Also, it looks like a primary ridgeline is cut in Photosimulation 3. Is this engineering allowable under the current ordinances? 149-336

There are other errors in Photosimulation 3. The cut slope depicted in the foreground is inaccurate. According to the Development footprint map in Figure IV.D-4, the cut slope grading that is below the houses and above the freeway should extend a little further down. Also, it is unknown how this cut will be engineered. The photo needs to show how it will be after engineering and whether terracing or crib walls will be built there to stabilize the hillside area. The vegetation depicted that is growing back in the cut area is inaccurate. Depending on how the cut is made, the vegetation does not grow back to its former natural state. Sometimes very little vegetation will grow back even after 50 years if it is a cut in bedrock. These errors or omissions in Photosimulation 3 must be corrected. 149-337

In Photosimulation 4, Figure IV.N-16, the number of trees depicted on the lots for the houses is erroneous. There are too many trees in this photo. In Table IV.D-16, the EIR indicates that in the entire project area (Areas A & B), only 250 Coast Live Oaks will be planted on private lots. With 280 homes in the development, this averages less than 1 tree per house lot. However, if you look at the photosimulation, each house has from about 7 to 12 trees per lot including driveways. This averages about 10 times the number of trees that are planned to be planted as a mitigation measure by the developer. The project residents are under no obligation to plant trees on their property. There is nothing in the CC&Rs that would require residents to plant trees or as many trees portrayed in the simulations. Even if residents were required to plant trees, they could always vote to change the CC&Rs. The depiction of the number of trees on the photosimulation is speculative at best and there is only a remote probability that the development will be landscaped with as many trees as there are in these simulations. Also, nearly all the trees are situated too close to the houses because of the fire danger. Fire regulations in high fire danger areas such as these require that vegetation not be situated too close to buildings. It looks like some trees in the photosimulations are only about 10 feet from the houses. The photosimulations must be changed to remove excess vegetation and correct errors in it. 149-338

Also, it looks like a primary ridgeline is cut in Photosimulation 4. There is also a peak that is lopped off in the development. It currently is at 1,800'. In the photo, it looks like it may be cut to 1,600' in height. Removal of about 200 vertical feet of a peak is quite a bit. Is this engineering allowable under the current ordinances? 149-339

There are other errors in Photosimulation 4. The cut slopes depicted are inaccurate. According to the Development footprint map in Figure IV.D-4, the cut slope grading that is below the houses should extend a little further down. Also, it is unknown how this cut will be engineered. The photo needs to show how it will be after engineering and whether terracing or crib walls will be built there to stabilize the hillside area. The vegetation depicted that is growing back in the cut area is inaccurate. Depending on how the cut is made, the vegetation does not grow back to its former natural state. Sometimes very little vegetation will grow back even after 50 years if it is a cut in bedrock. These errors or omissions in Photosimulation 4 must be corrected. 149-340

The EIR must discuss the landscaping plans for the development in this section or the tree portion of the Biology section in greater detail. For example, in Table IV.D-16, the EIR indicates that 515 Coast Live Oaks will be planted on the road right of ways in the project. However, if you look at Photosimulation 5, Figure IV.N-17, the trees on the road right of ways look like some type of Pine trees. Pine trees are not trees that are supposed to be planted as part of the tree mitigation plan. From this Photosimulation 5 vantage point, I see only a small portion of road in Development Area B. This means that there are too many trees in this photosimulation for the length of the road or some other street areas in the development will have few or no trees. There are not enough trees that the applicant plans to plant to have thick rows of trees on both sides of the sound wall by the freeway. Therefore, the EIR must discuss the landscaping plans in greater detail as either the photosimulations are wrong or the landscaping mitigation measures are inadequate or both. 149-341

In Photosimulation 5, Figure IV.N-17, the number of trees depicted on the lots for the houses is erroneous. There are too many trees in this photo. In Table IV.D-16, the EIR indicates that in the entire project area (Areas A & B), only 250 Coast Live Oaks will be planted on private lots. With 280 homes in the development, this averages less than 1 tree per house lot. However, if you look at the photosimulation, each house has from about 7 to 12 trees per lot including driveways. This averages about 10 times the number of trees that are planned to be planted as a mitigation measure by the developer. The project residents are under no obligation to plant trees on their property. There is nothing in the CC&Rs that would require residents to plant trees or as many trees portrayed in the simulations. Even if residents were required to plant trees, they could always vote to change the CC&Rs. The depiction of the number of trees on the photosimulation is speculative at best and there is only a remote probability that the development will be landscaped with as many trees as there are in these simulations. Also, nearly all the trees are situated too close to the houses because of the fire danger. Fire regulations in high fire danger areas such as these require that vegetation not be situated too close to buildings. It looks like some trees in the photosimulations are only about 10 feet from the houses. The houses in Development Area B that are closest to the freeway look like they have a thick forest in front of their houses. The photosimulations must be changed to remove excess vegetation and correct errors in it. 149-342

There are other errors in Photosimulation 5. The cut slopes depicted are inaccurate. According to the Development footprint map in Figure IV.D-4, the cut slope grading that is below the houses should extend a little further down. Also, it is unknown how this cut will be engineered. The photo needs to show how it will be after engineering and whether terracing or crib walls will be built there to stabilize the hillside area. The vegetation depicted that is growing back in the cut area is inaccurate. Depending on how the cut is made, the vegetation does not grow back to its former natural state. Sometimes very little vegetation will grow back even after 50 years if it is a cut in bedrock. These errors or omissions in Photosimulation 5 must be corrected. 149-343

The EIR must discuss the landscaping plans for the development in this section or the tree portion of the Biology section in greater detail. For example, in Table IV.D-16, the EIR indicates that 515 Coast Live Oaks will be planted on the road right of ways in the project. However, if you 149-344

look at Photosimulation 6, Figure IV.N-18, the trees on the road right of ways look like some type of Pine trees. Pine trees are not trees that are supposed to be planted as part of the tree mitigation plan. From this Photosimulation 6 vantage point, I see a few roads in Development Area A. This means that there are too many trees in this photosimulation for the length of these roads or some other street areas in the development will have few or no trees. Therefore, the EIR must discuss the landscaping plans in greater detail as either the photosimulations are wrong or the landscaping mitigation measures are inadequate or both. 149-344

In Photosimulation 6, Figure IV.N-18, the number of trees depicted on the lots for the houses is erroneous. There are too many trees in this photo. In Table IV.D-16, the EIR indicates that in the entire project area (Areas A & B), only 250 Coast Live Oaks will be planted on private lots. With 280 homes in the development, this averages less than 1 tree per house lot. However, if you look at the photosimulation, each house has from about 7 to 12 trees per lot including driveways. This averages about 10 times the number of trees that are planned to be planted as a mitigation measure by the developer. The project residents are under no obligation to plant trees on their property. There is nothing in the CC&Rs that would require residents to plant trees or as many trees portrayed in the simulations. Even if residents were required to plant trees, they could always vote to change the CC&Rs. The depiction of the number of trees on the photosimulation is speculative at best and there is only a remote probability that the development will be landscaped with as many trees as there are in these simulations. Also, nearly all the trees are situated too close to the houses because of the fire danger. Fire regulations in high fire danger areas such as these require that vegetation not be situated too close to buildings. It looks like some trees in the photosimulations are only about 10 feet from the houses. The photosimulations must be changed to remove excess vegetation and correct errors in it. 149-345

Also, it looks like a primary ridgeline is cut in Photosimulation 6. There are a few peaks that are shown lopped off in the development. It looks like one of the higher peaks in the area will be cut. It currently is at 1,936'. It is hard to tell from the photosimulations, but at least a couple hundred feet will be cut from that peak. This is another example of a major landform transformation. Is this engineering allowable under the current ordinances? 149-346

There are other errors in Photosimulation 6. The cut slopes depicted are inaccurate. According to the Development footprint map in Figure IV.D-4, the cut slope grading that is below the houses should extend a little further down. The homes on the street just to the south of the Edison transmission lines according to the Figure IV.D-4 map are closer to the Edison transmission lines than shown in the photosimulation. Also, it is unknown how this cut will be engineered. The photo needs to show how it will be after engineering and whether terracing or crib walls will be built there to stabilize the hillside area. The vegetation depicted that is growing back in the cut area is inaccurate. Depending on how the cut is made, the vegetation does not grow back to its former natural state. Sometimes very little vegetation will grow back even after 50 years if it is a cut in bedrock. These errors or omissions in Photosimulation 6 must be corrected. 149-347

The EIR must discuss the landscaping plans for the development in this section or the tree portion 149-348

of the Biology section in greater detail. For example, in Table IV.D-16, the EIR indicates that 515 Coast Live Oaks will be planted on the road right of ways in the project. However, if you look at Photosimulation 7, Figure IV.N-19, the trees on the road right of ways do not look like oaks or sycamore trees. These trees may not be the ones that are supposed to be planted as part of the tree mitigation plan. From this Photosimulation 7 vantage point, I see a few roads in Development Area A. This means that there are too many trees in this photosimulation for the length of these roads or some other street areas in the development will have few or no trees. Therefore, the EIR must discuss the landscaping plans in greater detail as either the photosimulations are wrong or the landscaping mitigation measures are inadequate or both. 149-348

In Photosimulation 7 Figure IV.N-19, the number of trees depicted on the lots for the houses is erroneous. There are too many trees in this photo. In Table IV.D-16, the EIR indicates that in the entire project area (Areas A & B), only 250 Coast Live Oaks will be planted on private lots. With 280 homes in the development, this averages less than 1 tree per house lot. However, if you look at the photosimulation, each house has from about 7 to 12 trees per lot including driveways. This averages about 10 times the number of trees that are planned to be planted as a mitigation measure by the developer. The project residents are under no obligation to plant trees on their property. There is nothing in the CC&Rs that would require residents to plant trees or as many trees portrayed in the simulations. Even if residents were required to plant trees, they could always vote to change the CC&Rs. The depiction of the number of trees on the photosimulation is speculative at best and there is only a remote probability that the development will be landscaped with as many trees as there are in these simulations. Also, nearly all the trees are situated too close to the houses because of the fire danger. Fire regulations in high fire danger areas such as these require that vegetation not be situated too close to buildings. It looks like some trees in the photosimulations are only about 10 feet from the houses. The photosimulations must be changed to remove excess vegetation and correct errors in it. 149-349

Also, it looks like a primary ridgeline is cut in Photosimulation 7. There are a few peaks that are shown lopped off in the development. It looks like one of the higher peaks in the area will be cut. It currently is at 1,936'. It is hard to tell from the photosimulations, but at least a couple hundred feet will be cut from that peak. This is another example of a major landform transformation. Is this engineering allowable under the current ordinances? 149-350

There are other errors in Photosimulation 7. The cut slopes depicted are inaccurate. According to the Development footprint map in Figure IV.D-4, the cut slope grading that is below the houses should extend a little further down. Also, it is unknown how this cut will be engineered. The photo needs to show how it will be after engineering and whether terracing or crib walls will be built there to stabilize the hillside area. The vegetation depicted that is growing back in the cut area is inaccurate. Depending on how the cut is made, the vegetation does not grow back to its former natural state. Sometimes very little vegetation will grow back even after 50 years if it is a cut in bedrock. These errors or omissions in Photosimulation 7 must be corrected. 149-351

The EIR must discuss the landscaping plans for the development in this section or the tree portion of the Biology section in greater detail. For example, in Table IV.D-16, the EIR indicates that 149-352

515 Coast Live Oaks will be planted on the road right of ways in the project. However, if you look at Photosimulation 8, Figure IV.N-20, the trees on the road right of ways look like some type of Pine trees. Pine trees are not trees that are supposed to be planted as part of the tree mitigation plan. From this Photosimulation 8 vantage point, I see only a small portion of road in Development Area B. This means that there are too many trees in this photosimulation for the length of the road or some other street areas in the development will have few or no trees. Therefore, the EIR must discuss the landscaping plans in greater detail as either the photosimulations are wrong or the landscaping mitigation measures are inadequate or both. 149-352

In Photosimulation 8, Figure IV.N-20, the number of trees depicted on the lots for the houses is erroneous. There are too many trees in this photo. In Table IV.D-16, the EIR indicates that in the entire project area (Areas A & B), only 250 Coast Live Oaks will be planted on private lots. With 280 homes in the development, this averages less than 1 tree per house lot. However, if you look at the photosimulation, each house has from about 7 to 12 trees per lot including driveways. This averages about 10 times the number of trees that are planned to be planted as a mitigation measure by the developer. The project residents are under no obligation to plant trees on their property. There is nothing in the CC&Rs that would require residents to plant trees or as many trees portrayed in the simulations. Even if residents were required to plant trees, they could always vote to change the CC&Rs. The depiction of the number of trees on the photosimulation is speculative at best and there is only a remote probability that the development will be landscaped with as many trees as there are in these simulations. Also, nearly all the trees are situated too close to the houses because of the fire danger. Fire regulations in high fire danger areas such as these require that vegetation not be situated too close to buildings. It looks like some trees in the photosimulations are only about 10 feet from the houses. The photosimulations must be changed to remove excess vegetation and correct errors in it. 149-353

There are other errors in Photosimulation 8. The cut slopes depicted are inaccurate. According to the Development footprint map in Figure IV.D-4, the cut slope grading that is below the houses should extend a little further down. One of the cut areas also should be steeper than depicted. This slope is to the left of the second house from the front of the photo in the left part of the photo. Also, it is unknown how this cut will be engineered. The photo needs to show how it will be after engineering and whether terracing or crib walls will be built there to stabilize the hillside area. The vegetation depicted that is growing back in the cut area is inaccurate. Depending on how the cut is made, the vegetation does not grow back to its former natural state. Sometimes very little vegetation will grow back even after 50 years if it is a cut in bedrock. These errors or omissions in Photosimulation 8 must be corrected. 149-354

In addition to Photosimulation 8, there must be an additional one. This one would be the view further south in La Tuna Canyon Park owned by the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy. Most hikers that take the trail from La Tuna Canyon Road, go further into the park than where Photosimulation 8 is taken. Most would probably reach a point on the ridge where if you look north would see Development Areas A and B. Also, people that hike, ride their bike or ride their horse along the crest of the Verdugos would also see Development Areas A and B. It is important to include this view as a Photosimulation, because there are a lot of people that will 149-355

experience this view. This is not a remote or speculative situation but something that will be experienced by many. This view shed will be viewed by hikers for maybe an hour or more, not just a matter of seconds or less than 2 minutes. 149-355

A second photosimulation that must be done is another one looking at Development Area A. This one would be the view the existing surrounding neighborhoods on Verdugo Crestline Drive look toward Development Area A. This important to understand how the residents of the existing neighborhoods will be impacted from different areas of the neighborhoods. It is important to decision makers to see how existing residents will be affected. These residents will see this view for years not for times under 2 minutes. 149-356

The photosimulations must be corrected to be meaningful and useful tools for decision makers. Additional photosimulations must be done to provide enough important views of the project. The findings about the development's impact on aesthetics will not change. All mitigation measures must conform with the Scenic Plan. 149-357

Section IV. O.1. CULTURAL RESOURCES-HISTORIC RESOURCES

There was no onsite survey done. The search for historic resources consisted only of a literature search. An actual onsite survey must be done to determine if there are any historical resources on site that will be lost due to the development. 149-358

The EIR does not discuss that the project site will impact a landmark in the Sunland-Tujunga area. The project abuts the Cross of San Yisidro on Mt. Mc Groarty, which was erected in 1923. The Cross of San Yisidro is a destination for area residents and tourists and is the site of an interfaith, nondenominational Easter sunrise service which has been sponsored by the Kiwanis Club for 80 years. The proposed site map would cut off one access road to the Cross and possibly prevent the community from continuing this historic event. 149-359

This is a significant impact that the project will have on the historic cultural resources of the EIR. The EIR must be changed to reflect this.

Section IV. O.2. CULTURAL RESOURCES-ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The onsite survey for archaeological resources may not have been adequate. There was a site inspection that was conducted two days on July 24 & 25, 2001. There was only two persons walking about 30 feet apart only on the accessible portions of the project site. This means since there are no trails over most of the project site, most of the project site was missed. The survey must be redone to inspect other areas to determine if there is any significant impact on archaeological resources by this development. They did not explore much of the project area as they decided it was not readily accessible. Assumptions such to exclude most of the project area from examination are not acceptable in the DEIR. 149-360

The archaeologists conducting the field survey did not indicate that they actually disturbed any earth 149-361

looking for artifacts that might be buried. There should be some search for buried artifacts in areas that were likely to have had human habitation. 149-361

The EIR consultants should have contacted appropriate Native American groups concerning location of potential archaeological sites, history of Native Americans, and relevant cultural information about Native Americans. This must be done and included in the EIR. 149-362

Various federal, state and local regulations have been promulgated to protect archaeological sites and resources. Although the state general plan law calls for mapping of the sites, all mapping of pre-historic sites is confidential, pursuant to California Government Code Section 6254.10. This is to protect sites from disturbance, scavenging and vandalism.

The federal Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (Public Law 96-95) protects archaeological resources and sites on federal and Indian lands, including requirements for issuance of permits by federal land managers to excavate or remove archaeological resources. The Native American Graves and Repatriation Act (1990) and the Native American Heritage Act (1984 and 1992) provide guidelines for protection of Native American remains and artifacts.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provides guidelines for identification and protection of archaeological sites and artifacts as a part of local development permit processing. CEQA guidelines define an archaeological resource as "significant," i.e., to be protected if: (1) it is associated with an event or person of recognized significance to California or American history or of recognized scientific importance in pre-history, including culturally significant Native American sites; (2) it can provide information that is of demonstrable public interest and is useful in addressing scientifically consequential and reasonable archaeological research questions; (3) it has a special or particular quality, such as the oldest, best, largest or last surviving example of its kind; (4) it is at least one hundred years old and possesses substantial stratigraphic integrity; or (5) it involves important research questions that historical research has shown can be answered only with archaeological methods. 149-363

If it is determined that a development project may disrupt or damage such a site, the project is required to provide mitigation measures to protect the site or enable study and documentation of the site, including funding of the study by the applicant. The city's environmental guidelines require the applicant to secure services of a bona fide archaeologist to monitor excavations or other subsurface activities associated with a development project in which all or a portion is deemed to be of archaeological significance. Discovery of archaeological materials may temporarily halt the project until the site has been assessed, potential impacts evaluated and, if deemed appropriate, the resources protected, documented and/or removed.

Under CEQA, discovery of human remains requires evaluation by the county coroner of the nature of the remains and cause of death. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Native American Heritage Commission is asked to determine the descendants who are to be notified or, if unidentifiable, to establish procedures for burial.

Additional work must be done on the EIR to declare that there is no impact in this area. Additional mitigation measures must be incorporated in the EIR. 149-363

Section IV. O.3. CULTURAL RESOURCES-PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The EIR report indicates that in the Alluvium found on site that may contain fossils. If there is a potential for finding fossils, in this area of the development, a search must be done. Pursuant to CEQA, if a land development project is within a potentially significant paleontological area, the developer is required to contact a bona fide paleontologist to arrange for assessment of the potential impact and mitigation of potential disruption of or damage to the site. This was not done even though there is discussion in the EIR about finding fossils in the alluvium. A paleontologist must do a field visit to the site to look for fossils in the alluvium areas. 149-364

Cuts, bores, or trenching must be done in different areas. The archaeological survey is also lacking for similar reasons.

This area containing the alluvium will be impacted by the construction of bridges through the La Tuna Canyon wash to reach Development Area B. There will be impact to the wash during construction. Depending upon the bridge design and construction techniques, portions of the wash may be excavated or impacted with construction machinery and equipment. 149-365

The developer must follow the mitigation measures proposed by the EIR consultant if fossils are found during the creation of the development. The City of Los Angeles says regarding site protection, "If significant paleontological resources are uncovered during project execution, authorities are to be notified and the designated paleontologist may order excavations stopped, within reasonable time limits, to enable assessment, removal or protection of the resources. For Los Angeles city and county, the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History, including the George C. Page Museum, provides advice concerning paleontological resources." 149-366

Section V. B. GENERAL IMPACT CATEGORIES-GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Even though there is a CEQA requirement that there must be a discussion on how this project can induce growth, there is really no discussion in the EIR. There is a two paragraph analysis of the economic impacts of this development. It does not really explain anything. This is wholly inadequate under CEQA. These are impacts that are created as a result of this development. The EIR under CEQA must discuss these impacts. 149-367

The applicant must disclose all lands that they own in the area off the project site. This includes land owned by related parties such as corporations or other business entities with common or similar owners, relatives of the owners or principals of Whitebird, Inc, and corporations or other business entities of relatives of the owners or principals of Whitebird, Inc. This important because if this project is allowed to proceed as submitted, there is a potential that other lands owned by the applicant or related parties may develop their parcels. This is part of the Growth 149-368

Inducing Impacts of the Proposed Project that must be discussed under CEQA section 15126.2(d).

CEQA Section 15126.2(d) requires a discussion of the ways in which a proposed project could induce growth. This section says, "**Growth-Inducing Impact of the Proposed Project**. Discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a waste water treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also discuss the characteristic of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment." 149-368

The EIR must first discuss what the project really is in order to discuss ways the project may induce growth in the area. The project must be described in what it is expected to occur beyond the creation of RE-9, RE-11, or custom lots. Part of the Growth Inducing Impact must include what types of homes will be expected to be built such as 3, 4, or 5 bedroom homes, or mansions. The EIR in Section III, Page 4 indicates that these are 4,000 square foot residences. This is an indication that these should be homes of at least $1 million in value when built. Also, the expected price range of these homes must be discussed. Residents that have $2 million homes are likely to have greater disposable income that they may spend locally than residents of $300,000 homes. Building a $2 million home during construction may bring more money into the local economy than building a $300,000 home. None of these types of impacts are described. CEQA guidelines require these discussions are a part of the EIR. 149-369

The EIR must include a discussion of expected costs. This is part of the growth inducing impact of this development. Monies that are spent on this development will benefit the local community. These costs must be identified to determine the impact on the local economy. These costs of development are probably already identified and detailed for this project and each alternative. 149-370

The EIR did not also discuss how additional housing projects or other developments could be a result due to the creation of the infrastructure of this development. CEQA requires that this must be done in the context of a growth inducing consequences or impacts of this development. 149-371

It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment. The EIR must have a greatly expanded discussion of this development's growth inducing impact on the local area. 149-372

If there is economic discussion, then the EIR must discuss local economic growth, address the economic feasibility of the project and each alternative. Therefore, the project and each alternative should be presented with the costs and feasibility to develop. 149-373

Section VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

We do not believe that there was a fair presentation of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project. Alternative A, the No Project Alternative is required under CEQA.

Alternatives B and C, Development Area A only, 280 lots and Duke Property Alternative Access, 280 lots in Development Area A only are almost identical alternatives. These alternatives are not significantly different from each other. Presenting these two alternatives does not provide additional reasonable alternatives. As these alternatives are so similar, it really provides decision makers with only one additional alternative to consider instead of two. Another different alternative must be presented and it is not good to limit the alternatives considered to save money or time as this is a substantial project with significant impacts.

Alternative D, Reduced Density 87 lots, is a good benchmark to help determine what is allowable under existing law. However, it is unclear whether this Alternative takes into account the Slope Density Ordinance LAMC §17.05 and the Hillside Ordinance provisions found under Section 12 of the LAMC. This alternative must incorporate those provisions of the law to help decision makers in their comparison of what the applicant wants and what is legally allowable for the project site. 149-374

Alternative E does present another alternative to the project. The EIR must as we have discussed previously have an additional alternative. We would like to see another alternative showing a less dense development which would be significantly different than the project or the other alternatives presented. The alternatives do not comply with the CEQA "Rule of Reason" under Section 15126.6(f). This section says, "Rule of reason. The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. ***The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.*** Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision making."

We were surprised to find that the EIR consultants did not consider other less dense alternatives that the ones presented. The EIR indicates that a mixed commercial-residential project, a 375 unit project and a 569 unit project were rejected as alternatives. We agree that the presentation of these alternatives would not serve the EIR as these are significantly more insensitive to the land use classifications, zoning restrictions, community plan, general plan, and will have greater impacts on the community that the proposed project. 149-375

CEQA requires those alternatives to be rejected. CEQA under Section 15126.6(b) says, " Purpose. Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1), the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would

impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly." This section also requires that alternatives that lessen the effects of the proposed project must be discussed. The EIR must be revised to reflect alternatives that fulfill this CEQA section. 149-375

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we ask that all our comments and recommendations for changes be addressed. We hope that the City of Los Angeles has EIR consultant Christopher Joseph and Associates and related consultants respond appropriately to all commenting on the EIR. We further ask that all comment letters be available for public access. This includes access during business hours at the Los Angeles City Planning Division, Sunland-Tujunga Library, Council District 2 offices and posting all comment letters on the City of Los Angeles website as an appendix to the revised EIR. Many of us do not have access to the Los Angeles Planning Division during normal business hours. Many residents cannot go downtown for viewing. Also, not all residents have computers. We should not disadvantage community members that do not have computer access. This should not be a barrier for the public to have access to everyone's comments. The public has a right to know this information. It is part of the public record on the project. 149-376

We hope that the city amends the EIR to make it a meaningful and useful document to determine if the project or any of the alternatives should be done.

Sincerely,

Fred Dong
Chairman of the Crescenta Valley Sierra Club for the Sierra Club

Cc: Michele Stone, Conservation Chair of the Crescenta Valley Sierra Club
Delphine Trowbridge, Chair of the Verdugo Hills Sierra Club
Don Bremner, Chair & Conservation Chair of the Pasadena Sierra Club
Johanna Zetterberg, Conservation Coordinator of the Angeles Chapter of the Sierra Club
George Kuc, Conservation Chair of the Verdugo Hills Sierra Club