

LETTER NO. 34

Dated: 2/22/01

Bert Saavedra
Pico Union/Westlake Cluster Network, Inc.
Family Support Services Program
Leavey Hall
1401 So. Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90015

COMMENT 34.1

We are a community based organization (501c3) working with over 50 agencies serving the immediate area adjacent to the sports arena. We are personally in touch with over 300 residents that live on Hope Street between Venice and Pico Blvd. and on numerous occasions have heard the residents personal outrage regarding the 20% increase crime and traffic congestion since October 16, 1999.

Our main concern is the neighborhood's public safety and well being, with specific regard, to insure a safety standard that will enhance a livable community and not detract from it. In October, 1999 we began an open line of communication with the Staple's Center, specific to their Responsible Alcohol Beverage Policy, and will continue to keep that dialog open. We anticipate an increase in the sale of alcoholic beverages in the new complex, which will demand further monitoring, to insure the public safety of our predominately pedestrian community.

RESPONSE 34.1

Project-related impacts to crime rates are addressed in Section IV.I.2, Police, of the Draft EIR. Project-related traffic impacts are analyzed in Section IV.F.1, Traffic, of the Draft EIR. It is anticipated that the Specific Plan and ABC license will contain extensive regulations regarding the consumption of alcohol and employee training.

COMMENT 34.2

Businesses large and small, are affected by the increase in traffic. A personal example, of a common occurrence in my building, located at Grand and Venice is anytime an early event is scheduled at the sports arena, we are e-mailed and ask to make personal arrangements, with our work schedule, which means we either come in earlier or stay later so we will not get stuck in traffic.

Additionally, we are writing to support the comments of (FCCEJ) with regard to the draft EIR for the proposed Sports and Entertainment District. We are most concerned about how the proposed

project will affect community residents in the area, who are predominantly low-income people of color. As stated previously, we believe the people living in the neighborhoods surrounding the existing Staples Center already suffer negative impacts from current operations, including the ongoing elimination of affordable housing; dramatically increased traffic and associated air and noise pollution; a marked rise in crime and vandalism; and decreased pedestrian and public safety. While the rest of the region benefits from the Staples Center operations, the residents who live and work closest to Staples bear the heaviest environmental and economic burdens.

However, with the proposed 3.75 million square foot project expansion, we believe these residents and businesses will be even more negatively impacted by both the proposed 7-year construction plan and ongoing operations of the project. We are most concerned about the failure of the draft EIR to adequately address the Imminent gentrification of the surrounding community, Including physical deterioration of buildings due to neglect and the loss of affordable housing in the area, the complete lack of an environmental energy analysis in the draft EIR; the Identified negative air and noise quality Impacts of the construction and operations, and the possible violation of water quality regulations.

RESPONSE 34.2

Existing conditions, such as those associated with operation of STAPLES Center, were carefully considered in the planning of the Los Angeles Sports and Entertainment District Project and also contributed to the assessment of identifying the potential impacts of the Project and mitigation measures. It is important to note that although the STAPLES Center is owned by the Project Applicant, it is separate and distinct from the proposed Project, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15378 c which states, “[t]he term project refers to the activity which is being approved and which may be subject to several discretionary approvals by governmental agencies.” STAPLES Center underwent its own environmental review process and the Final EIR for that project was certified by the City in 1997. The action described in the comment regarding e-mail notices appears to be initiated by an individual employer. There is no requirement or jurisdiction for the STAPLES Center to implement any such program. Refer to Responses to Comments 15.19 and 15.20 regarding neighborhood traffic impacts.

Existing conditions, such as those associated with operation of STAPLES Center, were carefully considered in the planning of the Los Angeles Sports and Entertainment District and also contributed to the assessment of identifying the projects potential impacts and mitigation measures. Regarding affordable housing, refer to Responses to Comments Nos. 15.7 to 15.16 and 15.36. The potential impacts of the proposed project on traffic congestion and increased criminal activity were analyzed in the Draft EIR in Sections IV.F.1. Traffic and IV.I.2. Police. Refer to Responses to Comments 15.19 and 15.20 for discussions regarding traffic. Refer to Responses to Comments 15.18 and 15.29 regarding impacts to air quality and noise, respectively. Pedestrian safety issues are addressed in Response to comment 15.27. Refer to Response to Comment 15.4 regarding the

Project's construction period. Energy is addressed in Response to Comment 15.3 and water quality is addressed in Response to Comment 15.17.

COMMENT 34.3

Specifically, we request the following:

- 1) The City properly and thoroughly address the significant environmental impacts identified in the draft EIR through mitigation measures that are community developed and community based;

RESPONSE 34.3

Refer to Response to Comment 16.2.

COMMENT 34.4

- 2) The City review and implement the requests for additional analysis and mitigation measures developed by Figueroa Corridor Coalition for Economic Justice in their comments to the draft EIR;

RESPONSE 34.4

The City has reviewed the requests developed by the Figueroa Corridor Coalition for Economic Justice and has responded to these requests. Refer to Letter No. 15 and associated Responses to Comments.

COMMENT 34.5

- 3) The City request that a full energy analysis be completed in the final EIR, including appropriate mitigation and conservation measures as required by CEQA;

RESPONSE 34.5

Refer to Response to Comment 15.3 for discussions regarding the Project energy analysis.

COMMENT 34.6

- 4) The City provide all of the final EIR materials translated into Spanish so that community residents can take an active part in this important decision-making process. To refuse to translate the materials would be a violation of civil rights law, and bad public policy; and

RESPONSE 34.6

Refer to Response to Comment No. 15.2.

COMMENT 34.7

5) The City request that the Developer incorporate into the Project proposal community benefits such as affordable housing, quality jobs and community services that will help mitigate negative Project Impacts. These benefits are outlined in the FCCEJ's comments to the DEIR.

RESPONSE 34.7

Refer to Responses to Comment 15.7 to 15.16 and 15.36.

COMMENT 34.8

On behalf of our community I respectfully ask for your support in our requests.

RESPONSE 34.8

The comment is noted for the record and will be forwarded to the City decision makers for their review and consideration.