plan to buffer the visual impacts of the project as well. The wall will preclude light and glare intrusion onto the residential property. The resulting view will be an attractive landscape that is designed to reflect the typical characteristics of a neighboring residence.

Moreover, it should be noted that the school will not include outdoor activities on a continuous basis 7 days a week. The school operates Monday through Friday and is closed on weekends. On an occasional and infrequent basis, special events or athletic programs may occur on the athletic field on weekends. However such occurrences would be exceptional and would not be a part of the normal operating activities. These activities would generate similar noise levels as the a typical school day, and, as discussed in the Draft EIR, would generate noise levels that are less than significant. The Draft

EIR concluded that with the implementation of the mitigation measures, construction and operational-related noise impacts of the proposed project were determined to be less than significant.

COMMENT 87.19

12) pg. 20, #6, "Any temporary outdoor speakers for limited numbers (what is that limited number?) of special events shall operate only from 8 am to 330 PM." Please address any recourse should this limited time frame and limited numbers of special events NOT be adhered to?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.19

The "limited number of special events" is in reference to the handful of special events that typically occur on the east campus throughout the school year. It is anticipate that the West Campus will provide additional gathering space for school events that involve large numbers of people. The events and the generalized schedule of events were discussed in the Draft EIR and reiterated in Response to Comment No. 87.6.

COMMENT 87.20

13) pg. 22, "Hillcrest ...appoint security staff personnel to patrol the campus and immediate adjacent neighborhoods..." What about when they rent/lease out the athletic field to others? I expect the school will be responsible should their baseball, football, golf ball etc. should damage residents' home or physically injure residents? The close proximity of the field to homes does NOT rule out this potential problem.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.20

All operational mitigation measures that are imposed on the Hillcrest Christian School are associated with any operation occurring on the project site. Regardless of whether an event is associated with a direct school function or a leased use activity, Hillcrest will be responsible for any damages or nuisances in the surrounding area. The reader is referred to the topical responses discussion with regard to Hillcrest's good neighbor policy and community grievance phone line.

COMMENT 87.21

14) pg. 23, Under Transportation/circulation, "Access to the proposed parking lot on the West Campus will be provided via ONE ingress/egress driveway located approximately 250 ft... This driveway will permit full access to the West campus with left and right turn entry and exiting onto and from Rinaldi Street."

First, will the lanes within the West parking lot allow for 2 lane driving? If not then how will the traffic flow if the carpool is on site? And if the carpool is off site, then WHERE is it to be located?

Second, if egress traffic is allowed to turn left, you MUST see the dangers of this. With traffic coming on and off campus during AM and PM peak hours, taking into account the west bound Rinaldi traffic, add to that the normal east bound Rinaldi traffic in the left turn lane trying to enter Shoshone going north, the location of this access driveways not acceptable. Also ingress access should limited to westbound Rinaldi to prevent Eastbound cars from making a made (sic) dash through west bound traffic, which will be significant during peak AM/PM hours. However If ingress is limited to westbound lanes, then any ingress slow down will result in very quick congestion. THE LOCATION of the access driveway is therefore unacceptable due to safety issues and potential creation of excessive congestion!

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.21

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 87.22

15) pg. 25, Under Street improvements, The widening of the street by 14 feet for 260 feet northerly on Shoshone to create 3 south bound lanes will make this intersection appear inconsistent with a residential neighborhood . With signal lights at Encino/Rinaldi and Shoshone/Rinaldi added to the tremendous increase in pedestrian traffic at Encino/Rinaldi and Shoshone/Rinaldi, this intersection will NO longer have a residential atmosphere. In addition, if the school plans to mitigate the carpool congestion on Rinaldi by increasing the carpool activity at the rear parking lot on the East side of SHOSHONE (pg. 26), then the east side will necessarily have to be widened to accommodate cars waiting to enter the narrow 28 foot wide Shoshone driveway and gate! This driveway cannot accommodate two vehicles (definitely NOT SUVs) and any vehicles trying to enter and exit will obstruct traffic flow on Shoshone at peak AM/PM hours . There should be NO parking at anytime along Shoshone northerly until Flanders . Any additional widening of Shoshone, will further take away from the residential aura of the community!

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.22

The widening of Shoshone Avenue is a required mitigation measure as prescribed by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation. Furthermore, as part of this roadway improvement, the LADOT recommends that parking be restricted at all times along the widened portion of Shoshone Avenue at all times. This is a requirement for widening the roadway. (See top of page 230 in Section IV.J.1, Traffic, of the Draft EIR)

COMMENT 87.23

16) pg. 25, Under Pedestrian Traffic, #5 Pedestrian Safety, it states, "Educational materials shall be provided to students and parents to address the hazards associated with crossing Shoshone Ave." The same mitigation, "providing informational leaflets", is listed on pg. 27 too "discourage off-site parking, pick-up or drop off traffic patterns....". YOU must be kidding! The parents currently do not even obey simple traffic laws, making illegal U-turns on Rinaldi, in spite of posted signs, making U-turns at Rinaldi/Andasol in order to access the current carpool line on Rinaldi.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.23

With regard to Hillcrest's operational characteristics and the enforcement of school sponsored programs, the reader is referred to the Topical Response 5 on page 31.

COMMENT 87.24

Increased pedestrian traffic will INCREASE the danger for both pedestrians and motorists! I timed my 3 children crossing singly across Rinaldi and crossing Shoshone. My oldest a typical high school student required an avg. of 17 seconds to cross Rinaldi and 12 seconds to cross Shoshone. My middle school child took 19 and 13 seconds respectively, and my elementary school child took a full 22 seconds to cross Rinaldi and 15 to cross Shoshone. These results were for single pedestrians. What is the estimated time for a group of pedestrians crossing? What will be the traffic delay for south bound Shoshone Ave. traffic turning left and right when there are pedestrian crosswalks on both the east and west side of Shoshone on Rinaldi AND a crosswalk across Shoshone? With the signal light at Encino also controlling Rinaldi traffic and pedestrian flow, AND with school carpool traffic entering Encino and westbound Rinaldi, there will be an IMPERATIVE need to time very well all the traffic lights (Rinaldi/Encino/Shoshone) and the time necessary for pedestrians. In the recent past, there have been traffic accidents, speeding tickets on Rinaldi, Shoshone and Nugent (hope to have the numbers submitted soon) facts which will add to the argument that this area is NOT conducive for the amount of pedestrian and vehicular traffic that result from the proposed expansion.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.24

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. With implementation of the required mitigation measures, project impacts on pedestrian safety would be less than significant. These measures are addressed on pages 230 and 232 of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT 87.25

17) pg. 27, Under Mitigation Measures, “Student parking shall be limited to a max of 66 student parking permits per school year at the West Campus.” How many students will drive and where will the overflow park. With only 124 (or is it 114 spaces, discrepancy listed in item 3 above) on site parking spaces, with a proposed estimated faculty increase of 60, that leaves only 64 available spaces for students, so 66 permits is already too many permits to issue. Then where will the other driving High School Students park? If 112 of the proposed estimated 400 students (assuming Jr. and Sr. will drive) take their own cars (200 students), where will the overflow of 136 vehicles be parked? How many neighborhoods can accommodate these cars?

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.25

With regard to Hillcrest School’s operational characteristics and the enforcement of the student parking program, the reader is referred to the Topical Response 5 on page 31. As a private and conditionally permitted school use, the Hillcrest Christian School will be responsible for complying with all of the conditions of approval set forth by the Decision-Maker. Therefore, since conditional uses are revocable if the conditions of approval are not met, it is in the best interest of the school to monitor all of it’s activities and programs to minimize conflicts with within the community.

COMMENT 87.26

I respectfully submit this short list of comments. I will stop here because I think the few issues here are just the beginning of a much longer list! Having only had 2 full days to study the DEIR in detail, I have not yet begun to cover the other environmental impacts and suggested mitigation. I am sure with closer study of the 240 or so remaining pages, there will more inconsistencies, omissions and errors that will deem this DEIR non-compliant with CEQA.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 87.26

No specific comments on the adequacy of the DEIR are provided in this comment; therefore, no response is required per Section 15204 of the CEQA Guidelines.

COMMENT LETTER No. 88

Lisa Moon
12045 Falcon Crest Way
Northridge, CA 91326
No Date

Ref: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 88.1

I would like to thank you for your consideration of the project under review at Hillcrest Christian School. As a resident of the surrounding neighborhoods, I HAVE SPECIFICALLY CHOSEN TO REMAIN IN THE AREA BECAUSE OF THE LOCATION OF THIS SCHOOL. I am the mother of 2 small children, and the quality of their education is of utmost importance to me, important enough to locate my family in the vicinity of a quality school. My oldest daughter will be commencing kindergarten at Hillcrest in the fall, and my younger daughter will soon follow. It is our intention to keep them in this school until they complete their high school studies.

Therefore, I have a particular interest and desire to see the expansion of this facility move forward. I am active in volunteer work in my community, and I am eager to improve it as a top-notch neighborhood for families.

Thank you for your time and devotion to improving our neighborhoods and allowing parents to make the personal choices that they feel are right for their children's education.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 88.1

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. 89

Loren and Rebecca Moore
29648 Cromwell Ave.
Castaic, CA 91384
August 8, 2001

Re: Case #CPC 2001-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao;

COMMENT 89.1

As parents of a fourth grader at Hillcrest Christian School, we would like to take this opportunity to express our support for the proposed project #CPC 200 1-2608 CU at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, CA 91344.

It will take another five years for our daughter to be in high school; however, we would like to give our 100% support to Hillcrest Christian School on their plans for expansion. We would like to see our daughter finish high school at Hillcrest Christian School, if financially possible and God willing.

Hillcrest Christian School is known to be one of the reputable Christian schools in the north end of the San Fernando Valley. We chose to put our daughter there even though this is about 25 miles away from home. With the school's motto of "Reverence, Respect and Responsibility", we believe that Hillcrest Christian School will be able to provide quality education, which is what every parent would want for their children.

With the draft EIR completed and with the traffic mitigation recommended that will improve the traffic flow at the existing campus, we firmly believe that Hillcrest Christian School is a great asset to the area.

We would certainly appreciate it if the City of Los Angeles approves the expansion development of Hillcrest Christian School for a future secondary campus.

Thank you for your kind consideration,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 89.1

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. 90

Brian & Nadine Morgan
16652 Gledhill Street
North Hills CA 91343
September 4, 2001

Ref: Case #CPC 200 1-2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 90.1

My wife and I have been residents of the San Fernando Valley for 38 and 35 years respectively and our children are and will be attending Hillcrest Christian School We would like to take a moment of your time to express our support for the proposed project #CPU 2001-2608 CU at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, California 91344.

The draft EIR has been completed and we believe the project is a must have for the north end of the San Fernando Valley. This project will fill a need for quality education. Hillcrest works with the community to solve problems as they arise and has always been a good neighbor. Also, the traffic mitigation recommended will improve the traffic flow at the existing campus during peak driving times,

As the population of the Valley continues to grow, Hillcrest Christian School is attempting to assist in meeting the important need' of good education.

Thank you for your time and consideration in regards to this project.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 90.1

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. 91

Armando O'campo
11945 Cameo Pl.
Granada Hills, CA 91344
July 31, 2001

RE: Case #CPC 2001-2608

Dear Mr. Liao

COMMENT 90.1

I would like to add my voice in support of the Hillcrest expansion project CPC 2001-2608 CU at 17531 Rinaldi St., Granada Hills Ca 91344. As a concerned parent and neighbor of the school I just can't see how moving ahead with the project can not do anything but continue to build the type of community that all parents would desire for their children to be raised and educated. With all the housing expansion in process in the immediate and surrounding neighborhoods it would seem to make sense that we the neighbors are going to need additional facilities such as this planned and in progress before we find ourselves with a critical shortage. Hillcrest, along with some of the other fine schools in the area, is a tremendous asset to our community and as such deserves support of the neighbors as well as that of our City Planners.

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 91.1

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. 92

Paul and Brenda Overlock
8821 Rubio Avenue
North Hills, CA 91343
Received August 7, 2001

Ref: Case #CPC 2001 -2608 CU

Dear Mr. Liao,

COMMENT 92.1

As friends of Hillcrest Christian School, my husband and I would like to make you aware of our support of the proposed project #CPC 2001-2608 CU at 17531 Rinaldi Street, Granada Hills, California 91344.

We are the parents of two grown daughters. However, when they entered High School we very clearly became aware of the scarcity of quality secondary education in the San Fernando Valley.

The San Fernando Valley is continually growing. Our desire is for all those families searching for quality education to be able to have a broader choice. Hillcrest Christian School is active in the community, being involved in supporting our local police as well as taking part in other community activities.

We would hope that Hillcrest Christian School might have the opportunity to meet the needs of families searching for this quality education

We appreciate your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

RESPONSE TO COMMENT 92.1

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).