

Errata 4

Archer Forward: Campus Preservation and Improvement Plan Final Environmental Impact Report

A. Background and Introduction

In accordance with Section 15082 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the City of Los Angeles prepared and circulated a Notice of Preparation for public comment to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, responsible agencies, and other interested parties for a 30-day review period, beginning January 3, 2012. Subsequently, a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared and, in accordance with CEQA, the Draft EIR was initially circulated for a 46-day public comment period beginning February 27, 2014, and ending April 14, 2014. In response to public comments, the comment period was extended an additional 15 days through April 29, 2014, to provide more time for responsible and trustee agencies, as well as the public, to comment on the Draft EIR. A Final EIR that included responses to comments on the Draft EIR and corrections and additions to the Draft EIR was prepared and distributed in November 2014. An Errata to the Final EIR (referred to as Errata 1) that described further refinements to the Project was also prepared and made available to the public in December 2014.

Subsequent to completion of the Final EIR, the City of Los Angeles Hearing Officer, on behalf of the City Planning Commission, conducted a public hearing on December 8, 2014 at which members of the public had an opportunity to present oral and written testimony regarding the Project. In order to provide the opportunity for additional comments, written comments were also accepted for an additional week after the public hearing. An Errata to the Final EIR (referred to as Errata 2) was then prepared in April 2015 to address commonly raised topics during the public hearing process and provide further clarification on other topics previously raised during the public comment period for the Draft EIR.

On April 23, 2015, the City Planning Commission, as the initial decision-maker, conducted a meeting at which members of the public had an opportunity to present oral and written testimony. Written comments were also received prior to the City Planning Commission meeting. The City Planning Commission found that the Project conforms to

the purpose and intent of the findings required for a conditional use under the Los Angeles Municipal Code and approved the Project with modified conditions at the City Planning Commission meeting. Based on a review of the oral and written testimony presented at the Planning Commission meeting and the written comments received prior to the meeting, the City determined that the environmental issues raised regarding the EIR have already been addressed. An additional Errata to the Final EIR (referred to as Errata 3) was prepared in June 2015 to describe the Project refinements made at the City Planning Commission meeting and provided additional clarification of the information presented in the EIR regarding noise generated from the Temporary Classroom Village under a three-year construction schedule.

This Errata to the Final EIR (referred to herein as Errata 4) addresses specific corrections to the Final EIR.

The Draft EIR, Final EIR, Errata 1, Errata 2, Errata 3, and this Errata 4 comprise the EIR for the Project.

B. Corrections and Additions to the EIR

Additional changes have been made to the Final EIR based on comments received. Such changes to the Final EIR are indicated under the appropriate Final EIR section. Where applicable, changes previously made in the Final EIR have been incorporated herein with deletions shown in ~~striketrough~~ and additions shown in underline.

I. Executive Summary

Final EIR, Volume I, Section I, Executive Summary, page I-119, Subsection K.b(1), Intersections, revise as follows:

b. Cumulative Impacts

(1) Intersections

The analysis of Future (Horizon Year 2020) with Project Conditions reflects both Project-specific and future cumulative traffic impacts related to intersection LOS as the Future (Horizon Year 2020) with Project Conditions considers a combination of existing traffic conditions plus traffic from regional growth and related projects and Project traffic. Cumulative conditions (Future Conditions) would result in significant impacts at several intersections and the Project would contribute to these impacts. Thus, the Project's contribution to

impacts that would occur under the future cumulative conditions would be considerable, and cumulative impacts would be significant at those intersections impacted by the Project.—~~Although mitigation would reduce several of the significant impacts to less than significant levels, some of the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. As demonstrated below and provided in Section II, Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, the Project has been refined to enhance the mitigation included in the Draft EIR and incorporate additional mitigation. With incorporation of the additional mitigation, the Project's remaining intersection level of service impacts under Future with Project Conditions (including cumulative conditions) during an event day would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation. Therefore, the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and cumulative impacts to intersections would be less than significant with mitigation.~~

Final EIR, Volume I, Section I, Executive Summary, page I-131, Subsection K.e(1)(b), Future (Horizon Year 2020) with Project Intersection Operations, revise last paragraph as follows:

As demonstrated above and provided in Section II, Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR, the Project has been refined to enhance the mitigation included in the Draft EIR and incorporate additional mitigation. With incorporation of the additional mitigation, the Project's remaining intersection level of service impacts under Future with Project Conditions (including cumulative conditions) during an event day would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation.

C. Effect of Corrections and Additions

This Errata 4 documents additional changes to the Final EIR. As demonstrated by the following discussion, the modifications to the EIR do not result in new significant impacts and do not warrant recirculation of the EIR.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 requires that an EIR that has been made available for public review, but not yet certified, be recirculated only if significant new information has been added to the EIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5(c), the entire document need not be circulated if revisions are limited to specific portions of the document. The relevant portions of CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5 read as follows:

- (a) *A lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review under Section 15087 but before certification. As used in this section, the term “information” can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement. “Significant new information” requiring recirculation include, for example, a disclosure showing that:*
- (1) *A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.*
 - (2) *A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.*
 - (3) *A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.*
 - (4) *The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.*
- (b) *Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.*

The information contained in this Errata 4 merely clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant changes to the information that has already been presented in the EIR. In addition, the modifications to the EIR are not significant because the EIR is not changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project. Based on the above, the clarifications to the EIR would not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of any impact already identified in the EIR. In addition, the clarifications to the EIR merely clarify, amplify or make insignificant refinements to the information that has already been

presented in the EIR. Thus, none of the conditions in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines are met, and recirculation is not required.