

## **LETTER NO. 96**

Sandra Garber  
2405 S. Holt Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90034-2126

### **Comment 96-1**

I hope that you will oppose any further development at Playa Vista. Some of the reasons are the already existing state of gridlock along Lincoln Bl. in that area, the danger posed to residents by underground methane gas and the uncertainty of the mitigation measures proposed to contain it, and the extreme liability for the city if those measures do fail to protect people.

The development built so far is UGLY—it looks like a fancy correctional facility. It will be a blight on what otherwise could be a wonderful, nature-oriented urban park, providing desperately needed open space in a natural setting, convenient for all residents of Los Angeles.

The Ballona Valley has been an important ecosystem and much needed stop on the Pacific Flyway for migrating birds. The opportunities it offers for nature preservation and public recreation and education should not be undervalued.

### **Response 96-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

The Draft EIR has fully analyzed the potential impacts mentioned in the comment and recommended mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts, consistent with CEQA guidelines. The Draft EIR provides a detailed analysis of traffic in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation on page 798, a detailed analysis of potential methane impacts in Section IV.I, Safety/Risk of Upset on page 660, a detailed analysis of visual impacts in Section IV.O, Visual Qualities (Aesthetics and Views) on page 1148, a detailed analysis of biological resources in Section IV.D, Biotic Resources on page 523, and a detailed analysis of parks in Section IV.L.(4), Parks and Recreation on page 1022.

## **LETTER NO. 97**

Dorothy Garven  
3630 Inglewood Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90066

### **Comment 97-1**

Now is the time for you to be mindful of your mission as a Los Angeles City Planner. One of those missions among others, I am sure, is to approve development that promotes an improved quality of life for the residents—certainly not to allow degradation of quality of life.

It is not right to impose the development of Playa Vista on us. We already are asked to take care of an exploding population causing stress on schools, police, fire and other city services, as well as directly affecting existing residents in the form of taxes and poorer quality of life.

### **Response 97-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

### **Comment 97-2**

Already, Inglewood Blvd. (the street on which I live) is backed up for 2 blocks every night and morning with mostly cut through traffic from Centinela which can no longer carry the existing traffic. Additional building at Playa Vista will only exacerbate this problem.

### **Response 97-2**

The commentor raises specific comments relating to the existing traffic conditions on Inglewood Boulevard and suggests commuter cut-through traffic is a substantial portion of that existing traffic. Such traffic would be included within the existing operating conditions presented in Table 115 of the Draft EIR, on page 812.

The Draft EIR contains an analysis of potential neighborhood impacts that could be caused by project traffic in Subsection 3.4.7 of Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR on page 872. As discussed in Subsection 3.4.7, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant impacts on neighborhood traffic in the Mar Vista area.

**Comment 97-3**

I have already moved once from a closer proximity to Santa Monica Airport (in 1997) when the noise and fumes from jets got to be intolerable. The entertainment types who will be the ones buying at Playa Vista will only increase this air traffic with their private jets.

**Response 97-3**

The Proposed Project does not propose any additional corporate, “entertainment industry” office space, but rather includes space for professional offices (i.e., doctors, dentists, banks, real estate offices, etc.). The Proposed Project is not anticipated to affect the operations of private/chartered jets at Santa Monica airport or LAX.

Santa Monica Airport has no commercial service, so a general increase in population at the Proposed Project will not necessarily lead to any increase in use at the airport. To the extent that a general increase in population at the Proposed Project will lead to increased private general aviation traffic at the airport, there is no reasonable way of measuring the prospect of private use of civil aviation. The airport imposes flight and noise restrictions which would apply to any resident at the Proposed Project, such as the Single Event Noise Exposure Level (SENEL) restriction contained in Section 10.04.04.060 of the Santa Monica Municipal Code. There are also curfew and other restrictions described in Chapter 10.04 of the Municipal Code. Uses and limitations upon traffic at the airport are within the jurisdiction of the Federal Aviation Administration and, to some extent, the City of Santa Monica.

**Comment 97-4**

Furthermore, Playa Vista will have heliport pads which will bring the helicopters lower over our homes and at all hours of the night. The necessary police helicopters are all that we should be asked to put up with.

**Response 97-4**

This comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

Section 15002 of the State CEQA Guidelines states that the basic purpose of CEQA is to inform governmental decision-makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of a proposed project. No changes to heliport operations are proposed with implementation of the Village at Playa Vista, with the exception of the elimination of one heliport within the boundaries of the Proposed Project. Therefore, there would not be any impacts from heliport operations as a result of the Proposed Project.

Subsection 2.2.5 of Section IV.I, Safety/Risk of Upset, of the Draft EIR on pages 715-717 identifies two heliports currently permitted within the adjacent Campus portion of the previously

approved Playa Vista First Phase Project. The Campus is envisioned to provide corporate headquarters-type facilities; as such, one or both of these heliports could become operational in the future to serve corporate executives. The impacts associated with opening one or more of the heliports at Playa Vista were addressed in the 1995 approvals of the Campus at Playa Vista, and are not an issue under consideration at this time. The study performed at that time, "Helistop Noise Study for Playa Vista," has been included in the Appendices of the Final EIR.

**Comment 97-5**

Why is it so necessary to blindly BUILD, BUILD, BUILD and inflict this misery on the residents of the Westside?

**Response 97-5**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 98**

Aimee Gates  
510 S. Burnside Avenue, #11A  
Los Angeles, CA 90036

### **Comment 98-1**

I'm writing to voice my opinion on the development of "The Village" within Playa Vista. I recently put a deposit down on a condo in the Crescent Walk development of Playa Vista and I am shocked and upset to find out that there may be further opposition to the development of "The Village." A major reason for my interest in Playa Vista was the idea of having retail, commercial, and residential properties all within one community. This is my first home and I was excited to finally find a community that would provide not only a place to live, but also social activities and nearby shopping. I think it would be a huge mistake to prohibit the building of the retail and commercial spaces. The more shops available within walking distance means less time driving and polluting the environment. Clearly "The Village" will save on traffic, congestion, and pollution, and will make Playa Vista more livable and keep the surrounding environment cleaner.

I strongly support the development of "The Village," as presented in the draft environmental impact report, and I hope you will consider the homeowners of Playa Vista properties when making your decision.

### **Response 98-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 99**

Dorraine Gilbert  
241 Rees Street  
Playa del Rey, CA 90293

### **Comment 99-1**

Living in Playa del Rey for the last nine years had me worried about Playa Vista... until it opened and we were invited to see what they were doing. I had felt the development would be too big for the area with buildings that seemed far too dense. Now that I have visited the site, it is easier to see the vision projected for Playa Vista. The management has held several meetings and we appreciate the traffic signal improvements and roadway widening started and on-going.

I was afraid that so many new residents would make traffic congestion, already bad, unbearable. This brings me to the solution proposed by the Playa Vista planners, the Village which will enable residents to meet many of their retail needs conveniently within walking distance.

Construction of the Village is needed to complete the vision. I think it is very important to have places to shop as well as places to live in a planned community. My recent visit to Israel made it even clearer to me. My son and his family live in a planned community outside of Jerusalem. As their community has grown so has their shopping area. In years past they had to go into Jerusalem for almost everything. What a pleasure it is in their town to be able to drive no more than a few minutes to shop.

I believe the Village will accomplish the same thing for Playa Vista. A community needs parks, open space, a library and shopping to make a community. I feel that as a local resident I will probably want to avail myself of the stores and restaurants in the community. It looks charming in the plans and execution of plans has been good so far.

I have no doubt that The Village will fit into the vision of Playa Vista, and I encourage the City to support this second phase of the project.

### **Response 99-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 100**

Barry Gribbon  
6975 Trolleyway  
Playa del Rey, CA 90293

12.19.2003

### **Comment 100-1**

As a Playa del Rey resident, I have watched the Playa Vista project carefully over the years. I am writing today to say that I am happy that the project has been scaled down significantly from the Summa days.

Our hopes are that this new, smaller version will have fewer impacts on the surrounding communities so residents can maintain a high quality of life. I am very glad to see that the housing plans incorporate park and open space sites.

I would, however, suggest that the city encourage Playa Vista to look into making the former Jake's restaurant site in Playa del Rey into a park. There are far too few parks in Playa del Rey and the Jake's site would make a perfect location for a park that everyone in the neighborhood could enjoy.

Thank you for your consideration.

### **Response 100-1**

The comment is noted and will be forwarded to the City decision-makers for their review and consideration. The parcel known as the Jakes' Lot is owned by an affiliate of the Project Applicant. The City and the Applicant and its affiliate are working to identify an appropriate future use for this lot.

## **LETTER NO. 101**

Jennifer Gribbon  
6975 Trolleyway  
Playa del Rey, CA 90293

12.19.2003

### **Comment 101-1**

As a Playa del Rey resident, I have watched the Playa Vista project carefully over the years. I am writing today to say that I am happy that the project has been scaled down significantly from the Summa days.

Our hopes are that this new, smaller version will have fewer impacts on the surrounding communities so residents can maintain a high quality of life. I am very glad to see that the housing plans incorporate park and open space sites.

I would, however, suggest that the city encourage Playa Vista to look into making the former Jake's restaurant site in Playa del Rey into a park. There are far too few parks in Playa del Rey and the Jake's site would make a perfect location for a park that everyone in the neighborhood could enjoy.

Thank you for your consideration.

### **Response 101-1**

The comment is noted and will be forwarded to the City decision-makers for their review and consideration. The parcel known as the Jakes' Lot is owned by an affiliate of the Project Applicant. The City and the Applicant and its affiliate are working to identify an appropriate future use for this lot.

## **LETTER NO. 102**

Howard Hackett  
5208 Etheldo Avenue  
Culver City, CA 90230

### **Comment 102-1**

First of all, I want to compliment the drafters of the EIR. A lot of thought and effort went into its planning and preparation. I have spent numerous hours with the document at the public library and now have the two CD's at home to review.

I wish to comment on three areas. I consider these major omissions, or not following Best Management Practices BMP's, and making poor mitigation choices.

The three areas are questionable:

1. Fourteen Parks within the two mile radius. You have omitted the Baldwin Hills Regional Park. This is a major omission because part of the PR on Playa Vista Village was the closeness to the new regional park, that will soon be larger than Central Park in New York. The PR toted [*sic*] that it would be possible to take a short bicycle ride and play in this new park. Further, there are no plans created to access any of these 14 locations except by automobile. The EIR omitted walking and biking access to all of them. Please add this important omission.

### **Response 102-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

The Baldwin Hills Regional Park appears to refer to the Baldwin Hills Park Master Plan, which is a proposed facility subject to planning and funding activities. As such, it was not identified as an existing park facility in the analysis of Proposed Project impacts on Parks. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, the Draft EIR analyzes impacts on parks and bikeways in Sections IV.L.(4) and IV.K.(3) of the Draft EIR, respectively. To the extent that the park provides new recreation opportunities in the region, it would relieve demand for service at other park locations and reduce their potential impacts from future regional growth. The availability of such a regional park would not alter the conclusions regarding impacts on parks that were presented in Section IV.K.(3), Bicycle Plan, of the Draft EIR. With mitigation, impacts on parks would be less than significant.

The analysis of impacts on bikeways in Section IV.K.(3), Bicycle Plan, analyzes the impacts of the Proposed Project and, where necessary, mitigation measures to address the Project's impacts. As indicated in Subsection 3.4.1 of Section IV.K.(3), Bicycle Plan, of the Draft EIR on page 961,

the Project's Class II lanes would link with other bikeways, would be compatible with adjacent Playa Vista First Phase Project bikeways and provide enhanced service for the Proposed Project's population, Playa Vista First Phase Project's population and regional travelers passing through the site on their longer journeys. The new bikeways would improve the quality of bikeway service. Thus, the Proposed Project would not interfere with the implementation of any planned bikeways, but would expand upon and complement existing Bike Plans. No mitigation measures are required. The comments regarding walking and biking between the Project and the site of the Baldwin Hills Regional Park are noted.

### **Comment 102-2**

2. Traffic and Circulation. The analysis of the 218 intersections within an approximate 110-square mile traffic study area show most rated as D, E, F levels of service. Please note. You cannot improve these intersections significantly by installing "turn pockets." Engineer them properly or leave them alone. How about adding means for "traffic calming." It works for the city of Santa Monica. Cut speed through intersections, not increase them. It is your duty, and the development criteria regulations to keep non resident traffic off our local neighborhood streets. You miss the point completely by "improving" intersections. Think Traffic Calming instead. Beautify our neighborhood streets, not turn them into speedways. You cannot convert [sic] D, E, and F intersections into A's anyway. Therefore your so called traffic mitigation planning is for naught.

### **Response 102-2**

The 218 intersections analyzed are part of the regional arterial network, with the primary focus on moving vehicular traffic. The City has a required methodology for assessing impacts to this system, and requires mitigation to address significant impacts thus identified. Effective mitigation measures include physical improvements, signal system improvements, alternative transportation (e.g., transit), and transportation demand management. Traffic calming on arterials would not work because it would worsen congestion on the arterial system and push traffic to other streets (i.e., neighborhoods).

It should be noted that improvement of arterial street intersections enhances mobility on the arterial roadway system and therefore reduces the potential for non-resident traffic intrusion on local streets.

The Draft EIR contains a discussion of potential project traffic impacts on neighborhood streets and mitigation for same; See Subsection 3.4.7 of Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 872 and Subsection 4.0 on page 903 of the Draft EIR. The neighborhood traffic impact analysis concludes that the Proposed Project may have significant impacts on the residential neighborhood bounded by Inglewood Boulevard, Ballona Creek, Sawtelle Boulevard, and Bray Street/Port Road, and includes a mitigation measure to address these impacts (page 903). In the event any unforeseen neighborhood traffic intrusion problems are reported after Project occupancy, LADOT will investigate the complaints and, if it is determined that the cut-through problem is attributed to the Project, LADOT will work with the

affected residents, the local City Council office, homeowner's groups, and traffic engineering consultants, to design a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan to address the items of concern. If the traffic intrusion is determined to be unrelated to the Project, the neighborhood could still work with LADOT to develop a Neighborhood Traffic Plan funded through other means. See Topical Response TR-5, Neighborhood Traffic Impacts, on page 458 above.

### **Comment 102-3**

I live in the del Rey neighborhood. Friends and colleagues have already moved in to Playa Vista so I see that as part of my community. As it grows in size, more of us will become neighbors and friends and share the same joys and concerns.

One of my joys is riding the bicycle for pleasure and commuting. I would like to bring to your attention the [sic]

3. Non planning for bicycle trails to connect the Village to surrounding Bicycle Trails and communities.

We now have major traffic concerns on the west side. This project will significantly add to this problem. We in the bicycle community firmly believe that part of the solution will be to get folks out of their autos and in to walking and bicycling modes of transportation. A recent California study points out that most trips are 2 miles or less. This plan if adopted as proposed will isolate residents to the confined walls within the Village. If one dares to ride on streets such as Lincoln Blvd., Jefferson Blvd., Centinela Ave., and Inglewood Blvd. they do so with great risk. The plan has specific Class I and Class II trails within the complex. This is good planning internally for the Village. (You even gave them "park credits" for this feature.) I do not comprehend this thinking when nothing has been recommended for community connections. I do give you credit for showing Class II trails on Runway Road, McConnel Avenue, 2nd [S]treet, Millennium, and Bluff Creek Drive. Good work.

You even point out in the EIR that Class I and Class II bicycle lanes will be provided on Lincoln Blvd. south, from Jefferson, to Manchester in Westchester. Your departments MAY have had some input on these trails, but the LACBC and bicycle community, Playa Vista, Caltrans, LADOT, the Coastal Commission and others did a lot of negotiation to make it happen. Without this pressure, Lincoln Blvd. south from Jefferson to Manchester would have been additional solid auto/truck lanes.

### **Response 102-3**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

The analysis of Proposed Project impacts on Parks in Section IV.L.(4), Parks and Recreation, of the Draft EIR does not include the area allocated to bikeways, approximately 1.0 acres, in the

Project's provision of park space, approximately 11.4 acres. The discussion in the Parks analysis identifies the bikeways as an additional Project feature.

#### **Comment 102-4**

You further make a special effort to define Bike trails in the area. The South Bay 22 mile Class I trail, the 8 mile Ballona Creek Class I Trail and the Culver Blvd. Class I Trail. This is good information, but unless means are provided [sic] for connections to these important trails, this is a waste of time, paper and effort. How about adding bike lanes from surrounding communities that connect to these wonderful Class I Bicycle Trails.

#### **Response 102-4**

Please refer to Response 102-1, above.

#### **Comment 102-5**

(ALSO TAKEN FROM THE EIR) "In addition, the Bicycle Plan points out design issues which should be considered, such as traffic control, safety, and convenience. At this time the City uses standards in Chapter 11, "Bikeway Planning and Design," of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual.<sup>377</sup> These standards address design criteria relating to lane widths, striping, signing, intersection design, surface materials, and other related topics."

<sup>377</sup> Anthony Nyivih, Civil Engineer, Program Development Division, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, February 25, 2003."

Further quotes: "The following objectives are included in the Bicycle Plan:"

- To make bicycling, for both transportation and recreation, a safer activity.
- To encourage and facilitate bicycle riding as an important mode of personal transportation as well as a pleasant source of outdoor exercise.
- To establish policies, guidelines, standards and criteria to facilitate the development of a comprehensive bicycle transportation and recreation system for the City.
- To identify route locations appropriate for known and potential bicycle trip demand.
- To assure that the routes chosen are compatible with the routes of neighboring municipalities.
- To establish criteria for implementation.
- To qualify the City for various funding sources.

The criteria address both the desired location of bikeways and the design standards under which they would be developed. Some of the locational criteria are related to the costs and

Bikeway systems have been grouped into three classes:

- Class I Bikeway—Bicycle Path or Trail
- Class II Bikeway—Bicycle Lane
- Class III Bikeway—Bicycle Route

There are approximately 300 miles of bike routes throughout the City which provide basic continuity and which can be expanded as needed.”

This is interesting news to the uninformed in the community. However the traffic planners completely ignored the City of Los Angeles, the County of Los Angeles, and Caltrans rules concerning the provision of bicycle trails from any new construction projects. Traffic mitigation to city planners ONLY focuses on means to move autos and trucks to the freeways where motorists can sit in gridlock during most hours of the day. Further, planning consists of turning existing residential streets, into new highways to connect to these freeways. This is inappropriate planning.

Our neighborhood streets are to be widened, re-striped with freeway type signage, left and right turn pockets, without one thought given on how a bicyclist can even safely ride the ¼ mile from the Village at Playa Vista to the Ballona Creek Bicycle Class I trail. The Ballona Creek trail is the only Class I east west trail on the west side of the city.

How about considering a “bicycle rider” factor, to mitigate some of the projected traffic increases?

As you can see, I have included some of the EIR writing in my comments to you. This has been done to impress upon you the great verbiage. However, if you look farther in the details, you will not find even one comment about including additional bike trails in the plan. Not even a comment about one sign that might say “CAUTION BICYCLE AHEAD”

### **Response 102-5**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

As cited in Subsection 2.1.2.1 of Section IV.K.(3), Bicycle Plan, of the Draft EIR on page 955 at the beginning of this comment: “At this time the City uses standards in Chapter 11, “Bikeway Planning and Design,” of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual. These standards address design criteria relating to lane widths, striping, signing, intersection design, surface materials, and other related topics.” As such, these standards would be applicable to construction of the Proposed Project. As noted in Response 102-1, the Draft EIR focuses on impacts of the Proposed Project and its required mitigation measures, pursuant to CEQA.

### **Comment 102-6**

In summary, please consider the following:

#### 1. Parks

Add the Baldwin Hills Regional Park to this section. At least one entrance will fall within your 2 mile radius criteria. Also include means for Village residents to hike/walk and bicycle to all these other recreational sites.

### **Response 102-6**

Please refer to Response 102-1, above.

### **Comment 102-7**

#### 2. Traffic and Circulation

You cannot improve any of 210 intersections significantly by installing “turn pockets.” There are examples in our neighborhoods where traffic is delayed, possibly by poor design, or other factors that planners must know about. A bicycle commuter also has a perilous problem getting safely through some of these intersections. How about adding means for “traffic calming.” It works for the city of Santa Monica. Incidentally, Santa Monica has reached out to the bicycle community and has added numerous routes throughout the city. An example of good design, is the case where a right turn pocket has a bicycle lane for through traffic marked on the left hand side of the turn lane. Cut speed through intersections, not increase speed. It is your duty, and the development criteria’s regulations to keep non resident traffic off our local neighborhood streets. You miss the point completely by “improving” intersections. Think Traffic calming instead.

### **Response 102-7**

Please see Response 102-2, above.

### **Comment 102-8**

3. Non planning for bicycle trails to connect the Village to surrounding Bicycle Trails and the local communities. We now have major traffic concerns on the west side. Help us get people out of their autos for those short trips. Implement my recommendations as listed above. Rethink the whole Traffic Plan. Include bicycle routes. My recommendations for improvements are as follows:

Add Bicycle Trails on both sides of streets/highways on

#### 1. All Streets in and out of the Village

2. Jefferson Blvd. from the Pacific Ocean to Sepulveda Blvd. on the east. Sepulveda is a designated north south trail connecting the west side to the San Fernando [V]alley.
3. Centinela Blvd. from Jefferson Blvd. to Venice Blvd. Venice Blvd. is the only Class II trail, connecting the west side of the city, to downtown Los Angeles.
4. Inglewood Blvd. from Jefferson Blvd. to Venice Blvd.
5. Lincoln Blvd. North to Fiji. from Jefferson Blvd. The present plan is to re-stripe the existing 4 lanes to 6 lanes, eliminating any chance of even safely reaching the Ballona Creek Trail, let alone making it to a Marina destination.
6. Jefferson Blvd. from Sepulveda Blvd. to the Fox Hills Mall Transit Center. All city busses are equipped with bicycle racks. Make it possible to ride to and from the Village to the Transit Center, Sepulveda Slauson, load the bike on the bus and commute to most anywhere in LA County, and beyond.

#### **Response 102-8**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

#### **Comment 102-9**

Overall the EIR is well thought out. A lot of great work has been done to insure that the Village project will succeed. Playa Vista is, and will be an asset, for the west side for decades to come. Thank you for this chance to comment on the EIR.

Lastly, please focus on these important changes to the EIR that I have brought to your attention. To create a great EIR for a new community, and completely ignore existing nearby neighborhoods is just not appropriate.

#### **Response 102-9**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 103**

Susana Halpine  
239 Sunridge Street  
Playa del Rey, CA 90293

December 21, 2003

### **Comment 103-1**

I urge you to stop Playa Vista's Phase 2. The New York business interests have recreated a monstrous version of an overcrowded Eastern city—the corner of Lincoln and Jefferson should be renamed Newark West.

- Eye-sore on Lincoln: The rat-maze architecture is four stories high and much denser than other multi-dwelling housing in the Playa del Rey-Westchester area. At the very least, they should have decided on a single architectural styles [sic] instead of the present hog-pog [sic], and moved the housing back from the street to conform with comparable local multi-housing.
- Negative impact on local housing market: As a recent homeowner in the area, I am concerned that the high housing density already existing in Playa Vista will have a negative impact on the local housing market.
- Smarter use of housing tax incentives: The needed housing should be built using existing infrastructure and in parts of the city that need revitalization dollars.
- Traffic Gridlock: Phase 2 will place additional vehicles in the unbearable Lincoln corridor traffic.
- Increase Air Pollution: Cute golf-carts showcased by Playa Vista developers will not alleviate the additional air pollution caused by increased car-trips.

Stopping further expansion of Playa Vista is FAIRNESS, NOT NIMBY'ism. The Playa del Rey-Westchester residents already contend with:

- Ballona Creek runoff fouling our beaches
- LAX airport—the biggest source of traffic, air and noise pollution
- Hyperion Water Treatment Facility and its foul odor discharges
- Scattergood Power Plant air pollution
- Sempra natural gas plant toxic discharge and odors

- Chevron oil refinery air pollution

The wetlands and the open space are minimal mitigation for the effects these public facilities. Please STOP Playa Vista's Phase 2 expansion.

### **Response 103-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

The Draft EIR has fully analyzed the potential impacts mentioned in the comment and recommended mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts, consistent with CEQA guidelines. The Draft EIR provides a detailed analysis of visual impacts in Section IV.O, Visual Qualities (Aesthetics and Views) on page 1148, a detailed analysis of housing in Section IV.J, Population, Housing and Employment on page 742, a detailed analysis of traffic in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation on page 798, a detailed analysis of air pollution in Section IV.B, Air Quality on page 270, a detailed analysis of runoff in Section IV.C.(2), Water Quality on page 400, a detailed analysis of noise in Section IV.E, Noise on page 553, and a detailed analysis of wastewater in Section IV.N.(2), Wastewater on page 1100. Corrections and Additions to these sections of the Draft EIR are contained in Section II.27, II.14, II.15, II.4, II.6, II.8 and II.25, respectively, of this Final EIR.

## **LETTER NO. 104**

Ann Henrichs  
8700 Pershing Drive, #5222  
Playa del Rey, CA 90293

### **Comment 104-1**

I recently had the opportunity to visit Playa Vista for the first time; and I was very impressed.

There were many beautiful parks built for the community, and I was amazed by the restoration of the freshwater marsh. The architecture was interesting with quite a range of different kinds of homes.

What impressed me most was how much of a community Playa Vista is. People walking down the street said “hello,” and neighbors knew each other. Unfortunately, few communities in Los Angeles can say that.

I am writing to support The Village, which will provide new shops, restaurants and parks to the Playa Vista neighborhood. These new amenities will only enhance the community feel and make Playa Vista an even better place to live. I am also pleased that all of Playa Vista’s amenities—parks, the library, etc.—will be also be open for us in the surrounding communities.

Playa Vista appears to be a wonderful place to live. It is a nice place to visit, and approval of the Village will make it even better.

### **Response 104-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

**LETTER NO. 105**

David A. Herbst  
Westchester, CA 90045

**Comment 105-1**

The Village at Playa Vista will be the culmination of the visionary concept conceived by Nelson Rising, Doug Gardner and set into motion by Peter Denniston and others who dreamed of a place that not only addressed Los Angeles' vital need for more housing, but also took into consideration the important issues of environmental preservation and coexistence with a surrounding community built in the post-World War II era.

Over the years, Playa Vista has continually changed and adapted to the needs and desires of the community, ultimately resulting in a model for urban development. The sale of land west of Lincoln Boulevard as open space addresses the concerns for the environment expressed by Ruth Lansford, the Friends of the Ballona Wetlands and others. In addition, the fact that the project now has 70 percent open space and a fully functioning freshwater marsh that is attracting scores of new bird species, should make true environmentalists ecstatic.

The extensive mix of new housing, including affordable housing products, addresses the need for the city to provide more and more affordable places for people to live near their jobs on the Westside. This has been the chief housing goal of numerous members of the City Council and our Mayor. At Playa Vista, a significant amount of the new housing (both in the first phase and in The Village) will be reserved for very low, low and moderate-income families. I am extremely proud that during my tenure with Playa Vista I was able to work on securing the funding and approvals for the first affordable homes on site.

Of course, Playa Vista is replete with examples of sustainable design, energy efficiency and other initiatives designed to reduce traffic and pollution.

The Village is the missing piece to this complex puzzle. By providing retail establishments next to the already approved residential area, more residents will be encouraged to leave their cars at home when going grocery shopping, out to eat or to the doctor's office. Furthermore, The Village completes the vital riparian corridor that stretches along the base of the Bluffs and provides an important first stage for the water entering the freshwater marsh. In addition, The Village will complete the roadway improvements along Jefferson Boulevard and complete construction of Bluff Creek Drive—a new east-west alternative that will make it easier to reach the 405. All these infrastructure improvements will not only benefit Playa Vista, but those of us who live in the surrounding community.

More than two decades have gone into the planning and design of Playa Vista and The Village, and its completion will be a shining accomplishment for everyone who has ever worked at Playa Vista, for the people who will eventually call The Village "home," and for the City of Los

Angeles, which can point to it forever as a model of how urban development can be responsible and successful.

**Response 105-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 106**

Lloyd G. Hild  
7429 McConnell Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90045-1036

### **Comment 106-1**

As a resident with beautiful views from atop the Westchester Bluffs, I have been quite concerned about Playa Vista's plans for The Village. Specifically, I wanted to make sure that the development would not in any way negatively impact the views from my backyard.

I heard a presentation by Playa Vista representatives and understand that all buildings in the Village will be restricted to well below the height of the bluffs. The first phase of Playa Vista has had a positive impact on the view. Instead of looking at an old industrial site, I will look out at a property that includes the freshwater marsh, some parks and buildings of varied architecture.

My sight lines are important to me, and I am confident that they will only get better with the Village—as long as the City of Los Angeles forces Playa Vista to live up to the building height restrictions.

In summary, I'd like to say that Playa Vista has had a positive impact in our community, and with the Village, the views should only get better. What was once an industrial site (and a deteriorating one at that), is turning into a very nice mixed use community.

### **Response 106-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

Impacts of the Proposed Project on Visual Qualities (Aesthetics and Views) are addressed in Section IV.O of the Draft EIR, beginning on page 1148. The proposed height limits are shown in Figure 103, page 1166 of the Draft EIR. As stated on page 1177, panoramic views would still be present from all locations along the Westchester Bluffs.

## **LETTER NO. 107**

James Hill  
James Hill and Associates  
8324 Chase Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90045

### **Comment 107-1**

I've lived in the Westchester community long enough to see the different development plans people have had for the former Hughes site. In the 80s, plans called for high rise condominiums, a regional mall, a hotel and a golf course through the wetlands. Then Maguire Thomas came along and proposed a master plan that would have had 13,000 residential units, a large mall, a hotel and a little marina.

Now we're down to the final proposal—The Village. Under this plan, the entire Playa Vista development will have less than 6,000 homes. Seventy percent of the property will be open space, thanks in part to the sale of the land west of Lincoln to the State of California. The hotel is gone. 7,000 proposed homes are gone. The regional shopping center is gone. The little marina is gone.

What's in the Village proposal are parks, open space, a neighborhood-serving, retail center and loads of regional transportation improvements. It looks like Playa Vista has finally got it right. This proposal deserves prompt approval from the City Council.

### **Response 107-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 108**

Ellie Holm  
7417 Henefer Avenue  
Westchester, CA 90045

Jacqueline M. Dewar  
6511 Firebrand Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90045

Adelle Vodovoz Wexler  
6529 Hedding Street  
Westchester, CA 90045

December 22, 2003

### **Comment 108-1**

According to the Specific plan Procedures Amended by Ordinance No. 170,785 Effective January 13, 1996, Section 6—Height of Building Structures (copy attached). pp. 12 & 13.

B. “Within the entire Specific Plan Area, Buildings or structures on a limited number of lots may exceed the height of the nearest bluff.”

C. “Within the entire Specific Plan Area, buildings or structures on a limited number of lots may exceed two-hundred forty (240) feet above the grade.”

Since the situation has changed and the owner of the parcel (Dreamworks) withdrew their offer to buy the parcel, the 240 ft height request should be taken out of the Playa Vista Area D Specific Plan. The Westchester Bluff residents were promised protection of their views and that no building would extend beyond the height of the bluff line. 75 feet.

The height of 240 ft. is unacceptable and must be reconsidered by the City of Los Angeles. No building should exceed the height of the bluff in the Playa Vista Project Plan. (75 ft.)

Please include in the Village EIR.

### **Response 108-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

This comment refers to an adjacent parcel within the First Phase Project at Playa Vista (The Campus at Playa Vista), which was previously approved by the City and is not under consideration in this EIR.

Impacts of the Proposed Project on Visual Qualities (Aesthetics and Views) are addressed in Section IV.O of the Draft EIR, beginning on page 1148. The proposed height limits are shown in Figure 103, page 1166 of the Draft EIR. These height limits restrict heights within the Village to two height zones, 95 feet AMSL and 112 feet AMSL, both of which are lower than the height of the Westchester Bluffs (average height of 140 feet AMSL). As stated on page 1177, panoramic views would still be present from all locations along the Westchester Bluffs with implementation of the Proposed Project.

## **Comment 108-2**

### **PLAYA VISTA AREA D**

Specific Plan

Ordinance No. 160,523

Effective December 26, 1985

Amended by Ordinance No. 170,785

Effective January 13, 1996

Specific Plan Procedures

Amended pursuant to L.A.M.C. Section 11.5.7

Design Review Board Procedures

Amended pursuant to L.A.M.C. 16.50

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

MAP Specific Plan Area D

Section 1. Establishment of Specific Plan

Section 2. Relationship to Other Provisions of Chapter 1 of the Municipal Code  
of the City of Los Angeles

Section 3. Definitions

Section 4. Zone Regulations

Section 5. Density and Floor Area

Section 6. Height of Buildings or Structures

Section 7. Project Permit - Compliance Review

Section 8. Landscape Standards

Section 9. Parking

Section 10. Time Limits

Section 11. Appeals

Section 12. Severability

Section 13. Owner Acknowledgment of Limitations

A Part of the General Plan - City of Los Angeles

<http://cityplanning.lacity.org> (General Plan - Specific Plan)

### **E. Allocation of Development Rights**

The cumulative totals of Floor Area utilized within each zoning category described in Section 4 of this ordinance above shall be maintained by the Departments of Planning and Building and Safety. Allocation of development rights to each lot within a subdivision shall be made at the time of subdivision, and prior to the recordation of a Final Map. Deed restrictions or covenants running with the land shall be recorded to limit development in accordance with such allocated development rights and in conformity with Section 5 of this Ordinance. Notwithstanding anything in this Specific Plan to the contrary, the total Floor Area devoted to the following kinds of uses within the Specific Plan shall not count towards the maximum Floor Area allowable under Sections 5A, 5B, 5C or 5D of this Ordinance, provided however that the total Floor Area of such uses shall not exceed 25% of the total Floor Area allowed within the Specific Plan Area:

1. Museums and art galleries
2. Libraries
3. Fire stations
4. U.S. postal facilities
5. City of Los Angeles police facilities
6. Churches and synagogues
7. Community centers
8. Civic center and government offices.
9. Schools, elementary, junior and high, public or private (not including universities)
10. Concert halls and performing arts facilities (not including cinemas)
11. Health care facilities
12. Other public-serving and community uses and facilities similar to those listed above, when determined as provided in Section 12.21 A 2 of the Code.

A density bonus in an amount equal to the total Floor Area devoted to the above-listed uses, when such uses are operated on a non-profit basis, shall be granted as an addition to the maximum Floor Area otherwise permitted under Section 5B4 of this ordinance.

## Section 6. HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS OR STRUCTURES

No building shall be erected, enlarged or maintained which exceeds the height limits hereinafter specified. Notwithstanding such height limits, development within the Specific Plan Area shall be subject to the applicable density and Floor Area limitations set forth in Section 5 of the ordinance.

A. Except as provided in Subsections B and C below, in all portions of the Specific Plan Area no buildings or structures may exceed 140 feet above mean sea level as measured by a licensed surveyor and approved by the Department of Building and Safety.

B. Within the entire Specific Plan Area, buildings or structures on a limited number of lots may exceed the height of the nearest bluff. The total area of all such lots shall not exceed twenty percent (20%) of the total area of the Specific Plan Area. For such lots, no buildings or structures shall exceed two-hundred forty (240) feet above grade.

C. Within the entire Specific Plan Area, buildings or structures on a limited number of lots may exceed two-hundred forty (240) feet above grade. The total area of all such lots shall not exceed ten percent (10%) of the total area of the Specific Plan Area. For such lots, no buildings or structures shall exceed the maximum height allowed under Part 77 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The lots affected by this Subsection B shall be separate and distinct from the lots affected by Subsection A above.

D. Notwithstanding anything in the foregoing exceptions to the contrary, in that portion of the Specific Plan Area located southerly of a line which is 600 feet northerly of the top of the bluff, no buildings or structures, or any part hereof, including rooftop equipment and skylights, may exceed 140 feet above mean sea level as measured by a licensed surveyor and approved by the Department of Building and Safety. The precise location of such line for the purpose of this Specific Plan shall be the line established on the Map in Figure 2 of this ordinance and verified by the City Engineer. Once such line is established, it shall not be subject to change due to future erosion or earth movement.

## Section 7. PROJECT PERMIT - COMPLIANCE REVIEW

The purpose of this Section is to provide standards and a process for review and approval of project permits for all buildings, structures and attendant site improvements proposed for construction within the Specific Plan Area.

### A. Jurisdiction

No building permit shall be issued for any building, structure or other development of property, including any transit facilities, unless a Plot Plan for such building, structure or development has been reviewed and approved by the Director of Planning in accordance with the specific plan procedures of Section 11.5.7 of the L.A.M.C. . The foregoing requirement shall not apply to building permits for single-family residences or for remodeling, rehabilitation or repair work solely within the interior of a building or structure.

**Response 108-2**

The attachment supports statements in Comment 108-1. As such, the attachment is addressed in Response 108-1.

## **LETTER NO. 109**

Eleanor Holm  
7417 Henefer Avenue  
Westchester, CA 90045

### **Comment 109-1**

Regarding Bluff Creek Drive:

Because the highway is in close proximity to the Westchester Bluffs and the homes located above the project, the following mitigation measures should be considered to reduce noise and pollution impacts from Bluff Creek Road.

- Limit the size and weight of trucks allowed to use Bluff Creek Dr. There is concerned [*sic*] about the stability of the sloping portion of the bluffs from heavy truck vibration, and, also, reduce the noise which impacts the homes above the project. The larger trucks have the option of using Jefferson Blvd.

### **Response 109-1**

The portion of this comment referring to pollution is addressed in Response 109-2. The composite roadway noise impacts shown in Table 77 on page 577 of the Draft EIR are detailed by roadway segment in the Noise Technical Appendix (Appendix H). As detailed therein, worst-case roadway noise impacts attributable to development of the Proposed Project (that includes truck traffic volumes along Bluff Creek Drive) would be 0.3 dBA, in terms of the peak  $L_{eq}$  and CNEL noise descriptors. The uses that would be served by Bluff Creek Drive (e.g., residential, local-serving retail, office, etc.) typically do not generate large volumes of heavy-duty truck trips. As noise and vibration impacts would not be significant, no mitigation measures are required.

### **Comment 109-2**

- Prohibit diesel trucks and buses from using Bluff Creek Dr. (Studies at UCLA have shown that diesel fuel is highly toxic.) Jefferson Blvd. is an option for these vehicles.

### **Response 109-2**

This comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

The commentor correctly identifies that studies have shown that mobile source diesel exhaust contains air toxics. However, Bluff Creek Drive would not be a significant source of mobile-source toxic air emissions as Bluff Creek Drive is a non-contiguous roadway that would serve uses within the Playa Vista project area (e.g., residential, local-serving retail, office, etc.) that typically do not generate large volumes of heavy-duty truck and bus trips. In addition, it is more likely that truck and bus traffic that approaches/departs the project site from the north and east would use Jefferson Boulevard, due to Jefferson Boulevard's direct access from/to the 405 Freeway and Sepulveda Boulevard. Furthermore, the transit bus fleet is increasingly powered by alternative fuels such as compressed natural gas (CNG) and liquified petroleum gas (LPG) rather than diesel fuel. Since air toxic impacts from mobile sources would not be significant, no mitigation measures would be required.

**Comment 109-3**

- Prohibit trucks carrying combustible materials from using Bluff Creek Dr.

**Response 109-3**

The Proposed Project will comply with all applicable regulations and requirements regarding truck traffic. The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

**Comment 109-4**

- Who is responsible for the protection of the Westchester Bluffs? (The City of Los Angeles or Playa Vista?)

**Response 109-4**

The Westchester Bluffs extend along the southern boundary of the Proposed Project and adjacent First Phase Project from Lincoln Boulevard on the west to Centinela Avenue on the east. Several separate property owners hold portions of the bluffs, including Loyola Marymount University, the Applicant, and various residential property owners on top of the bluff. In addition, the City has an easement for the North Outfall Sewer (NOS), which runs beneath Cabora Road (a maintenance road running midway up the bluffs). In the area adjacent to the Proposed Project, the Applicant owns and is responsible for the portion of the bluff to the north of Cabora Road.

Individual property owners, including the Applicant, are responsible for the maintenance and protection of the portions of the bluffs under their ownership. The City is responsible for maintenance related to their easement for the NOS.

### **Comment 109-5**

The attached letter sent to Ruth Galanter by the National Audubon Society, November 30, 1987 should be included in the Village EIR. The letter “brings to your attention the ecological importance of the Westchester Bluffs to the Ballona Wetland.”

As a protective measure for the environmentally sensitive bluffs, a fence should be erected along the South side of Cobora Road to preclude casual walkers and their dogs.

### **Response 109-5**

These comments are noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration by decision-makers.

### **Comment 109-6**

[ATTACHMENT: November 30, 1987 letter.]

National Audubon Society  
Western Regional Office  
555 Audubon Place  
Sacramento, CA 95825  
(916) 481-5332

30 November 1987

The Honorable Ruth Galanter  
Los Angeles City Council  
200 N. Spring Street, Room 333  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Councilwoman Galanter:

We would like to bring to your attention the ecological importance of the Westchester bluffs to the Ballona Wetland. As you know, we will be restoring the wetland after the Coastal Commission certifies the city's Local Coastal Program. This restoration project is proposed in our Habitat Management Plan, which we submitted to the Los Angeles City Council on November 19, 1986.

We are aware that portions of the bluffs west of Lincoln Boulevard are currently being developed for single family residences. In addition there is a substantial amount of additional development proposed for the top and face of the bluffs west of Lincoln. The bluffs provide important habitat for wildlife which we will discuss further below. Due to their adjacency to the

wetland, we feel strongly that the bluffs should be preserved in their natural state as much as possible.

Complicating the preservation of the bluffs as a significant natural feature is the fact that the California Coastal Commission's jurisdiction includes only a limited portion of the bluffs. Therefore, it is necessary for the city to regulate the adjacent bluff lands outside of the coastal zone in order to protect the resource. Political boundaries do not comport with ecological relationships in the natural world.

The bluffs are environmentally significant both in their own right and because they are biologically related to the wetlands. According to Zedler (1984), "Restoration efforts must take into consideration the qualities of adjacent and upstream uses." For the restored Ballona Wetland coastal ecosystem to be self-sustaining, it must contain a diversity of habitat types, especially upland habitat areas which will be in short supply.

Dr. Ralph Schreiber, Curator or *[sic]* ornithology, Los Angeles County Natural History Museum and principal author of *The Biota of the Ballona Region, Los Angeles County* (1981), believes the bluffs are extremely important as habitat. According to Dr. Schreiber, the bluffs provide critical support habitat for the wetlands, especially for the birds of prey. The bluffs provide an elevational *[sic]* habitat gradient of upland vegetation. It is necessary not only to protect but enhance the native plant communities on the bluffs in order to build as much diversity into the coastal wetland ecosystem as possible. This diversity will in turn provide the basis for an ecosystem which can respond to environmental changes and still survive and in fact thrive.

Dr. Howard Towner, Professor of Biology, Loyola Marymont *[sic]* University, based upon fifteen years of experience teaching and collecting in the area of the Westchester bluffs, can corroborate Dr. Schreiber's observations about the ecological importance of the bluffs. Some of the animal species Dr. Towner has personally observed include birds such as the Great Horned Owl, Barn Owl, Black-crowned Night Heron, California Quail, Red-tailed Hawk, and American Kestrel. In addition, he has observed reptiles such as the California Legless Lizard, Western Skink, and Black Bellied Slender Salamander. Common mammals include mice and ground squirrels. Towner points out that the bluffs represent a unique type of environment for the flight of larger birds such as ravens, hawks, and vultures by providing an updraft of wind for soaring. The bluffs also provide an important corridor for the east/west movement of animals. Our own observations are that the bluffs are not only a critical component of the Ballona coastal wetland ecosystem, but their preservation and enhancement have great environmental education value due to their rarity.

To summarize, the bluffs should be preserved, enhanced, and managed as a native community. They add to the habitat diversity and as such are linked to the adjacent wetlands biologically. The City should coordinate with the Coastal Commission, Audubon, local knowledgeable experts, and affected landowners as well as other interested members of the public and pass an effective bluff protection ordinance.

We would be happy to provide any additional information or assistance which you deem appropriate.

Thank you.

**Response 109-6**

This attachment was submitted in support of comments stated in Comment 109-5. As such, comments related to this attachment are addressed in Response 109-5.

## **LETTER NO. 110**

Gunnar J. Holm  
7417 Henefer Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90045

### **Comment 110-1**

I am writing to voice my concern regarding the establishment of 3 heliports in the Playa Vista development. Based on written summaries and conversations with Playa Vista representatives I have found that 3 permits have been issued to allow as many as 60 flights a day between the hours of 7 AM and 10 PM. This level of operation and their proximity to the Westchester Community will negatively impact the quality of life I have enjoyed. The noise associated with helicopter operations is well established and certainly diminishes the communities exposed to it.

I request mitigation to eliminate this threat to our community and its quality of life.

### **Response 110-1**

This comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

Section 15002 of the State CEQA Guidelines states that the basic purpose of CEQA is to inform governmental decision-makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of a proposed project. No changes to heliport operations are proposed with implementation of the Village at Playa Vista, with the exception of the elimination of one heliport within the boundaries of the Proposed Project. Therefore, there would not be any impacts from heliport operations as a result of the Proposed Project.

Subsection 2.2.5 of Section IV.I., Safety/Risk of Upset, of the Draft EIR on pages 715-717 identifies two heliports currently permitted within the adjacent Campus portion of the previously approved Playa Vista First Phase Project. The Campus is envisioned to provide corporate headquarters-type facilities; as such, one or both of these heliports could become operational in the future to serve corporate executives. The impacts associated with opening one or more of the heliports at Playa Vista were addressed in the 1995 approvals of the Campus at Playa Vista, and are not an issue under consideration at this time. The study performed at that time, "Helistop Noise Study for Playa Vista," has been included in the Appendices of the Final EIR.

**LETTER NO. 111**

Carole Hossan  
7725 Hindry Avenue  
Westchester, CA 90045-3225

**Comment 111-1**

1. How would the proposed 6 lane road running along the bottom of the West Bluffs impact residents living above the Bluffs in terms of noise and air pollution?

**Response 111-1**

The commentor appears to be referring to Bluff Creek Drive, which would run at the base of the Westchester Bluffs through the previously approved First Phase Project and the Proposed Project.

An in depth analysis of potential localized construction and operational impacts related to the Proposed Project is provided in Subsection 3.4.1.2 (Local Construction Impacts) and Subsection 3.4.2.3 (Operational Local Impacts) of Section IV.B, Air Quality, in the Draft EIR. These analyses evaluated conditions atop the Westchester Bluffs as well as a number of other locations in the areas surrounding the Project site. As concluded in these subsections of the Draft EIR, no localized significant impacts (e.g., no exceedance of any health based standard) would occur as a result of the Proposed Project.

Operational impacts attributable to travel along Bluff Creek Drive (i.e., the proposed 6 lane road referenced in the Comment), are analyzed in terms of carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations per SCAQMD procedures and practices. The SCAQMD recommends analyzing CO in cases such as the Proposed Project as CO is the largest single constituent and is considered to be the best indicator to assess changes in pollutant concentrations attributable to mobile-source emissions. Furthermore, it is the only pollutant from mobile sources for which standardized modeling methodologies for estimating localized concentrations have been developed and approved by the SCAQMD.

The intersection of Bluff Creek Drive and Lincoln Boulevard was analyzed as it is the location with the highest potential to yield a CO hotspot along Bluff Creek Drive since it is the location with the highest Project traffic and level of traffic congestion. All other locations along Bluff Creek Drive are anticipated to yield CO concentrations that are lower than the Bluff Creek Drive and Lincoln Boulevard intersection due to relatively reduced traffic volumes and traffic congestion. CO concentrations at this, as well as all other analysis locations were analyzed relative to national and state ambient air quality standards.

Consistent with SCAQMD's CO modeling protocol, all four corners of the intersection were modeled using a receptor distance of three meters for the one-hour analysis and seven meters for the eight-hour analysis. As shown in Tables 17 through 20 of Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, no significant impacts would occur at the intersection with the highest traffic volumes and worst level of service along Bluff Creek Drive (i.e., the intersection of Bluff Creek Drive and Lincoln Boulevard). As CO concentrations are lower when traffic volumes and congestion are reduced, no significant impacts would be anticipated to occur at any other locations along Bluff Creek Drive as the conditions yielding CO hotspots would not be worse than those occurring at the analyzed intersection. Consequently, the residents living along the Bluffs overlooking Bluff Creek Drive would not be significantly affected by CO emissions generated by the net increase in traffic which would occur under the Proposed Project. As the Proposed Project or cumulative traffic does not cause localized air quality impacts related to mobile sources, emissions were therefore concluded to be less than significant for the Proposed Project.

With regard to noise levels, composite roadway noise impacts for locations atop the Westchester Bluffs was analyzed in the Draft EIR. Specifically, Section IV.E, Noise, of the Draft EIR in Table 77 on page 577 and Appendix H (Noise) of the Draft EIR provide the analysis of potential Project impacts. As detailed therein, worst-case roadway noise impacts attributable to the Proposed Project (that includes traffic volumes along Bluff Creek Drive) would be 0.3 up to 1.9 dBA, CNEL. As stated in Section IV.E, Noise, of the Draft EIR on page 553, "changes in a community noise level of less than 3 dBA are not typically noticed by the human ear."

Therefore, as discussed in Subsection 3.4.2.1.2 of Section IV.E, Noise, of the Draft EIR, the increases in traffic noise would not exceed the thresholds of significance and are not considered significant.

### **Comment 111-2**

How would this road impact the wildlife of the area? How close would it be to areas that are supposed to be sanctuaries for animals?

### **Response 111-2**

As demonstrated in Figure 4 of Section II.B, Project Characteristics, of the Draft EIR on page 155, the distance between the roadway and the proposed habitat areas within the Habitat Creation/Restoration Component of the Proposed Project would vary from 14 feet to 180 feet. The potential impacts of this road on the Habitat Creation/Restoration Component are evaluated in Section IV.D, Biotic Resources, of the Draft EIR, and mitigation measures are included in Subsection 4.0 of Section IV.D, Biotic Resources, of the Draft EIR, on page 551, to address those impacts.

**Comment 111-3**

2. As LAUSD has declined the site that Playa Vista proposed for a school to be built, what schools will the children who reside in Playa Vista attend? What impact will this cause in terms of traffic generated trips and classroom size at the affected schools? How will this impact be mitigated?

**Response 111-3**

As of this date, the LAUSD has not declined a school site at Playa Vista. As stated in their letter dated March 20, 2002 (included in the Final EIR Appendices), the Los Angeles Unified School District “has taken no action regarding the school site” at Playa Vista, discussions between the school district and Playa Vista “are ongoing,” and the district expects “a successful solution to meeting the school needs for the Playa Vista development will be reached in a timely and cooperative manner.”

As stated in Section IV.L.(3), Schools, of the Draft EIR, it is projected that the Proposed Project would generate 304 students within the attendance boundaries of Playa del Rey Elementary School, 145 students within the attendance boundaries of Marina del Rey Middle School, and 167 students within the attendance boundaries of Venice High School. The school-related vehicle trips that would be generated by the Proposed Project are part of the project trip generation presented in Subsection 3.4.3 of Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 859. The trip distribution component of the travel demand model used in the traffic study matched the project-generated school trips to the school locations in the vicinity of the project. Therefore, off-site traffic impacts associated with the project-generated school trips are encompassed within the traffic impact analysis conducted in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR.

With regard to the question raised regarding school facilities, Section IV.L.(3), Schools, of the Draft EIR on page 997 of the Draft EIR analyzes the Project’s potential impacts on public schools. The Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) has established attendance boundaries for each of its schools. Based on information provided by the LAUSD, the Project site is currently located within the attendance boundaries of Playa del Rey Elementary School, Marina del Rey Middle School and Venice High School. These are the schools that would accommodate the Project’s school age children, notwithstanding inter-District transfers. While inter-District transfers are possible, they account for a very small percentage of the students attending any particular school. As such, schools other than the three noted above are not anticipated to be needed to accommodate the public school students generated by the Proposed Project.

**Comment 111-4**

3. Westchester will lose more of its neighborhood identity as sidewalks are reduced /trees removed by the widening of roads to accommodate the traffic generated by Playa Vista Phase 1 and 2. How can this loss of community quality of life be mitigated?

**Response 111-4**

None of the proposed roadway widening improvements would occur within the Westchester community. All of the roadway widening projects that are recommended as traffic mitigation measures for the Proposed Project are described in Subsection 5.8 of Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR on page 937. The impacts of these off-site improvements are analyzed at the end of the Subsection 3.0 Impact Analysis within each Environmental Topic in Sections IV.A through IV.P.(3). As indicated in Subsection 3.4.5 of Section IV.G, Land Use, on page 650, these improvements would not cause the loss of any sidewalks and would improve the connectivity of sidewalks along Centinela Avenue. As indicated in Subsection 3.4.5 of Section IV.O, Visual Qualities, of the Draft EIR on pages 1181 and 1183, the amounts of landscaping affected would be less than significant and two mitigation measures are proposed for these impacts. One measure requires tree replacement on a one-to-one basis. The other requires landscaping plans to address affected landscaping.

**Comment 111-5**

4. If Mayor Hahn's Alternative D to the LAX Master Plan is implemented, how will it impact traffic flow to and from Playa Vista? What additional streets in Westchester/Playa del Rey will be impacted? What will the impact be? How will it be mitigated?

**Response 111-5**

Traffic impacts of and mitigation measures for LAX Master Plan Alternative D are the subject of separate environmental documentation prepared for the LAX Master Plan.

Nevertheless, the traffic study prepared as part of the Draft EIR analyzed potential impacts of the Proposed Project both with and without LAX Alternative D. Since LAX Alternative D is not an approved plan, the cumulative base traffic forecasts in the Draft EIR against which the Proposed Project's traffic impacts were assessed assuming growth of LAX to 78 million annual passengers (MAP) by 2010. A second analysis was conducted for an alternative cumulative baseline scenario with LAX Alternative D. This analysis is shown in Chapter IX of Appendix K to the Draft EIR, beginning on page IX-1, and concluded that the Proposed Project would have similar traffic impacts with LAX Alternative D as those identified in the body of the Draft EIR without LAX Alternative D. As indicated in Appendix K, the Proposed Project would not have any additional impacts under the LAX Alternative D scenario.

**Comment 111-6**

5. If there is a methane explosion at Playa Vista, the City of Los Angeles would be sued. What kind of insurance and how much will it cost to protect the City of LA in case such an unfortunate incident should occur. Would this cost be passed on to LA City residents? If so, approximately how much per person and/or household?

**Response 111-6**

The City is statutorily immune from tort liability under the California Government Claims Act, California Government Code Sections 810-996.6. Furthermore, expert review indicated the methane at the Proposed Project posed no health risk with the implementation of mitigation measures. See CLA report, Appendix J-6 of the Draft EIR.

**Comment 111-7**

6. Will the City be evaluating a No Project (or in this case, no Phase II) alternative? If not, why not?

**Response 111-7**

The Draft EIR provides a detailed analysis of the No Project Alternative in Subsection 4.1 of Section VII, Alternatives on page 1267.

**Comment 111-8**

7. What is the comparison between costs of impacts of Phase 2 development (air pollution/noise/utilization of water/electricity/development subsidies) vs. leaving the land as open space?

**Response 111-8**

A comparison of Alternative 1 (No Project/No Development) to the Proposed Project is provided in Subsection 4.1 (Alternative 1) of Section VII, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR on pages 1419 through 1422. Air quality, noise, water consumption, and energy impacts related to the Proposed Project are analyzed in Sections IV.B, Air Quality; IV.E, Noise, IV.M, Energy; and IV.N.(1), Water Consumption, of the Draft EIR, respectively.

**Comment 111-9**

8. What Phase 1 mitigations have not been completed yet? Can Phase 2 begin if mitigations for Phase 1 have not been completed? If so, how? Who oversees/enforces that mitigations are completed?

**Response 111-9**

Mitigation measures associated with the adjacent First Phase Project were addressed in a separate EIR (EIR No. 90-0200-SUB(C)(CUZ)(CUB), State Clearinghouse No. 90010510), certified by the City of Los Angeles in September, 1993, and Mitigated Negative Declaration/Addendum to the EIR, certified by the City of Los Angeles in December, 1995. Completion of mitigation measures adopted in the certification of these documents is proceeding according to the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Programs adopted in conjunction with them, and is not under consideration in this EIR. Nonetheless, implementation of First Phase Project mitigation measures continues to comply with the requirements of the First Phase Project. The Proposed Project may be approved and construction may commence prior to completion of all mitigation measures required for the First Phase Project. However, the Proposed Project is required to comply with the terms and mitigation measures set forth in this EIR as well as any other conditions or approvals imposed on the Proposed Project.

**Comment 111-10**

9. How will Sepulveda Boulevard (Manchester/Lincoln) be affected? What impacts/mitigations will Phase 1 bring? Phase 2? What happens if these mitigations are in conflict with the Westchester/Playa del Rey Community Plan?

**Response 111-10**

The Draft EIR determined that the Proposed Project would have significant impacts during the P.M. peak hour at the intersections of Sepulveda Boulevard/Manchester Avenue, Sepulveda Boulevard/La Tijera Boulevard, and Sepulveda Boulevard/Westchester Parkway (see Figure 74 on page 867 in Subsection 3.4.5.1 of Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR). The mitigation measures proposed to address these impacts consist of providing funding for a new bus to provide additional service along Culver City Bus Line 6, providing funding for new buses to implement limited bus service between Fox Hills Transit Center and the Century Boulevard office corridor along the Sepulveda Boulevard corridor, and contributing to the design and implementation of the City of Los Angeles' Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) at Sepulveda Boulevard/Manchester Avenue (see Subsection 4.0 of Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR on pages 893, 894, 896, 897, and 898). With these improvements, the impacts of the Proposed Project along Sepulveda Boulevard would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Further, the Proposed Project's mitigation measures do not conflict with the Westchester-Playa del Rey Community Plan.

The traffic impacts associated with the First Phase Playa Vista Project were addressed in a separate EIR (EIR No. 90-0200-SUB(C)(CUZ)(CUB), State Clearinghouse No. 90010510), certified by the City of Los Angeles in September, 1993, and Mitigated Negative Declaration/ Addendum to the EIR, certified by the City of Los Angeles in December, 1995. The Draft EIR analyzed the traffic impacts of the Proposed Project assuming a full build out of the adjacent First Phase Project at Playa Vista, as well as all other known projects expected to be completed in the study area. Please see Topical Response TR-3, Related Projects, on page 453 above, for additional information.

### **Comment 111-11**

10. The community of Westchester/Playa del Rey was here before the Playa Vista project was proposed. It has suffered quality of life deterioration for years due to the encroachment of LAX. In the City of Los Angeles, Megaprojects are proposed without thought for the cumulative impact that they will have. Westchester/Playa del Rey is in a rather unique position in terms of being impacted by LAX, an economic engine for the City but not beneficial to the property values/quality of life of nearby residents, many of whom have lived in the community for decades. Phase 2 of Playa Vista will add an increasing burden. What can be done to mitigate the degradation of Westchester/Playa del Rey's quality of life due to the synergistic effects of growth at LAX/Playa Vista impacts? And if it can't be mitigated, why should it be allowed to proceed?

I appreciate the opportunity to present my concerns.

### **Response 111-11**

Subsection 6.0 of each environmental topic, Sections IV.A through IV.P(3) of the Draft EIR analyzes the Proposed Project's cumulative impacts inclusive of a list of 96 related projects. The related projects are listed in Table 5 on page 195, and their locations are illustrated on Figure 11 on page 194 of the Draft EIR. The LAX Master Plan Project has been included in the list and has been considered in all of the cumulative impacts analyses in the Draft EIR. (Please also refer to the relationship between the related projects and the Traffic analysis in Topical Response TR-3, Related Projects on page 453.) Pursuant to CEQA guidelines, mitigation measures are proposed in Subsection 4.0 of each environmental topic that mitigates the Proposed Project's impacts to the extent feasible. The LAX Master Plan Project is currently undergoing environmental impacts review. A Draft EIR was circulated in January 2001 and a Supplement to the Draft was circulated in July 2003. Review of that project is pending. The environmental analyses of the LAX project have included the Proposed Project as a related project in its cumulative impacts analyses. That project will be required to mitigate its impacts, to the extent feasible. Any residual significant impacts for either project would require a Statement of Overriding Considerations by the decision-makers, pursuant to CEQA.

It may also be noted that the Proposed Project would contribute several benefits to the Westchester Community. These include: (1) the redevelopment of a blighted, former industrial site; (2) traffic mitigation measures, particularly public transit improvements that would serve the community; (3) increased support for local businesses; (4) new on-site shops, restaurants and

parks that would serve neighbors; (5) bluff and riparian corridor improvements; and (6) water quality improvements that would serve Westchester areas as well as on-site areas.

## **LETTER NO. 112**

Agnes Huff  
Ágnes Huff Communications Group, LLC  
Howard Hughes Center  
6601 Center Drive West, Suite 100  
Los Angeles, CA 90045

### **Comment 112-1**

I am one of the lucky people in Los Angeles who lives close to where I work. Most people don't have that opportunity because home prices are too high and there are not enough residences to meet the demand.

The Village helps address that issue by providing up to 2,600 new homes. I understand that there will be a mix of apartments, condos and single family homes. In this part of Los Angeles--less than a mile from the beach--most developers would want to build the Valencia-style home (4-8 to an acre) and charge top dollar that most people could not afford. I think it is far more equitable to do what Playa Vista is planning--a mixed-use community with a wide selection at moderate price levels.

The City should approve The Village. It's a great project that meets many community needs.

### **Response 112-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 113**

Sarah Hughes  
114 Montreal Street  
Playa del Rey, CA 90293

### **Comment 113-1**

As a Playa del Rey resident, I have watched the Playa Vista project carefully over the years. I am writing today to say that I am happy that the project has been scaled down significantly from the Summa days.

Our hopes are that this new, smaller version will have fewer impacts on the surrounding communities so residents can maintain a high quality of life. I am very glad to see that the housing plans incorporate park and open space sites.

I would, however, suggest that the city encourage Playa Vista to look into making the former Jake's restaurant site in Playa del Rey into a park. There are far too few parks in Playa del Rey and the Jake's site would make a perfect location for a park that everyone in the neighborhood could enjoy.

### **Response 113-1**

The comment is noted and will be forwarded to the City decision-makers for their review and consideration. The parcel known as the Jakes' Lot is owned by an affiliate of the Project Applicant. The City and the Applicant and its affiliate are working to identify an appropriate future use for this lot.

## **LETTER NO. 114**

Michel Ingham  
123 Sunridge Street  
Playa del Rey, CA 90293

12.21.2003

### **Comment 114-1**

As a Playa del Rey resident, I have watched the Playa Vista project carefully over the years. I am writing today to say that I am happy that the project has been scaled down significantly from the Summa days.

Our hopes are that this new, smaller version will have fewer impacts on the surrounding communities so residents can maintain a high quality of life. I am very glad to see that the housing plans incorporate park and open space sites.

I would, however, suggest that the city encourage Playa Vista to look into making the former Jake's restaurant site in Playa del Rey into a park. There are far too few parks in Playa del Rey and the Jake's site would make a perfect location for a park that everyone in the neighborhood could enjoy.

### **Response 114-1**

The comment is noted and will be forwarded to the City decision-makers for their review and consideration. The parcel known as the Jakes' Lot is owned by an affiliate of the Project Applicant. The City and the Applicant and its affiliate are working to identify an appropriate future use for this lot.

## **LETTER NO. 115**

Julie Inouye  
Michael W. Rubottom, M.D.  
6508 Vista del Mar  
Playa del Rey, CA 90293

### **Comment 115-1**

#### **(1) RE: VOTE NO ON PLAYA VISTA—Phase II**

Dear Councilmembers and Planning Department of Los Angeles,

In 1992, I was appointed to Chair a committee that would look into the environmental and planning impacts of Playa Vista Phase I, by then Councilmember Ruth Galanter. As an ad hoc team of community and planning professionals we attempted in a short period of time to study the impacts on the environment and for the larger impact on the City of Los Angeles for environmental issues, traffic mitigations and infrastructure demands of a mixed use development, the largest of it's *[sic]* kind in the United States.

For eight years from 1987 through 1995, I was also an appointed member of the Westchester/Playa del Rey CPAC—Community Planning Advisory Committee.

Since I have intimate knowledge of this project and having been one of the last community leaders to oversee the entire project transition from the 1980's when Summa Corporation, David O'Malley was the President through Nelson Rising of Maguire Thomas Partners, then the Playa Capital investors of Morgan Stanley, Goldman Sachs, the infamous Gary Winick of Global Crossing and then president, Peter Dennison. Steve Soberoff, now sits in the leadership position acting as the current and most recent President, CEO of Playa Vista. To this date I have never been contacted by Mr. Soberoff personally.

With this intimate knowledge of how this development evolved for over two decades, I felt a responsibility to contact you and share this information.

Anticipating the loss of leadership and a development vision after Nelson Rising and Doug Gardner left the project, it became obvious that what the community thought we were collectively planning in the numerous charettes *[sic]* we participated in was not going to be.

Here is a letter to the editor that I wrote to the Argonaut newspaper June 4, 1998, publicly announcing a message to Playa Capital investors.

### **II—Playa Vista project built on communication**

To the Editor,

Can you believe we are finally seeing some movement with the Playa Vista Project?

Thirteen years ago, (1985) in our living room, was the first presentation to us of the proposed Playa Vista project.

Unfortunately, that earlier group planning to develop Playa Vista did not have a pulse on our community, and with a lack of communication and a lack of agreeable concepts that relationship ended.

In 1989, the Vista del Mar Neighbors Association received the first phone call from representatives of Maguire-Thomas Partners, who had assumed the Playa Vista project.

With cool apprehension, we began a dialogue that in eight years would grow to become a mutual relationship based on trust and a shared vision of what we all wanted for this new city called Playa Vista.

The only way for a mixed-used project like Playa Vista to work with its many complexities—both its environmental responsibilities as well as speaking to the diversity of community needs—is by listening and learning from the people who live and breathe in the surrounding areas and who are raising their children here.

We have the pulse of the land and we are the people with the vested interests.

The developers may come and go but the community will always be here.

At the end of the day, it is the relationships that have been developed that will show the outcome of this unique city.

The day-to-day communications, like any marriage, will make Playa Vista a success or a failure.

The Vista del Mar Neighbors Association looks forward to building new relationships with the Playa Capital Investment Group and to see that the vision of this city will be one that we can all be proud of to leave as al [sic] legacy for many generations to come.

We all have a major responsibility to make sure that happens.

Julie Inouye  
Co-Founder of the Vista del Mar Neighbors Association  
Playa del Rey

A. Adjacent to the Wetlands

I am sorry to report that this letter was a prophecy of how this project would begin to unravel.

Now, twenty years later from our initial communication from the Summa Corporation, heirs of Howard Hughes family, this project is tragically doomed.

It became obvious to the entire community that when the first building, Playa Vista's Visitors Center went up we were in trouble.

The vision of great architecture and responsible mix use planning became a faint memory from almost a decade of sharing a similar vision in how this community could be.

With regret, we send you this letter to lend our support in voting NO on Playa Vista, Phase II.

**Response 115-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

**LETTER NO. 116**

Nancee Inouye

**Comment 116-1**

This is in response to the above referenced Phase II development. I live between Alla Road and Centinela, north of the bike path in the Del Rey neighborhood. We held a homeowner association meeting with a couple of Playa Vista representatives on Tuesday, December 16.

After listening to the street developments that the Playa Vista group is planning to start doing on Alla Road and Centinela, I am asking that you please hold off on continuing with the Phase II development until our Del Rey neighborhood sees what the traffic impact it will have on our residential streets. As of right now, we are having difficulty getting onto Centinela during rush hour traffic. Furthermore, the two representatives during the meeting did not provide us with any answers on what the traffic impact will be on our residential streets in our neighborhood.

I would like to see another meeting on the above referenced issues before we go forward with the planned development.

**Response 116-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision makers.

A detailed analysis of the Proposed Project's traffic impacts has been performed and is presented in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 798. The Traffic Study measured the performance of 218 key intersections within an approximately 100 square mile study area described in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR, beginning on page 828 and in Technical Appendix K-2.

The traffic impact analysis is provided in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 798 and in Appendix K-2. The Draft EIR includes a comprehensive mitigation program to address the significant impacts identified in the analysis. In addition, a new mitigation measure has been added to the mitigation program in the Draft EIR as discussed in Section II.15, Corrections and Additions of the Final EIR on page 216 and Topical Response TR-10, Alternative 2010 Baseline Scenario – Additional Mitigation Measure, on page 472. This new mitigation measure would mitigate the one remaining significant traffic impact at Centinela Avenue and Jefferson Boulevard that was identified in the Draft EIR. With implementation of the mitigation measure, the Proposed Project would not have any significant traffic impacts. The traffic model and methodology used to evaluate the Proposed Project's impacts is also discussed in greater detail in Topical Response TR-1, Playa Vista Transportation Model, on page 445.

In addition to the analysis described above, the transportation analysis included an evaluation of the locations where the addition of Project traffic might cause an impact on neighborhood streets. This analysis is discussed in Subsection 3.4.7 of Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR on pages 872-877. One of the four neighborhoods identified as a potential neighborhood impact area lies within the Del Rey Homeowners and Neighbors Association boundaries and therefore is eligible to participate in the neighborhood traffic mitigation program identified in the mitigation program. Participation is outlined on page 6 of the LADOT Assessment Letter in Appendix K-1, of the Draft EIR.

In the event any unforeseen neighborhood traffic intrusion problems are reported after Project occupancy, LADOT will investigate the complaints and, if it is determined that the cut-through problem is attributed to the Project, LADOT will work with the affected residents, the local City Council office, homeowner's groups, and traffic engineering consultants, to design a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan to address the items of concern. If the traffic intrusion is determined to be unrelated to the Project, the neighborhood could still work with LADOT to develop a Neighborhood Traffic Plan funded through other means.

## **LETTER NO. 117**

Philip Jamtaas  
3225 Malcolm Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90034

### **Comment 117-1**

I hope you can help stop any more Playa Vista expansion, as the Westside is already overbuilt, and traffic has already overloaded both the freeways and the side streets. It's way past time for the building to stop. Please, let's save this last little speck of open space.

### **Response 117-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

Potential impacts associated with the Proposed Project on Land Use are addressed in Section IV.G of the Draft EIR, beginning on page 613. As discussed therein, the Proposed Project would be compatible with the land use/density designation in the Community Plan and Specific Plan, and the adopted environmental goals and policies of the community (page 647). The Proposed Project would integrate with and provide continuity with the adjacent portions of the Playa Vista First Phase Project lying to the east and west of the Proposed Project site, and would not adversely affect other surrounding land uses (page 648).

Potential traffic impacts associated with the Proposed Project are addressed in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, beginning on page 798 of the Draft EIR and Section II.15, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR. All significant traffic impacts associated with the Proposed Project can be mitigated to a less than significant level with the proposed traffic mitigation program.

In the event any unforeseen neighborhood traffic intrusion problems are reported after Project occupancy, LADOT will investigate the complaints and, if it is determined that the cut-through problem is attributed to the Project, LADOT will work with the affected residents, the local City Council office, homeowner's groups, and traffic engineering consultants, to design a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan to address the items of concern. If the traffic intrusion is determined to be unrelated to the Project, the neighborhood could still work with LADOT to develop a Neighborhood Traffic Plan funded through other means.

As discussed in Section III.A, Overview of Environmental Setting, of the Draft EIR, beginning on page 182, the Proposed Project site is not vacant, unused open space. In contrast, the site is currently used for a number of permitted activities associated with the construction of the adjacent Playa Vista First Phase Project, and since the 1940s has been part of an industrial

complex which housed the Hughes Aircraft operations. Because of historic and existing disturbances, only small stands of native plants remain on-site, and even these have a high proportion of non-native species. Due to the presence of a high percentage of non-native species and long history of disturbance, habitat within the site is highly fragmented and of marginal quality. No threatened or endangered species occur within the site.

## **LETTER NO. 118**

Ryan Jamrog  
Corporate Relations Manager  
LMU Athletics  
One LMU Drive, MS 8235  
Los Angeles, CA 90045-2659

### **Comment 118-1**

As I drive around Los Angeles' fringes, I see cookie-cutter neighborhoods; they have no style or character. At Playa Vista, however, I see diverse architecture, New Urbanist design and an innovative system of parks and open space. The City of Los Angeles should encourage this kind of project, and one way to do that is to approve The Village.

Like Playa Vista's first phase, The Village will be aesthetically appealing. Rather than looking like a monolithic mini-city, its varying styles will connote multiple neighborhoods.

Above the project, on the Westchester Bluffs, the homeowners will maintain their panoramic views, because there will be restrictions on the height of The Village's buildings.

Let's send Los Angeles in a smarter planning direction by approving The Village and more architecturally interesting projects.

### **Response 118-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 119**

Carol Kapp  
127 Rees Street  
Playa Del Rey, CA 90293

### **Comment 119-1**

As a Playa del Rey resident, I have watched the Playa Vista project carefully over the years. I am writing today to say that I am happy that the project has been scaled down significantly from the Summa days.

Our hopes are that this new, smaller version will have fewer impacts on the surrounding communities so residents can maintain a high quality of life. I am very glad to see that the housing plans incorporate park and open space sites.

I would, however, suggest that the city encourage Playa Vista to look into making the former Jake's restaurant site in Playa del Rey into a park. There are far too few parks in Playa del Rey and the Jake's site would make a perfect location for a park that everyone in the neighborhood could enjoy.

### **Response 119-1**

The comment is noted and will be forwarded to the City decision-makers for their review and consideration. The parcel known as the Jakes' Lot is owned by an affiliate of the Project Applicant. The City and the Applicant and its affiliate are working to identify an appropriate future use for this lot.

## **LETTER NO. 120**

Kevin Katz  
vinkman@earthlink.net

### **Comment 120-1**

My name is Kevin Katz and I live in Venice California.

I just want to quickly state that I am opposed to any further development in Playa Vista.

I believe that the impact to surrounding communities has not been thoroughly investigated.

Already the traffic through the Lincoln corridor is in a state of gridlock. What will happen once the community of Playa Vista is fully inhabited?

I hear that there are also potential liabilities associated with the natural gas reserve that is below the Playa Vista Development.

This is one of the last open spaces on the West Side of Los Angeles as well as a rare and endangered wetlands habitat.

I urge you once again to re-think the consequences of the irreversible development decisions that you are making.

### **Response 120-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 121**

Yates A. Keir  
108 Montreal Street  
Playa del Rey, CA 90293

### **Comment 121-1**

As a Playa del Rey resident, I have watched the Playa Vista project carefully over the years. I am writing today to say that I am happy that the project has been scaled down significantly from the Summa days.

Our hopes are that this new, smaller version will have fewer impacts on the surrounding communities so residents can maintain a high quality of life. I am very glad to see that the housing plans incorporate park and open space sites.

I would, however, suggest that the city encourage Playa Vista to look into making the former Jake's restaurant site in Playa del Rey into a park. There are far too few parks in Playa del Rey and the Jake's site would make a perfect location for a park that everyone in the neighborhood could enjoy.

### **Response 121-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers. The parcel known as the Jakes' Lot is owned by an affiliate of the Project Applicant. The City and the Applicant and its affiliate are working to identify an appropriate future use for this lot.

## **LETTER NO. 122**

Dr. Robert Kilroy  
2519 Cloverfield  
Santa Monica, CA 90405

### **Comment 122-1**

The streets that run between Ocean Park and Pico, namely Cloverfield and 23rd continue to carry large amounts of traffic.

These speed bumps were installed to help provide safety for the region. However, since the installation of the speed bumps, I have not seen one traffic officer (other than parking) or any speed monitor on these streets. Cars, trucks and SUVs continue to fly up theses [sic] freeways [sic] to the Freeway at speeds that well exceed the 25mph speed limit. Come sit and watch. You would be amazed at the speeds that cars truck and SUVs can develop between these bumps or fly over them at.

Given the speeds and volume of the vehicles on these streets and high density of families with young children on these streets and the presence of an elementary school less than a block away, you are flirting with tragedy if you do not work to continue to limit or at least slow down the traffic through this area. Should Playa Vista increase the traffic through this region it is even more incumbent on you to act to keep our neighborhood safe from this ever present and potentially disastrous traffic hazard.

I look forward to seeing you [sic] efforts in handling this matter

### **Response 122-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

A detailed analysis of the Proposed Project's traffic impacts has been performed and is presented in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR. The commentor raises specific comments relating to the existing traffic conditions on Cloverfield and 23rd, between Ocean Park and Pico. Such traffic would be included within the existing operating conditions presented in Table 115 of the Draft EIR, on page 812.

The streets mentioned by the commentor appear to be within the boundaries of the City of Santa Monica. The traffic analysis presented in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR, and Technical Appendix Volume 3 (Part 3 of 5) of Technical Appendix K of the Draft EIR determined that the Proposed Project would not have significant impacts at any of the 23 study intersections located within the City of Santa Monica under either the City of Los Angeles

intersection analysis method and significance criteria or the City of Santa Monica intersection analysis method and significance criteria.

As a result of the State's acquisition of Area A and portions of Area B and the passage of SB 666, the Playa Vista Drive bridge and road extension to Culver Boulevard will not be constructed and is no longer a part of the baseline conditions for the year 2010. As discussed in Subsections 3.1 and 5.1.5 of Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR on pages 828 and 931, respectively, the Traffic Report included an analysis of the Proposed Project's impacts under the no Playa Vista Drive bridge and road baseline. Under either baseline scenario (i.e., with or without the Playa Vista Drive bridge and road construction), the analysis of traffic impacts within Santa Monica intersections is the same, and the Proposed Project would not result in any significant impacts at any intersections in Santa Monica. Please see Section II.15, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR on page 216 and Topical Response TR-10, Alternative 2010 Baseline Scenario – Additional Mitigation Measure, on page 472 for a further discussion.

In addition to the analysis described above, the transportation analysis included an evaluation of the locations where the addition of Project traffic might cause an impact on neighborhood streets. This analysis is discussed in Subsection 3.4.7 of Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR on pages 872-877. The analysis concluded that there would be no significant impacts due to the proposed project on neighborhood streets referred to in this comment.

## **LETTER NO. 123**

Bev Klocki

### **Comment 123-1**

As a longtime resident of Westchester and a former resident of Playa del Rey, I am so pleased that Playa Vista is finally being built. The homes are beautiful and the intelligent way in which the project has been planned will mean additional traffic improvements in the surrounding community as well as numerous new parks for my family to enjoy.

I am writing today to support the second phase of the project, The Village. Like phase one, I am certain that it will be well-planned and will offer a variety of amenities both to the residents who ultimately move there and those of us who live near Playa Vista in Westchester.

The Village is a great addition to what has already been approved and built, and I hope the City of Los Angeles will move forward to approve it quickly.

### **Response 123-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 124**

Celia Knight  
1040 Victoria Avenue  
Venice, CA 90291

### **Comment 124-1**

I am involved in two community organizations, Del Rey Homeowners and Neighbors and the Del Rey Neighborhood Council, and I have been following the progress on Playa Vista since I voted for Ruth Galanter shortly after Howard Hughes died.

I love the concept of The Village at Playa Vista! I haven't forgotten that the site was an industrial complex with 2 shifts of workers. I love the entire idea of the development having commercial and residential instead of just a mega-housing complex or a mega-commercial area where everyone would have to travel elsewhere.

The Village being a type of old-style European residential/retail/commercial mix will be a great buffer between Phase I and the commercial east end, and I appreciate that all the amenities there will be available to local residents also.

I'm not sure if the Freshwater Marsh is part of Phase I or Phase II, but it is delightful. I appreciate that there is a place in Playa Vista for the descendants of the very earliest residents of the area--even if most of them are transients.

### **Response 124-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

**LETTER NO. 125**

Stephen Knight  
12820 Short Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90066

**Comment 125-1**

I find the neighborhood protection plan in the E.I.R. to be lacking. The problems that will result from phase II and phase I will greatly affect the neighborhood [sic] immediately to the north of Playa Vista. When I say problems, I mean traffic in that neighborhood and loss of parking along Jefferson, Inglewood and Centinela.

**Response 125-1**

A neighborhood traffic impact analysis was conducted as part of the analysis of potential traffic impacts for the Proposed Project; the findings of this analysis can be found in Subsection 3.4.7. of Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR, beginning on page 872. The neighborhood traffic impact analysis concludes that the Proposed Project may have significant impacts on the residential neighborhood bounded by Inglewood Boulevard, Ballona Creek, Sawtelle Boulevard, and Bray Street/Port Road, and includes a mitigation measure to address these impacts (page 903). Please also See Topical Response TR-5, Neighborhood Traffic Impact, on page 458.

As discussed in Section IV.K.(2), Parking, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 943, the transportation improvement plan for the Proposed Project will not result in any loss of parking along Jefferson Boulevard, Inglewood Boulevard, or Centinela Avenue. Approximately 27 parking spaces along the east side of Centinela Avenue between the Ballona Channel and Culver Boulevard would be subject to peak hour parking restrictions, in order to increase capacity during peak hours along this roadway segment. Because other parking is available off of Centinela Avenue (i.e., on Milton Street, Havelock Street, Allin Street, Braddock Drive, Verdi Street, Wagner Street, and Culver Boulevard), the Draft EIR concludes that impacts on parking at this location are adverse but less than significant.

The comments is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

**Comment 125-2**

Loss of parking along Jefferson will affect many business people to the extent that they may go out of business.

This loss of parking, and the delay in the project should require Playa Vista (Playa Capital) to renegotiate condition 125.

**Response 125-2**

Please refer to Response 125-1, above. Condition 125 is a condition of approval for the adjacent Playa Vista First Phase Project which requires funding of a Parking Replacement Trust Fund to address the loss of parking spaces resulting from First Phase Project traffic mitigations along Centinela Avenue, Inglewood Avenue, and Jefferson Boulevard, and is not part of the Proposed Project. As noted above, the transportation improvement plan for the Proposed Project will not result in any loss of parking along Jefferson Boulevard, Inglewood Boulevard, or Centinela Avenue.

## **LETTER NO. 126**

Robert A. Krauch  
6633 Esplanade  
Playa del Rey, CA 90293

### **Comment 126-1**

After including The Village plan in Playa Vista, nearly 70 percent of the total project will be devoted to parks and open space. That's an astounding number.

I served on the parks and open space sub-committee as part of the Westchester-Playa del Rey Community Plan Update—approved by LA City Council late this fall—after more than two years in the revision process. Most of the 30-member Plan Update Committee were very impressed with Playa Vista's coordinated, multi-use planning. Playa Vista's parks will vary in size and use, but it's clear to me these many new parks and open space areas will offer a broad range of recreational experiences, social interaction and cultural opportunities.

These parks will be connected by a network of paths, sidewalks and nature trails. And, according to a recent Los Angeles Times article, the overall park system at Playa Vista is being designed by noted New York landscape designer Ed Schlossberg.

The Village alone will have more than 11 acres of recreational parks. There will also be bike lanes that connect to a larger system of bike trails and, even more acres of open space in the final segment of the riparian corridor.

The best benefit of all is that these parks will be open to residents beyond those actually living in the Playa Vista community.

I strongly urge support of the Phase II portion of Playa Vista as an attractive and practical "infill." The Village should encourage Playa Vista residents to walk more, use their autos less, and trade & recreate locally.

### **Response 126-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 127**

Myra Kriwanek  
Neighborhood Council  
Westchester/Playa del Rey  
Public Safety Chair & Res. Dist. #7 (North Kentwood)  
6340 Riggs Place  
Westchester, CA 90045

### **Comment 127-1**

I have lived in Westchester for over 20 years and own a home in North Kentwood. I have been an active community leader and have been a Board member of the Neighborhood Council of Westchester/Playa del Rey for the last year. I am responding to the Playa Vista Village EIR as an individual resident on my own behalf.

The following is a list of concerns which I would like to go on record should I need to refer to them in the future regarding the impacts of the Playa Vista project:

- 1/ PUBLIC SAFETY
- 2/ HEALTH
- 3/ TRAFFIC
- 4/ COMPATIBILITY and ELEVATIONS

### **Response 127-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers. This comment lists issues that are discussed and responded to below.

### **Comment 127-2**

#### **1/ PUBLIC SAFETY**

As the Public Safety Committee Chair on the Neighborhood Council, I am aware of the need for providing more police officers in this area as Playa Vista adds to the increase in population and density. I am concern [*sic*] with the City of L.A. requiring adequate police protection and its ability to effectively protect and serve this vast area as well as the surrounding community. The law enforcement agencies are already strained and under staffed to handle the current increase in crime and security threat, especially located near LAX. The same comments extend to requesting more resources necessary to support the fire stations, emergency medical services, paramedics, ambulances, hospitals and trauma centers. Let me address the need for Playa Vista to compensate for increased police and fire services to maintain public safety. How can I be assured that Playa Vista's commitment to this need will be put into place before construction is permitted?

**Response 127-2**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

The Draft EIR analyzes the impacts of the Proposed Project on Fire and Police services in Sections IV.L.(1) and IV.L.(2), respectively. As stated in Section IV.L.(2), Police Protection, of the Draft EIR on page 990. “The Proposed Project would generate revenues to the City which could be applied toward the provision of new police facilities, with related staffing. The sufficiency of such funds, and a decision to allocate such funds accordingly, is a socio-economic issue which may be addressed further by the decision-makers. Since it cannot be guaranteed that the Proposed Project’s revenue contributions would be applied to police services, it is conservatively concluded that the Proposed Project’s demand may result in a substantial reduction in the service ratio, and impacts prior to mitigation would be significant.” A similar finding is made regarding Fire Services on page 975. As stated in Section IV.L.(1), Fire Protection, of the Draft EIR on page 976: “It is anticipated that the Proposed Project would be served by the new Fire Station located at Playa Vista Drive and Fountain Park Drive. No additional facilities would be required, and there would not be a significant impact. If this facility is not constructed or sufficiently staffed, a significant impact could occur.” Appendix The Draft EIR includes a contingency mitigation measure on page 980 that would be applicable if the new fire station were not built prior to the issuance of the first building permit for the Proposed Project.

**Comment 127-3****2/ HEALTH**

There are reports in the EIR referring to unhealthy, toxins which exist and must be monitored for environmental safety. There is large concern for full disclosure of any health risks and to hold Playa Vista responsible and accountable to control and mitigate any unhealthy conditions to protect the public. Likewise, any air and noise pollution arising from the Playa Vista project would be of concern to the community. What state department or city agency will investigate and review the health standards and what party will be held responsible for any liability due to unhealthy measures. Who will be upholding the laws to protect property owners, employees and the public should environmental hazards exist?

**Response 127-3**

The Draft EIR addresses in detail in Section IV.I, Safety/Risk of Upset, the potential impacts of the Proposed Project that relate to public health and safety. As indicated in Section IV.I, Safety/Risk of Upset, of the Draft EIR on page 664, the RWQCB is the lead agency responsible for oversight of contamination issues, and corresponding health issues that are associated with man-made contamination at the Proposed Project site. With RWQCB oversight, residual chemical contamination from past industrial operations that occurred at the Proposed Project site

will be remediated to achieve protection of people that may live, work or recreate in the Proposed Project site from unacceptable cancer risks or non-cancer health hazards. As addressed in Section IV.I, Safety/Risk of Upset, worker safety is regulated by the federal occupational safety and health regulations implemented by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). A major component of the regulations is designed to promote worker safety and training. In California, Cal/OSHA is the agency that administers the safety and health regulations.

While regional air quality construction emissions would exceed SCAQMD regional significance thresholds, an in depth analysis of potential localized construction and operational air quality impacts related to the Proposed Project was provided in Subsection 3.4.1.2 and Subsection 3.4.2.3 of Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR. As concluded in these subsections of the Draft EIR, no localized significant air quality impacts (e.g., exceedance of any health based standards) would occur as a result of the Proposed Project.

As discussed in Subsection 4.0 of Section IV.B., Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, a comprehensive and strategic program of air emission control strategies is set forth in the Air Quality Management Plan for the Village at Playa Vista (Village AQMP). The Village AQMP is included as Appendix E of the Draft EIR. The SCAQMD has primary oversight of air quality issues in the Southern California area.

Noise impacts related to the long-term operations of the Village at Playa Vista are fully analyzed in Subsection 3.4 of Section IV.E, Noise, of the Draft EIR, starting on page 569. Based on the analyses contained therein, Proposed Project operations would result in a less than significant impact and as such, no adverse health affects from Proposed Project operational noise sources are anticipated. Noise issues will generally be regulated by the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance.

#### **Comment 127-4**

With the growing senior population of the elderly, the demand for more rest homes, senior centers, rehabilitation centers, parks and recreation and open space is advisable and most desirable.

#### **Response 127-4**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

As described in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR on page 166, the Proposed Project includes an option that would allow development of up to 200 assisted living units in-lieu of a portion of the proposed 175,000 square feet of office development. The impacts of such an exchange of uses are discussed within each environmental analysis in Sections IV.A through IV.P.(3).

**Comment 127-5****3/ TRAFFIC**

Traffic congestion, from accumulative surrounding effects, which Playa Vista, when built out will become a major contributor, is one of the worst problems to solve in this area around LAX and the 405 Freeway. There are too many problems to list here that will negatively impact the traffic conditions in this area. Further traffic studies will be necessary to address mobility at specific intersections and locations. Serious mass transit alternatives will become a must with future growth. I refer to additional studies and comments made by residential community groups to address the traffic impacts. I encourage community input and coordinating with the existing Westchester Streetscape Improvement Association.

**Response 127-5**

The project mitigation program is based on a comprehensive traffic analysis that studied the Proposed Project's impacts at over 200 intersections within a large study area. The study utilized the latest state-of-the-art transportation modeling techniques to identify and isolate the impacts of the Proposed Project on the transportation system. The project mitigation program mitigates the incremental impacts of project traffic through a program of physical improvements, traffic signal system enhancements, and mass transit improvements as called for in the comment. The Draft EIR traffic model is discussed further in Topical Response TR-1, Playa Vista Transportation Model, on page 445 above. The model and traffic analysis provided in the Draft EIR includes traffic projections for growth in the surrounding area, as discussed further in Topical Response TR-3, Related Projects, on page 453, above.

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers.

**Comment 127-6****4/ COMPATIBILITY & ELEVATIONS**

The importance of keeping within the scope of compatibility among the surrounding neighborhoods will go a long way to create a successful and desirable project. Building heights below the view shed of the 100-foot bluffs are more acceptable from an aesthetic, protective and good-neighbor point of view of Playa Vista. A standard measurement from sea level should be established to determine the heights of the buildings to the buildable base.

**Response 127-6**

The Proposed Project's height limits are discussed throughout the Draft EIR, and are described as a measurement from sea level. See for example, Subsection 2.1.1.2.2.1 of Section II. B, Project Characteristics, of the Draft EIR on page 160 and Figure 6 on page 161. As indicated on Figure 6, the average height of the bluffs is approximately 140 feet above mean sea level (AMSL), and the highest buildings that would be permitted on the Project site would be

approximately 112 feet AMSL, approximately 28 feet below the average height of the bluffs. The view impacts associated with these height limits are analyzed in Subsection 3.4.2 of Section IV.O, Visual Qualities, of the Drat EIR, on page 1174.

### **Comment 127-7**

Any means to preserve and maintain the bluffs and bluffs side, as well as protect the toe of the slope is essential to providing the essential buffer between Playa Vista and the Westchester community.

### **Response 127-7**

As indicated in Subsection 4.0 of Section IV.A, Earth, of the Draft EIR on page 266 and Appendix D-2 of the Draft EIR, the slope stability mitigation measures, as recommended by Group Delta Consultants, require the repair and maintenance of the bluff slope. As such, the requirement (as part of the approval of the Final EIR) to adhere to such slope stability mitigation measures would serve to preserve the bluff and maintain an effective buffer between Playa Vista and the Westchester community.

As described in Subsection 2.2 of Section II.B, Project Characteristics, of the Draft EIR on page 167 and illustrated on Figure 6 on page 161, the bluffs fall within the Project's Habitat Creation/Restoration Component. As indicated: "The Project's Habitat Creation/Restoration Component includes the construction of a 6.7-acre Riparian Corridor and the restoration and maintenance of a 5-acre portion of the Westchester Bluffs, located to the south of the Riparian Corridor. This component would be restricted from future development."

### **Comment 127-8**

I recommend the LA City Planning Department carefully consider the Westchester-Playa del Rey Community Plan as a guideline for enforcing appropriate zoning which protects the balance of land uses in the area. I request being informed in a timely manner of any zone change and/or plan ammendment [sic] changes that are proposed on any of the Phases of Playa Vista which the Planning Department must decide on. I would like to be given the opportunity for public input in this process.

I support more neighborhood supported retail proposed in the Playa Vista Village. Not only for the convenience of close proximity and access for its own Playa Vista residents, but I would like to especially see more choice restaurants, coffee shops and bakeries, boutique stores and specialty food stores, as well as banks, savings and loans, pharmacies, card shops, beauty salons, barbers, cleaners, florists, travel agencies, etc.

In conclusion, the four areas of concern: public safety, health, traffic and compatibility/elevations are being addressed in my comments on the Playa Vista Village EIR. In consideration of a mega-development that will progress forward through the City's process of

building and planning, and will impact my neighborhood, I respectfully submit this letter for the record.

I would appreciate being kept up-to-date on public hearings about this project.

**Response 127-8**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

The Proposed Plan amendments are identified and analyzed in Subsection 3.4.1.1.4.2 of Section IV.G, Land Use, of the Draft EIR. Descriptive information regarding proposed plan amendments is provided in Section IV.G, Land Use, of the Draft EIR in Figures 53 and 54 and Table 88 on pages 637 through 639. Table 89 on page 640 compares land use features under the existing plans to those for the Proposed Project. As indicated in Subsection 3.4.1.1.4.2, the Proposed Project's regulatory impacts with regard to the Community and Specific Plans would be less than significant.

## **LETTER NO. 128**

Jim Lamm  
10916 Braddock Drive  
Culver City, CA 90230-4211

### **Comment 128-1**

Although I am president of Ballona Creek Renaissance, a Culver City-based 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization, I am providing you with a few comments as an individual. Also, by way of identification, I am a licensed architect (although not currently practicing). I'll start with some general remarks followed by some more specific ones.

Based on a review of a small portion of the extensive documentation at the local library and Online, I would like to make the following comments and suggestions. I realize that it [sic] possible these are addressed somewhere in the material and that I might have missed them. My hope is that Playa Vista can continue to evolve as much as possible into a part of our urban landscape that provides substantive environmental and social benefits and clearly and directly addresses and mitigates the significant and serious lingering concerns of many people in the surrounding communities and the environmental arena. If more of the proposed development can become open space, great. However, if the development occurs, it should be as sustainable and positive as possible.

Aside from the big picture question about whether or not development should occur in this particular location, I recognize and appreciate various environmentally good features, such as energy efficiency and use of recycled water and the provision of housing and jobs in close proximity to each other. However, I continue to hear concerns from many friends and associates, with much of their focus relating to the presence of methane and other gasses and to the impact of increased traffic on surrounding freeways, streets, and neighborhoods.

### **Response 128-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers. The concerns raised in this comment are described in further detail, and responded to below.

### **Comment 128-2**

Relative to Soil/Gas (Vol. 1, Book 2, Section I, Para. 2.2.4, page 700 and elsewhere), the document seems to cover the bases, but serious concerns by the Grassroots Coalition, Sierra Club and others linger. In order to provide solid assurance to all parties that the development is safe, I would encourage you to address these concerns as specifically as possible. If there are unaddressed problems or reasons to change course, it's best to learn that early. Based on my

direct professional experience with successful projects in gassy areas, I realize that gas usually can be dealt with, but each situation is different.

### **Response 128-2**

Soil gas concerns are addressed in Topical Response TR-12, Soil Gas, on page 477.

### **Comment 128-3**

As for traffic (Vol.1, Book 2, Section K-1, 2, & 3 and elsewhere), I would encourage you to strengthen your description of and proposals for alternative transportation. In addition to or in lieu of certain street intersection modifications and the like, consider bicycle and other linkages as mitigations and consider related commitments to active participation in efforts to provide rail options on the Westside, including connections to LAX, the proposed east-west Exposition Light Rail and Bikeway, and a possible north-south rail/bike/bus route in the vicinity of the Lincoln Boulevard Corridor. For bicycle commuting and recreation options, possible Playa Vista participation in connections to and improvements along the Ballona Creek Bike Path could provide significant benefit to the project and the surrounding communities. Figure 83 (page 959) illustrates a much more limited scope.

### **Response 128-3**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

Please see Topical Response TR-4, The Village at Playa Vista Transit Plan Effectiveness, on page 455, above, for information on the proposed transit plan, its components and its effectiveness. The Proposed Project will also include parks, sidewalks, bicycle lanes and other amenities including a substantial investment in transit infrastructure consisting of regional transit buses, transit priority systems, adaptive traffic control systems and an intelligent Playa Vista local shuttle system. The transit improvement program includes connections to regional rail, including the Metro Green Line Station to the south and the planned Exposition Light Rail Line to the north. Additionally, the transit improvements and enhancements provide connections to transit centers to facilitate coordinated transfers to bus lines operated by other providers.

### **Comment 128-4**

The above limited comments and concerns notwithstanding, past and ongoing efforts by Playa Vista (and the City of Los Angeles) regarding Ballona Creek and its watershed are much appreciated. While much could be said about the various alternative scales of development, I am not in a position to address those and other important issues. I hope these comments are constructive and I'll look forward to reviewing the resultant documentation. And with the just completed transfer of significant lands to the State, I also look forward to participating in a small way in the renewal of the wetlands and open space resources.

**Response 128-4**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

**LETTER NO. 129**

Angela Lee  
4046 Tivoli Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90066

**Comment 129-1**

I feel that allowing the Playa Vista Phase II project to go forward is a very poor idea. I live in the Del Rey area and already have to contend with the terrible traffic on Lincoln Blvd. I am concerned that a development the size of Playa Vista Phase II will cause more gridlock on Lincoln and Centinela and will result in cars detouring through residential streets. Please demand a thorough assessment of the traffic impact of Playa Vista.

**Response 129-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

A detailed analysis of the Proposed Project's traffic impacts has been performed and is presented in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 798. The Traffic Study measured the performance of 218 key intersections within an approximately 100-square mile study area described in Section IV.K.(1) of the Draft EIR, beginning on page 828 and in Technical Appendix K-2.

The traffic impact analysis is provided in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 798 and in Appendix K-2. The Draft EIR includes a comprehensive mitigation program to address the significant impacts identified in the analysis. In addition, a new mitigation measure has been added to the mitigation program in the Draft EIR as discussed in Section II.15 of the Final EIR on page 216 and Topical Response TR-10, Alternative 2010 Baseline Scenario – Additional Mitigation Measure, on page 472. This new mitigation measure would mitigate the one remaining significant traffic impact at Centinela Avenue and Jefferson Boulevard that was identified in the Draft EIR. With implementation of the mitigation measure, the Proposed Project would not have any significant traffic impacts. The traffic model and methodology used to evaluate the Proposed Project's impacts is also discussed in greater detail in Topical Response No. TR-1, Playa Vista Transportation Model, on page 445, above.

In addition to the analysis described above, the transportation analysis included an evaluation of the locations where the addition of Project traffic might cause an impact on neighborhood streets. This analysis is discussed in Subsection 3.4.7 of Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR on pages 872-877. One of the four neighborhoods identified as a potential neighborhood impact area lies within the Del Rey Homeowners and Neighbors Association boundaries and therefore is eligible to participate in the neighborhood traffic mitigation program

identified in the mitigation program. Participation is outlined on page 6 of the LADOT Assessment Letter in Appendix K-1, of the Draft EIR.

In the event any unforeseen neighborhood traffic intrusion problems are reported after Project occupancy, LADOT will investigate the complaints and, if it is determined that the cut-through problem is attributed to the Project, LADOT will work with the affected residents, the local City Council office, homeowner's groups, and traffic engineering consultants, to design a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan to address the items of concern. If the traffic intrusion is determined to be unrelated to the Project, the neighborhood could still work with LADOT to develop a Neighborhood Traffic Plan funded through other means.

## **LETTER NO. 130**

Hyun Gwon Lee  
Lee & Co.  
3660 Wilshire Boulevard, #936  
Los Angeles, CA 90010

### **Comment 130-1**

Despite arguments to the contrary, people will use public transit as long as it is clean, well-maintained and goes somewhere they want to go--regardless of their socio-economic status. Just because you have a car doesn't mean you will use it for every trip, especially if there is a convenient alternative. I think of the public transit that serves Laguna Beach, especially during the annual Festival of Arts, and I know that those shuttles are packed.

It is possible for the City to approve a project that would use such a shuttle every day of the year. The Village at Playa Vista would provide a shuttle to deliver residents, like me, from our homes to the office buildings at The Campus portion of the project and to important destinations outside the project, including Howard Hughes Center, Fox Hills Mall and Marina del Rey.

I think I speak for everyone at Playa Vista when I say that it would be refreshing to leave our cars behind and ride the shuttle to work or to do our shopping. The shuttle system at Playa Vista could be a model for other such systems throughout the City, and I urge the City to support this cutting-edge project.

### **Response 130-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 131**

Sue Levitt  
12580 Rosy Circle  
Los Angeles, CA 90066

### **Comment 131-1**

Demographers predict a huge increase in population in Southern California over the next 20 years. Some have estimated the increase to be as large as “two Chicagos.” Where are we going to house all these people?

I believe it is important to create new housing in urban areas, rather than continuing down the path of urban sprawl. Urban sprawl takes people farther away from their places of employment and creates undo strains on the regional transportation system.

The Village at Playa Vista is an example of smart planning and smart growth. It provides for 2,600 new residential units, neighborhood retail stores within walking or shuttle distance to residents, and the opportunity for people to live and work in the same community.

Unfortunately, this is a novel concept for Los Angeles, and one that should be replicated as much as possible to accommodate the population growth that is coming. The Village is a smart concept, well-reasoned and a model. It is deserving of the City’s support and approval.

### **Response 131-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 132**

Lance Lipscomb  
Westchester Resident

### **Comment 132-1**

Conversations about the sprawl of a city, Los Angeles is general the first example cited. The concept of building communities from within our city borders rather than continuing to consume the out laying landscape seems to be beyond the grasp of most city planners and developers. However, Playa Vista is an example of a community that has been masterfully designed to thrive within the metropolis of Los Angeles.

The developers have learned their lessons well from other less desirable projects. They have taken an abandoned airstrip and manufacturing facility and turned it into a viable community. The new homes are artistically crated and wired for the latest in technology. Instead of expansive garages, cars are parked underground. There are people who oppose any change. Their issue is not whether a project is beneficial only that it involves change. Playa Vista is a great place and a model for cities short on housing.

The Village is a critical feature of the immerging community. With its mix of housing, retail, office and open space, it will allow Playa Vista to become a true mixed-use community. Without The Village Playa Vista will be just another housing project. Compromises area part of living in this city. There are realities of city life in the 21 Century that we may not like; however, they are realities to which we have to identity new solutions. We need to be willing to live closer together. We need to use public transportation. We need to be content with parks, rather than a personal yard. Playa Vista vision has been to address these issues and create a visionary neighborhood that is attractive, with open spaces and self contained.

The Village only builds on what is already a great place. I urge the City of Los Angeles to approve the plans.

### **Response 132-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 133**

Jocelyn and David Lutzky  
5801 Kiyot Way #10  
Playa Vista, California 90094

### **Comment 133-1**

Would you build a school without a playground or a house without a bathroom? Then why on earth would you consider building a housing development without a retail center?

The two go hand in hand. The businesses in the retail center will feed off the residents; and the residents will find the convenience of the retail center irresistible. Better still is the fact that while the residents are doing their shopping and the businesses are making money, the people in the surrounding community remain unburdened by the traffic that would otherwise be seeking out these services elsewhere.

We moved to Playa Vista for a new sense of urban living. Part of that was the promise of the shops and restaurants that will be part of The Village and the prospect of being able to walk to the corner restaurant on a Saturday morning and read the paper, drink a cup of coffee and watch the world go by.

The Village is a wonderful concept that should be replicated elsewhere. It provides a town center that will be the heart of our community.

### **Response 133- 1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 134**

N. Challis Macpherson  
738 Howard Street  
Venice, CA 90292-5515

### **Comment 134-1**

The Village at Playa Vista will create not only thousands of new construction jobs, but it will very likely create hundreds of new careers as well.

As you may be aware, the construction industry can be difficult to break into, especially if you are faced with obstacles such as prior drug use or incarceration that make it difficult to get past the job interview stage. Playa Vista, however, has set the bar high by agreeing to reserve a significant percentage of its construction jobs for at-risk youth and adults through the Playa Vista Job Opportunity and Business Services (PVJOBS) program.

This commitment is nothing short of spectacular because it means that at-risk adults who might otherwise turn back to their gang or drug lifestyles have a light at the end of the tunnel. The Village will create new jobs for them, but once the project is completed, these people will have learned a trade, been accepted into the union and have outstanding prospects for future work.

In this way, The Village and Playa Vista are about more than building new homes; they are about building new lives. I am writing to support The Village because it will make a difference in the lives of hundreds of people and their families long after it is built.

I am one of the original community activists that negotiated a jobs training program with Playa Vista some ten years ago. This company has never ceased working with us toward a viable program that guaranteed no less than 10% of the construction jobs at Playa Vista went to multi-barriered local people. Our success rate is amazing. Please contact me for details. I am always happy to talk about PVJOBS.

### **Response 134-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 135**

Jayne Major  
Breakthrough Parenting Services  
12405 Venice Boulevard, #172  
Los Angeles, CA 90066

### **Comment 135-1**

I live near Playa Vista and the traffic is getting worse and worse.

Please do what you can to minimize the impact to traffic; we are approaching gridlock.

### **Response 135-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

A detailed analysis of the Proposed Project's traffic impacts has been performed and is presented in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 798. The Traffic Study measured the performance of 218 key intersections within an approximately 100-square mile study area described in Section IV.K.(1) of the Draft EIR, beginning on page 828 and in Technical Appendix K-2.

The traffic impact analysis is provided in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 798 and in Appendix K-2. The Draft EIR includes a comprehensive mitigation program to address the significant impacts identified in the analysis. In addition, a new mitigation measure has been added to the mitigation program in the Draft EIR as discussed in Section II.15 of the Final EIR on page 216 and Topical Response TR-10, Alternative 2010 Baseline Scenario – Additional Mitigation Measure, on page 472. This new mitigation measure would mitigate the one remaining significant traffic impact at Centinela Avenue and Jefferson Boulevard that was identified in the Draft EIR. With implementation of the mitigation measure, the Proposed Project would not have any significant traffic impacts. The traffic model and methodology used to evaluate the Proposed Project's impacts is also discussed in greater detail in Topical Response TR-1, Playa Vista Transportation Model, on page 445.

## **LETTER NO. 136**

Glenn Marzano  
Glenn Marzano Photography  
Post Office Box 12407  
Marina del Rey, CA 90295

### **Comment 136-1**

I am proud to say that I am a resident of Playa Vista.

I am one of the few people in Los Angeles who actually doesn't mind their commute. I work just a few minutes from my new home at Playa Vista, so unlike most people, I don't even have to get on the freeway to get to and from work.

While a commute like that is an anomaly in LA., Playa Vista is helping to make it more common for people to live close to where they work. I work with many people who live in places like Santa Clarita and Long Beach because there is no new housing for them on the Westside.

The Village plan, however, would add additional housing to Playa Vista and encourage people to move closer. The Village will also include neighborhood stores and cafes that we can all walk to. I am hopeful that The Village will be like neighborhoods back East and in the Midwest, where neighbors meet for coffee in the morning and bump into each other in the local market while getting their groceries.

I hope you will support this project and recommend to the City Council that it be approved.

### **Response 136-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 137**

Sylvester Matthews  
425 West Regent Street, #12  
Inglewood, CA 90301

### **Comment 137-1**

The Playa Vista community has been a wonderful addition to the area. The developers' attention to creating open spaces, preserving wildlife and providing residents with beautiful, environmentally friendly homes has set an example that I hope will become a standard for the future in our city.

I therefore look forward with great anticipation to the beginning of the next step-the Village. This phase promises to continue what was started by the residential project. The Village will provide area residents with a grocery store and other service related businesses, retail shopping, restaurants and more, reducing traffic and pollution, as the need for car trips to other neighborhoods is eliminated.

I strongly urge the City to approve the Village and complete what is becoming a model community for Los Angeles.

### **Response 137-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 138**

Jeffrey McLean  
4400 Westlawn Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90066-6140

### **Comment 138-1**

My wife and I live in the neighborhood west of Centinela just south of Washington. We have many concerns about the additional traffic that the Playa Vista projects are contributing through our street. When we bought our house 2 years ago we thought it would be a good place to begin raising a family, now we are not so sure. With a baby on the way I am saddened every time I see a car race down our street, an occurrence that is happening more and more frequently.

With all of the remaining land intended to be developed, there is a great potential impact on both my family's way of life and on the value of my property. I feel that there is nothing I can do to stop the inevitable save for letting my voice be heard.

### **Response 138-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

### **Comment 138-2**

1) Please require traffic impact studies to the surrounding neighborhoods prior to any additional development.

### **Response 138-2**

A neighborhood traffic impact analysis was conducted as part of the analysis of potential traffic impacts for the Proposed Project. The findings of this analysis can be found in Subsection 3.4.7 of Section IV.K(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR, beginning on page 872. The neighborhood traffic impact analysis concludes that the Proposed Project may have significant impacts on four residential neighborhoods, including the neighborhood bounded by Inglewood Boulevard, Ballona Creek, Sawtelle Boulevard, and Bray Street/Port Road, and includes a mitigation measure to address these impacts (page 903). Please also see Topical Response TR-5, Neighborhood Traffic Impacts on page 458, above.

**Comment 138-3**

2) Please install speed bumps on our street, Westlawn Ave. between Short Ave. and Louise Ave. See the map below:

**Response 138-3**

The Draft EIR measured the impact of Proposed Project traffic on the street system in the area. Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR on page 872, presented an analysis of potential neighborhood impacts that could be caused by project traffic, and the intersections listed in this comment were not found to be among the areas of potential impact. In the event any unforeseen neighborhood traffic intrusion problems are reported after Project occupancy, LADOT will investigate the complaints and, if it is determined that the cut-through problem is attributed to the Project, LADOT will work with the affected residents, the local City Council office, homeowner's groups, and traffic engineering consultants, to design a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan to address the items of concern. If the traffic intrusion is determined to be unrelated to the Project, the neighborhood could still work with LADOT to develop a Neighborhood Traffic Plan funded through other means. See Topical Response TR-5, Neighborhood Traffic Impacts, on page 458 above.

The request for speed humps on Westlawn Avenue will be forwarded to LADOT for consideration.

**Comment 138-4****ATTACHMENT**

See following page.

[http://maps.yahoo.com/maps\\_result?ed=PaHeZ.p\\_0TptY7.8Cd34wVAKShBRbA--&csz=90066&country=us&resize=s](http://maps.yahoo.com/maps_result?ed=PaHeZ.p_0TptY7.8Cd34wVAKShBRbA--&csz=90066&country=us&resize=s)

**Response 138-4**

This attachment was submitted in support of comments stated in Comment 138-3. As such, comments related to this attachment are addressed in Response 138-3, above.

Yahoo! Maps and Driving Directions

Page 1 of 1



## Yahoo! Maps

[Back to Map](#)

★ 4400 Westlawn Ave  
Los Angeles, CA 90066-6140



When using any driving directions or map, it's a good idea to do a reality check and make sure the road still exists, watch out for construction, and follow all traffic safety precautions. This is only to be used as an aid in planning.

Copyright © 2003 Yahoo! Inc. All rights reserved.  
[Privacy Policy](#) - [Terms of Service](#) - [Copyright Policy](#) - [Yahoo! Maps Terms of Use](#) - [Help](#) - [Ad Feedback](#)

h h c c e e

## **LETTER NO. 139**

Sandy Medrano  
13163 Fountain Park Drive, #B-130  
Playa Vista, CA 90094

### **Comment 139-1**

As a resident of Playa Vista, I am enthusiastically looking forward to the beginning of Phase Two—The Village. Smaller than originally planned, the Village promises to provide us with restaurants, cafes, a market and retail that will enable us to shop without a commute! The office space and the residential areas of Playa Vista will be mutually beneficial, each creating a draw to the other—the residential apartments and homes will be attractive to people coming to work in the office park, while demand for the available office space will surely increase as a result of people moving in to live!

The Village at Playa Vista will complement the residential community perfectly, creating a model for what Los Angeles of the future can be at its best! I encourage the City to join me in supporting this wonderful project by approving its next phase.

### **Response 139-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

**LETTER NO. 140**

Irene Meltzer  
12547 Mitchell Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90066

**Comment 140-1**

As 15 year resident in both Venice and Mar Vista, I have become increasingly distressed by the poor public planning in the surrounding neighborhoods. As examples:

Culver City shoved Cost Co on Washington Blvd (off Lincoln) with no perceptible [*sic*] traffic mitigation causing weekly traffic accidents and crawling traffic. Rampant over-building of the Marina area, has caused some of the worst traffic in LA off Lincoln Blvd. I live off Centinela which has now become the defacto highway to Playa Vista and is a traffic nightmare. My commute has increased by 20 minutes due to the traffic on Centinela. The quality of life in the Marina area is steadily decreasing.

The worst is yet to come with phase two of Playa Vista. There is no way you can mitigate the effect of thousands of more people in this small area. We're already seeing an increase of cars using our street to avoid the Washington/Venice intersection, creating dangerous situations for kids in our neighborhoods.

It is the responsibility of the city council to look after the best interest of the tax-paying citizens, not just deep-pocketed, well-connected developers. I urge you to do a comprehensive and thorough study of the traffic impact Playa Vista will have on our neighborhood streets. This area is becoming unbearable.

**Response 140-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

A detailed analysis of the Proposed Project's traffic impacts has been performed and is presented in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR. The commentor raises specific comments relating to the existing traffic conditions. Such traffic would be included within the existing operating conditions presented in Table 115 of the Draft EIR, on page 812. A new mitigation measure has been added to the mitigation program in the Draft EIR as discussed in Section II.15, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR on page 216 and Topical Response TR-10, Alternative 2010 Baseline Scenario – Additional Mitigation Measure, on page 472. This new mitigation measure would mitigate the one remaining significant traffic impact at Centinela Avenue/Jefferson Boulevard identified in the Draft EIR. With mitigation, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant traffic impacts.

The Draft EIR contains an analysis of potential neighborhood impacts that could be caused by project traffic in Subsection 3.4.7 of Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR on page 872. As discussed therein, a total of four neighborhoods were identified as having potential significant neighborhood traffic impacts as a result of the Proposed Project, and would be eligible to participate in the neighborhood traffic mitigation program identified in the mitigation program.

## **LETTER NO. 141**

Cheryl Mitchell  
714 East 92nd Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90002

### **Comment 141-1**

Los Angeles has been described as “parks poor.” Playa Vista’s plan for The Village helps improve the situation. The Village will contain over 11 acres of recreational parks and bike lanes. Twelve more acres of open space will provide improved habitat for plants and wildlife.

Having The Village will not suddenly make Los Angeles “parks rich,” but it will be a significant contribution to the city. Please support Playa Vista’s plans.

### **Response 141-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 142**

Ross Moen  
4707 La Villa Marina, #D  
Marina del Rey, CA 90292-7011

### **Comment 142-1**

The current master plan for Playa Vista is significantly smaller in size and scope than the original plan envisioned more than a decade ago, so the construction's impacts on air quality will be proportionately smaller. To minimize these impacts, Playa Vista says it will use equipment and technology to control emissions, water construction sites to help control dust and hire an air quality monitor to oversee the project.

The comprehensive transit program will further reduce pollutant emissions and create opportunities for increased bus ridership, bicycling and walking. Design features of The Village, similar to Playa Vista's first phase, will promote energy-efficient appliances and lighting in all residences.

These are outstanding and progressive measures that will minimize impacts to air quality. I love living by the beach and enjoying the fresh sea breeze. It's nice to know that Playa Vista values clean air as much as I do, and is taking extraordinary measures to keep it that way.

### **Response 142-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 143**

John Monaghan  
121 Sunridge Street  
Playa del Rey, CA 90293

### **Comment 143-1**

As a Playa del Rey resident, I have watched the Playa Vista project carefully over the years. I am writing today to say that I am happy that the project has been scaled down significantly from the Summa days.

Our hopes are that this new, smaller version will have fewer impacts on the surrounding communities so residents can maintain a high quality of life. I am very glad to see that the housing plans incorporate park and open space sites.

I would, however, suggest that the city encourage Playa Vista to look into making the former Jake's restaurant site in Playa del Rey into a park. There are far too few parks in Playa del Rey and the Jake's site would make a perfect location for a park that everyone in the neighborhood could enjoy.

Thank you for your consideration.

### **Response 143-1**

The comment is noted and will be forwarded to the City decision-makers for their review and consideration. The parcel known as the Jakes' Lot is owned by an affiliate of the Project Applicant. The City and the Applicant and its affiliate are working to identify an appropriate future use for this lot.

## **LETTER NO. 144**

Faridah Monghate  
13000 Washington Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90066

### **Comment 144-1**

I am writing to urge the City of Los Angeles to approve the Environmental Impact Report for The Village at Playa Vista. In particular, I support Playa Vista's plans to protect local and regional water quality.

Playa Vista has designed an innovative system that collects water runoff from the development and its neighbors, to protect the wetlands in the area and the Santa Monica Bay. An attractive habitat for wildlife, the freshwater marsh system doubles as a natural water filter.

The Village design contains several features to complete the system. Acreage within The Village will fully connect the Riparian Corridor, linking it to the marsh. Rooftop drains and other upstream measures will filter the water before it enters storm drains. Underground parking will minimize pollutants. Native landscaping will reduce the need for irrigation. These are smart measures, and there are many more in the Village EIR.

### **Response 144-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 145**

Jeanne Moody  
7023 Trolley Way  
Playa del Rey, CA 90293

### **Comment 145-1**

As a Playa del Rey resident, I have watched the Playa Vista project carefully over the years. I am writing today to say that I am happy that the project has been scaled down significantly from the Summa days.

Our hopes are that this new, smaller version will have fewer impacts on the surrounding communities so residents can maintain a high quality of life. I am very glad to see that the housing plans incorporate park and open space sites.

I would, however, suggest that the city encourage Playa Vista to look into making the former Jake's restaurant site in Playa del Rey into a park. There are far too few parks in Playa del Rey and the Jake's site would make a perfect location for a park that everyone in the neighborhood could enjoy.

### **Response 145-1**

The comment is noted and will be forwarded to the City decision-makers for their review and consideration. The parcel known as the Jakes' Lot is owned by an affiliate of the Project Applicant. The City and the Applicant and its affiliate are working to identify an appropriate future use for this lot.

## **LETTER NO. 146**

Christopher Moore  
205 Rosecrans Place  
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

### **Comment 146-1**

I am writing to submit my comments regarding the Draft EIR for Playa Vista Phase II (EIR No. ENV 2002-6129 EIR).

As a resident of the South Bay, it appears that our communities will be spared direct impact of both the proposed project and of many of the mitigation efforts. However, my daily routine takes me through the very heart of the project and as such I imagine that I will experience quite a bit of disruption and delay if this project is to be approved. I am sure that many, many other area residents will be similarly affected.

I would encourage the City Planning Department to pursue “Alternative 1: No Project - No Development”. Los Angeles County is highly stressed in its infrastructure already. A glance at Book 2, Table 116 “Freeway Operating Conditions - 2003 Base” shows that, today, a large part of our freeway system is already operating at low levels of service, many segments rating a grade of D or worse. At this time, the majority of Playa Vista Phase I is still unoccupied; once those thousands of individuals join the many current, surrounding-area residents, how much of the nearly exhausted capacity of our roads will be left for those that will live in Phase II?

I ask that the City Planning Department use some common sense when looking at this project proposal. Los Angeles cannot accommodate the people that are already living here—we are in already overloaded lifeboats. Rather than laboring to make the Westside more attractive to prospective residents, why not do something to improve the quality of lives of those that are here now? Please say no to the second phase of Playa Vista and the disruption, dust, traffic, people, and pollution it will bring. We have enough of that here already.

Give us a little bit of freedom here on the Westside and say to Playa Vista, “No Project - No Development.” We shall be all the better for it.

### **Response 146-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers. The topics of dust and pollution are addressed in Section IV.B, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 270. The topic of traffic is addressed in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 798.

**LETTER NO. 147**

Dana Morgan  
8500 Belford Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90045

**Comment 147-1**

As a 20 year resident of Westchester I would like you to consider less housing and road building at Playa Vista and more public acquisition of land. Clearly, the approval of Phase II will add to the already crowded roadways on the west side and will encourage even more traffic to migrate onto our local residential streets. We have suffered from the building of the Hughes Center, from the increase in LAX airport traffic. Many of our local streets are becoming unsafe because of cars cutting through the residential [*sic*] neighborhoods of Westchester. The bottom line is that the Playa Vista Project will increase traffic to unacceptable, and illegal levels at many intersections. Please review the facts about traffic mitigation very carefully. My research into the traffic [*sic*] issue shows that spokepeople [*sic*] for Playa Vista have not been totally truthful when analyzing the effect of the increase of car trips that might be the result of Phase I and II. The false belief that Playa Vista residents will use public transportation instead of their private cars must be addressed.

**Response 147-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

A detailed analysis of the Proposed Project's traffic impacts has been performed and is presented in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 798. The Traffic Study measured the performance of 218 key intersections within an approximately 100-square mile study area described in Section IV.K.(1) of the Draft EIR, beginning on page 828 and in Technical Appendix K-2.

The traffic impact analysis is provided in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 798 and in Appendix K-2. The Draft EIR includes a comprehensive mitigation program to address the significant impacts identified in the analysis. In addition, a new mitigation measure has been added to the mitigation program in the Draft EIR as discussed in Section II.15, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR on page 216 and Topical Response TR-10, Alternative 2010 Baseline Scenario – Additional Mitigation Measure, on page 472. This new mitigation measure would mitigate the one remaining significant traffic impact at Centinela Avenue and Jefferson Boulevard that was identified in the Draft EIR. With implementation of the mitigation measure, the Proposed Project would not have any significant traffic impacts. The traffic model and methodology used to evaluate the Proposed Project's impacts is also discussed in greater detail in Topical Response TR-1, Playa Vista Transportation Model, on page 445.

The proposed transit enhancement mitigation measures are designed for use by Playa Vista residents and employees, and to meet the existing and future demand of other transit riders in the area. The transit mitigation does not rely on a majority of Playa Vista residents or employees using transit to be effective; in fact, the proposed mitigation would be effective to reduce potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant levels with as little as 1 percent to 3.3 percent of the total trips along the enhanced transit corridors using the proposed system. This level of usage is consistent with Los Angeles Congestion Management Plan projections.

### **Comment 147-2**

Instead of approving Phase II, even at the smaller, cleaner levels suggested by Playa Vista, why not make a positive and courageous step toward conservation and restoration. The environmentally wise decision would be one that serves the needs of all affected constituents: humans and non-humans alike. A decision to bring more public parks and green space for residents on the west side would be a decision for health of the entire 100 mile radius which has been researched as part of the EIR. The ocean, the wetlands, the uplands, and all the people would benefit from 250-300+ acres [sic] in Area D - including Phase 2 lands put into the Public Trust. Please consider this alternative. Review the environmental [sic] impact of parkland and greenspace in contrast to more housing, more car trips, more pollution.

My children and grandchildren's grandchildren will forever thank you for taking a step in the right direction, a step to block Phase II. We need to restore the wetlands area to its previous beauty. It can be done with your help.

### **Response 147-2**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision makers.

Section VII, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR, starting on page 1258, analyzes a range of alternatives to the Proposed Project, and identifies alternatives considered but rejected in Subsection 3.2 on page 1262. As described, therein, a regional park/habitat restoration alternative was discussed, but not pursued further as analysis of such an alternative is not appropriate per Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines. As described in Section 15126.6(c), the reasons for rejecting alternatives from detailed consideration include the following: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives; (ii) infeasibility; or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

## **LETTER NO. 148**

Ingrid Mueller  
1027 Elkgrove Avenue  
Venice, CA 90291

### **Comment 148-1**

It is difficult to hold back disagreements and anger after soooo many years of opposition to PV.

Although we were promised that the DEIR for Phase II would not be published before Phase I was completed...yet here are 1,500 pages of detailed jungle to stumble through at year's end—indeed, what's the big hurry????!!

All obvious protests, like traffic congestion and air pollution, will arrive on your desk in piles, and no mitigation will change our resolve.

Here in Venice, we know that thousands of newcomers would enjoy the beach areas, if only there were shuttles provided by the 'owners', for instance, and no taxes were spent on additional 'public' transport.

Here in Venice, we already s m e 11 the crawling traffic on Lincoln Blvd...and this is supposed to be the West Coast's last, all inclusive, beach city with public access! Already a shifting dream... If more mega-boxes and homes were to rise in our Ballona Wetlands, plenty of 'dreams' would be doused, killed, and that goes for the spirit of our neighborhoods as well. Why continue to live here?

Whatever you can do, dear Councilwoman, please DO DO IT! Our Grassroots Venice Neighborhood Council's LUPC will join other surrounding NCs in your district in their PV opposition.

Please DO voice the deeply felt and researched concerns of your constituents!

Please DON'T allow that falsely calculated population increase over the next couple of decades for you to succumb to pressure and burning greed and a dozen LA neighborhoods's [sic] seriously impaired quality of life!

Your serious and honest consideration is truly appreciated.

### **Response 148-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

There is no requirement that consideration of the Proposed Project be delayed until completion of the First Phase Playa Vista Project. A comprehensive traffic impact evaluation study has been performed, including coordination with numerous jurisdictions, during the study process. The traffic impact analysis is provided in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 798. This study is included along with all the technical analysis in Appendix K of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR includes a comprehensive mitigation program to address the significant impacts identified in the analysis. In addition, a new mitigation measure has been added to the mitigation program in the Draft EIR as discussed in Section II.15, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR on page 216 and Topical Response TR-10, Alternative 2010 Baseline Scenario – Additional Mitigation Measure, on page 472. This new mitigation measure would mitigate the one remaining significant traffic impact at Centinela Avenue and Jefferson Boulevard that was identified in the Draft EIR. With implementation of the mitigation measure, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant traffic impacts. The Draft EIR identifies residual significant impacts on regional air quality emissions from both Project construction and Project operations. The Playa Vista First Phase Project will include the provision of a beach shuttle service on summer weekends. This service will be available to Project residents and visitors and will serve to reduce the impact on beach and coastal resource parking demand. The shuttle system would be expanded under mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR for the Proposed Project. The Proposed Project includes no development in the Ballona wetlands.

## **LETTER NO. 149**

Laura Munsterteiger  
2302 Aviation Boulevard, #A  
Redondo Beach, CA 90278

### **Comment 149-1**

I am routinely baffled by how many hoops a good development must jump through before being approved. Los Angeles has gone out of its way, it seems, to discourage good developers from building the housing we desperately need.

At Playa Vista, for example, the developer has crafted a wonderful vision for how new housing can address environmental concerns, incorporate an enormous amount of open space and make a dent in the jobs/housing imbalance. Yet, Playa Vista is routinely attacked by those who would prefer that nothing be built on the eyesore that is the old Hughes Aircraft site.

I believe, as do many of my friends and neighbors, that it is high time that Playa Vista is built. Please look at the many regional and local benefits this project will provide. Thank you.

### **Response 149-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 150**

Richard S. Musella  
6383 West 80th Street  
Westchester, CA 90045

### **Comment 150-1**

The Village will continue Playa Vista's commitment to the environment and balancing the critical need for housing with the protection of the environment. This commitment is an extension of important environmental work already underway, including the creation of the Freshwater Wetland System that is creating and protecting habitat and treating stormwater before it enters Santa Monica Bay.

The Freshwater Marsh (FWM), constructed as part of the Playa Vista's First Phase, is designed to both establish new wetlands habitat and to function as a buffer to protect the salt marsh from impacts from upstream urbanization. Previously contemplated development, which was greater than The Village project is today, was taken into account in the design of the FWM.

Resources in the area will benefit from the fact that The Village proposes no development west of Lincoln Boulevard or north of the Ballona Channel. In connection with The Village, Playa Vista will complete the Riparian Corridor of the Freshwater Wetland System and restore the Westchester Bluffs east of Lincoln. Approximately 12 acres of the 111 acres in the Village will be habitat creation or restoration. Overall, I believe the Project will be an improvement to habitat and benefit the local wetlands system compared to what exists today.

I am a forty year resident of Westchester and strongly support The Village.

### **Response 150-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 151**

Richard Nickey  
110 Rees Street  
Playa del Rey, CA 90293

### **Comment 151-1**

As a Playa del Rey resident, I have watched the Playa Vista project carefully over the years. I am writing today to say that I am happy that the project has been scaled down significantly from the Summa days.

Our hopes are that this new, smaller version will have fewer impacts on the surrounding communities so residents can maintain a high quality of life. I am very glad to see that the housing plans incorporate park and open space sites.

I would, however, suggest that the city encourage Playa Vista to look into making the former Jake's restaurant site in Playa del Rey into a park. There are far too few parks in Playa del Rey and the Jake's site would make a perfect location for a park that everyone in the neighborhood could enjoy.

### **Response 151-1**

The comment is noted and will be forwarded to the City decision-makers for their review and consideration. The parcel known as the Jakes' Lot is owned by an affiliate of the Project Applicant. The City and the Applicant and its affiliate are working to identify an appropriate future use for this lot.

## **LETTER NO. 152**

Guy Nicolet  
13075 Pacific Promenade, #112  
Playa Vista, CA 90094

### **Comment 152-1**

As a homeowner at Playa Vista, I wanted to stress the importance of The Village to the community. The Village is not only an asset to the residents of Playa Vista, but also to the surrounding communities of Venice, Playa del Rey, Marina del Rey and Westchester.

The Village will provide the community with a town center - filled with restaurants and stores and open areas for people in the community to gather. The Village will provide the residents of Playa Vista and surrounding neighborhoods with a special place close by to eat and shop which will unburden our local roads with additional traffic.

Public transportation will also be available to and throughout The Village via the addition of new bus lines and a shuttle system connecting The Village with key local destinations such as Fox Hills Mall, Howard Hughes Center, Marina del Rey, UCLA and Century City.

The Village is a much-needed addition to the community and I urge the City of Los Angeles to support the project to its fullest extent.

### **Response 152-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 153**

John W. Nugent  
7335 Vista del Mar Lane  
Playa del Rey, CA 90293

### **Comment 153-1**

As part of The Village project, five acres of the Westchester Bluffs will be restored, with native coastal sage replacing non-native grasses and iceplant. This improvement will make the bluffs more stable, and will be far more attractive than what exists today.

At the base of the bluffs in The Village area will be a riparian corridor that will include more native habitat and walking trails. I understand that this area will be accessible to people living outside Playa Vista. What a nice improvement to the area and one that will be enjoyed by residents like me.

My wife and I have had the opportunity to stroll along the freshwater marsh, and look forward to expanding that walk to include the riparian area. We look forward to looking up, and seeing the bluffs greatly improved. Better yet, we look forward to strolling over to a coffeehouse in the Village for a cup of coffee before resuming our walk.

The Village is a win-win proposal in that it provides important environmental improvements to the bluff and riparian corridor while providing walking and exercise trails to local residents like us.

### **Response 153-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

**LETTER NO. 154**

Patrick O'Neill  
3868 East Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90066

**Comment 154-1**

The Village at Playa Vista is an important continuation of a much-needed project in our city. While building on Playa Vista's commitment to protect plants and wildlife, air and water, it will provide area residents with a grocery store, retail shops, restaurants and other amenities that will complete this model community.

The current Village plan is smaller and greener than what was originally proposed, and will honor the environment by greatly reducing the need to drive to access goods and services.

I strongly urge the City to approve this phase of the Playa Vista project.

**Response 154-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 155**

Mark A. Ozzello  
8109 Sinaloa Road  
Playa del Rey, CA 90293

### **Comment 155-1**

Population estimates continue to grow for Los Angeles at a pace that far exceeds the amount of new housing. Where are all these new residents going to live?

The City of Los Angeles should be thrilled that Playa Vista has come along to provide critically needed housing at a time when demand far exceeds supply.

We can either continue moving people out to suburbia, or provide opportunities for them to live in the city, closer to where they work.

The Village plan only provides for 2,600 new housing units, but that is a lot more than any other development I know. Also, there will be a variety of housing at moderate prices, which is exactly what people are looking for. I only wish Playa Vista would build even more housing to meet the demand.

If you haven't come to Playa Vista, I encourage you to do so. If the second phase is anything like what is being built now, it will be a wonderful addition to the City.

### **Response 155-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 156**

Phil Parlett  
13115 Washington Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90066

### **Comment 156-1**

For too long, the residents of our city have been victims of urban sprawl. The housing crisis has made it nearly impossible for most of us to live and work without intolerable commutes. Playa Vista is offering an opportunity to reverse this trend as it embarks on its next step.

With the approval of The Village, Playa Vista will provide area residents with retail, grocery, restaurant, and office facilities, among other amenities, that will result in a greatly reduced need to travel more than a short, convenient distance for work, shopping and recreation.

When you combine the residential area, the diverse parks and wildlife areas and the proposed Village, Playa Vista is a complete community that is efficient, environmentally sensitive and beautiful.

I strongly support the Village, and hope that the City will too.

### **Response 156-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 157**

Richard S. Payne  
5701 Kiyot Way, #8  
Playa Vista, CA 90094

### **Comment 157-1**

I just moved to Playa Vista from Huntington Beach and am thrilled to now be living close to my job at Sony Pictures Studios in Culver City. My particular office is located in the Corporate Pointe Business Center near the Fox Hills Mall, just few blocks east of where Playa Vista ends at Centinella [sic].

Like many people who live in the Los Angeles area, I was spending countless hours trapped in my car fighting traffic. For over 25 years, I commuted to jobs in the Los Angeles area from Orange County. Not only was it frustrating, I now want to eliminate fighting traffic on my off time as well. If the city approves The Village at Playa Vista, many people like myself will be able to walk instead of drive to take care of our daily necessities like shopping, entertainment, and dining.

Factor into that the many people like myself who will be able to ride a shuttle, ride their bikes or even walk to work, and it is clear that Playa Vista is everything that it was intended to be when it was billed as the community of the future.

### **Response 157-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

**LETTER NO. 158**

Terence Pearce  
Tweedlbach@aol.com

**Comment 158-1**

I am writing this letter to voice my deep concern & frustration at the continuing push to implement the Phase 2 development of the Ballona Wetlands area. Not only my deep concern, but that of so many of the residents that speak to me or are overheard by me on the subject of Ballona. It's already more than enough that we local residents have had the specter of the Playa Vista urban-blight monstrosity rammed down our throats in the face of obvious dissent & disapproval by the great majority. It is much more than enough that my small son, a toddler, is already breathing the heightened toxicity of the air caused by the increased traffic flow from this development and, like all the other young innocents in the area, must suffer for the overwhelming greed of those who have pushed Playa Vista through, and suffer yet more if the building continues. It is more than enough that the opportunity for a park for public use, in a city notorious for it's lack of green spaces, has been tossed away so negligently, gutted at the altar of corporate greed, so that a few may increase their bank accounts at the expense of the many. It is more than enough that this development has been bulldozed through the courts and governmental bodies of this state by the power of vested interests and corporate wealth in direct contravention of a whole slew of laws. It is more than enough that the unfortunate and misled residents of this eyesore are to be put at serious risk to lives and health from a long list of dangers including earthquake liquefaction, cancer clusters from gas seepage, and the distinct likelihood of enormous gas explosions. But now we are to understand that, to top it all, after all this has been heaped upon us time after time, we the taxpayers of this city, and not the rapacious developers of Playa Vista, are to be held financially liable in the future for the untold millions it would cost to pay for the damage and loss of life that would occur should the gas mitigation systems at Playa Vista fail and a massive explosion ensue. It is nothing short of a direct slap in the face of the hard-working public of this area, already spat upon by those who are supposed to represent and protect us in collusion with those who just don't care for anything but an extra buck, and it is much too much to bear. Eventually this betrayal of the electorate's trust will come back to haunt politically, and I like to think perhaps, for some, even in terms of conscience, whoever backs this superannuated madness. To those in positions of authority who are attempting to stop this we give our thanks and best wishes. To those who would bring further threat and suffering upon us and especially upon our children we ask, "When will enough be enough?" Will you look back on this watershed issue & say to your children "Yes, I was there, I had the power & I did nothing to stop it!". Do the right thing, or if not the right thing then just the smart thing if you value the public's perception of you & hence your political future, and let this destructive development go no further! In all seriousness, will you ever be able to look your children or family members in the eyes if you do not make a personal stand now against the poisonous creed of greed that is pushing us all towards a degraded society in a destroyed environment, at the very time when we now possess the technology to make just as much or more money and still advance the welfare of the citizens at the same time? And yes, I am angry! It seems to be somehow very unfashionable

to be angry in the present political climate, as if anger somehow equalled [sic] delusion or disloyalty. Tell me then! What right-thinking sane person would not be angry at what is being perpetrated here and at least have the tiny bravery to let one's voice be heard?

### Response 158-1

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

The Draft EIR has fully analyzed the potential impacts mentioned in the comment and recommended mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts, consistent with CEQA guidelines. Section IV.B, Air Quality, on page 270 provides a detailed analysis of the Proposed Project's impacts on air quality. As indicated, the Proposed Project would have a significant impact on regional air quality emissions. Subsection 3.4.2.3 on page 307 provides an analysis of local impacts associated with CO hotspots that could occur from additional Project traffic. As indicated, such impacts would be less than significant.

Relating to liquefaction hazards at the site, as discussed in Subsection 3.4.1.3 of Section IV.A, Earth, of the Draft EIR on page 256, there exists moderate liquefaction potential, based on geotechnical investigations completed at the Proposed Project site. Geotechnical studies (such as Appendix D-11 of the Draft EIR) have indicated that because of the scattered nature and relatively small size of the lenses found at the Playa Vista site, there would be a limit in the extent of liquefaction. Nonetheless, the City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety (LADBS) requires site-specific geotechnical investigations for issuance of building permits for individual structures. Given that LADBS requires site-specific investigations (including liquefaction risk assessment) prior to construction, and further, that application of engineered fill soils in building pads would address the potential for liquefaction directly under structures; hence, impacts to the Proposed Project from on-site liquefaction are considered less than significant.

The commentor's remark on "cancer clusters from gas seepage" is unclear. However, Section IV.I, Safety/Risk of Upset, of the Draft EIR on page 705, discusses the soil gas issues adjacent to the Proposed Project site. Regarding the potential for a gas explosion, Subsection 3.4.3 of Section IV.I, Safety/Risk of Upset, of the Draft EIR on page 727, addresses the potential risk of release or explosion of soil gas during construction and operation associated with the Proposed Project.

Section IV.I, Safety/Risk of Upset, of the Draft EIR starting on page 660, addresses in detail safety at Playa Vista. The commentor's concern regarding the City's liability is not an environmental issue. The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 159**

Alicia M. Perez  
5399 Playa Vista Drive, #E202  
Playa Vista, CA 90094

### **Comment 159-1**

Sometimes when I drive around Los Angeles or walk around my neighborhood I wonder, where are all these people driving? I can only imagine that many of them are making their trips because whatever it is they need is not available to them near their home or office.

The Village at Playa Vista will help cut down on these short, wasteful, polluting trips by putting services and amenities close to the community's residents and workers. Imagine being able to walk from your home to a nice restaurant or being able to take an electric car to the grocery store. This is the future!

The planning commissioners and City Council should approve The Village:

### **Response 159-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 160**

Perryman

### **Comment 160-1**

As a Playa del Rey resident, I have watched the Playa Vista project carefully over the years. I am writing today to say that I am happy that the project has been scaled down significantly from the Summa days.

Our hopes are that this new, smaller version will have fewer impacts on the surrounding communities so residents can maintain a high quality of life. I am very glad to see that the housing plans incorporate park and open space sites.

I would, however, suggest that the city encourage Playa Vista to look into making the former Jake's restaurant site in Playa del Rey into a park. There are far too few parks in Playa del Rey and the Jake's site would make a perfect location for a park that everyone in the neighborhood could enjoy.

### **Response 160-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers. The parcel known as the Jakes' Lot is owned by an affiliate of the Project Applicant. The City and the Applicant and its affiliate are working to identify an appropriate future use for this lot.

## **LETTER NO. 161**

Shannon C. Phillips  
6218 West 77th Street  
Westchester, CA 90045

### **Comment 161-1**

As a Westchester homeowner, I am always concerned about property values in our community. When people down the street remodel and improve their homes, it helps the entire area. When people let their homes fall into disrepair, home values plummet.

The addition of Playa Vista's new Village and the thousands of new homes will have an enormous positive impact on the home values in our community. Certainly the amenities provided by the project will enhance home values as well.

Our area is one of the most desirable places to live, not only in Los Angeles but in the entire country. People will continue to be attracted to the Westside because of the plethora of available and high-paying jobs, the climate and the beach. Now, of course, they have an additional incentive to move here--Playa Vista.

### **Response 161-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

## **LETTER NO. 162**

Linda Piera-Avila  
1424 12th Street, #E  
Santa Monica, CA 90401

### **Comment 162-1**

I am opposed to the approval of Playa Vista II. The impacts of Playa Vista I are only now beginning to be felt and it is irresponsible to approve the next phase so soon. The traffic impacts need to be fully studied by objective consultants. Gas seeps from storage fields below the development pose serious hazards to existing and potential residents. The desecration of indigenous graves to build the development is morally reprehensible.

Please stop Playa Vista II and Catellus on the West Bluff as well.

### **Response 162-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

The Draft EIR has fully analyzed the potential impacts mentioned in the comment and recommended mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts, consistent with CEQA guidelines. The Draft EIR provides a detailed analysis of traffic in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation on page 798, a detailed analysis of methane in Section IV.I, Safety/Risk of Upset on page 660, and a detailed analysis of archaeological resources in Section IV.P.(2), Archaeological Resources on page 1199. Corrections and Additions to these Sections are contained in Sections II.15, II.13 and II.29 of the Final EIR, respectively. Also please refer to comments of the California Native American Heritage Commission and responses in Letter 14. The “West Bluff” Project is a separate project from the Proposed Project.

## **LETTER NO. 163**

Elizabeth A. Pollock  
11923 Bray Street  
Culver City, CA 90230-6009

### **Comment 163-1**

I live just east of Inglewood Blvd. and about six blocks north of what will be Playa Vista Phase II. The traffic and parking problems on Jefferson Blvd. between the 405 and Culver Blvd. have worsened noticeably during the past five years, and no “remediation” effort can compensate for the fact that more people will mean more traffic.

### **Response 163-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

The commentor raises specific comments relating to the existing traffic and parking conditions. Such conditions would be included within the existing operating conditions presented in Table 115 of the Draft EIR, on page 812.

A detailed analysis of the Proposed Project’s traffic impacts has been performed and is presented in Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR beginning on page 798. The Traffic Study measured the performance of 218 key intersections within an approximately 100 square mile study area described in Section IV.K.(1) of the Draft EIR, beginning on page 828 and in Technical Appendix K-2.

The Draft EIR includes a comprehensive mitigation program to address the significant impacts identified in the analysis. In addition, a new mitigation measure has been added to the mitigation program in the Draft EIR as discussed in Section II.15, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR on page 216 and Topical Response TR-10, Alternative 2010 Baseline Scenario – Additional Mitigation Measure, on page 472. This new mitigation measure would mitigate the one remaining significant traffic impact at Centinela Avenue and Jefferson Boulevard that was identified in the Draft EIR. With implementation of the mitigation measure, the Proposed Project would not have any significant traffic impacts. The traffic model and methodology used to evaluate the Proposed Project’s impacts is also discussed in greater detail in Topical Response TR-1, Playa Vista Transportation Model, on page 445.

Impacts on parking are addressed in Section IV.K.(2), Parking, beginning on page 943 of the Draft EIR. The Proposed Project will have no impact on parking on Jefferson Boulevard between the I-405 and Culver Boulevard.

### **Comment 163-2**

DO NOT approve this development. It is going to be on one of the last big pieces of open land in this city, and the land should be set aside as parkland and connected with the Baldwin Hills (Kenneth Hahn) Recreation Area to create an open space corridor. Once the open land is gone, it cannot be retrieved. Further, the ugliness of Phase I does not bode well for the aesthetic value of Phase II if it is built.

### **Response 163-2**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers. The Draft EIR provides a detailed analysis of visual impacts in Section IV.O, Visual Qualities (Aesthetics and Views) on page 1148.

### **Comment 163-3**

The City of Los Angeles had no business approving the bonds to help finance any part of Playa Vista. I cannot believe that people have forgotten the explosion in the basement of the Ross Dress For Less on Fairfax, and the oil seepages that have occurred on Carthage Circle in Beverly Hills. This development will be putting an unknown amount of weight onto an area that is being used to store natural gas underground. There are going to be leaks and other problems, and the developers' limited liability companies will sneak off into the night, leaving the City to pay for the damages. Also, the City of Los Angeles will be paying for damages to people who shop in Culver City, not Westchester.

### **Response 163-3**

The Proposed Project is not located over the Southern California Gas Company's Del Rey Gas Storage Facility. Section IV.I, Safety/Risk of Upset, of the Draft EIR starting on page 660, addresses in detail safety at Playa Vista. The commentor's concern regarding the City's liability is not an environmental issue.

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

### **Comment 163-4**

In short, you can put this constituent in the "NO" column.

### **Response 163-4**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

**Comment 163-5**

P.S. In light of this morning's earthquake, you should be advised that there is no emergency earthquake shutoff valve on the huge gas pipeline that runs underneath Inglewood Blvd. If that line were to crack, Playa Vista II would be one of the neighborhoods affected.

**Response 163-5**

The gas pipeline in Inglewood Boulevard is over one-quarter of a mile from the closest portion of the Proposed Project and is therefore generally removed from the Project site. The ability to estimate the likelihood and consequences of an earthquake on that proposed pipeline and, specifically, its possible impact on the Proposed Project, which is over one-quarter of a mile away, would be speculative. Should there be an incident, the City and County of Los Angeles' Fire Departments will use incident response units as applicable (i.e., Hazardous Materials Response Unit) and guidelines (which are incident specific) already in place in order to stop, contain and correct the incident.

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of the decision-makers.

**LETTER NO. 164**

Bill Pope

**Comment 164-1**

Phase 2 DEIR grossly underestimates its 2010 Baseline traffic on at least Inglewood Boulevard between National and Venice Boulevards.

Correct existing 2003 traffic volumes are needed street-segment-by-street-segment to start the City's required traffic modeling process.

Playa Vista produced their 2003 starting traffic volumes not by actual count but by extrapolating from actual counts taken as far back as 1998 or earlier. The annual extrapolation factor used was 1.63% and 0.91% per year for AM and PM peak hours respectively.

(This is only one-third the annual increases being experienced by the Mar Vista Hill area. LADOT has measured the increase on Inglewood Boulevard between National and Venice Boulevards 4.5% per year between 1994 and 1998, the last year for which traffic counts exist.)

As a result of the above mentioned extrapolations, the Phase 2 DEIR gives the following projected 2010 PM peak hour traffic volumes for Inglewood Boulevard:

Between National Boulevard and Palms Boulevard:

Northbound	384 and 378
Southbound	114 and 114
Total of highest projected volumes =	498 [Average Daily Volume* ~ 4,980]

Between Palms Boulevard and Venice Boulevard:

Northbound	415 and 391
Southbound	216 and 242
Total of highest projected volumes =	657 [Average Daily Volume* ~ 6,570]

\* Using the rule of thumb that the PM Peak Hours is approximately 10% the Total Average Daily Volume.

In 1998 residents of Inglewood Boulevard concerned over growing cut-through traffic privately funded a private traffic survey by LADOT. This LADOT Traffic Survey stated that Average Daily Traffic on Inglewood Boulevard five years ago was:

Between National Boulevard and Palms Boulevard: 3,992

Between Palms Boulevard and Venice Boulevard: 9,214 (2644 more trips than the DEIR projects for 2010.)

Cut-through commuter traffic has increases [sic] substantially since 1998.

Therefore we find it impossible to believe the Playa Vista Phase 2 2010 Baseline traffic model with such glaring inaccuracies as this example that states that 2010 PM Peak Hour traffic on Inglewood Boulevard after Playa Vista Phase 1 and 95 other Related Projects will be almost 30% less than it was 12 years prior to 2010.

### **Response 164-1**

The commentor raises questions about the validity of the 2003 existing conditions traffic count data and the 2010 Baseline Conditions data presented in the Draft EIR. As stated in Subsection 2.2.3.1, Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, on page 808 of the Draft EIR, manual A.M. and P.M. peak-hour turning movement counts were conducted at 97 locations in the year 2001 and at 53 locations in the year 2002. Over 70 percent of the studied intersections had traffic counts in either 2001 or 2002. At City of Santa Monica locations, traffic count data was obtained from the Citywide Traffix model prepared by the City of Santa Monica. The counts for the remaining intersections (15 percent of the studied intersections) were updated from counts conducted in earlier years. The growth factor of 1.63 percent and 0.91 percent during the A.M. and P.M. peak hours was calculated based on comparing the year 2001 and 2002 counts to year 1998 traffic counts and reflect a statistically valid sample within the study area.

The commentor does not present the 1994 and 1998 LADOT traffic counts referenced in this comment, nor does he present the privately funded 1998 traffic survey he suggested was performed by LADOT. According to a November 12, 2002, LADOT presentation to the Mar Vista Community, total traffic growth in the Mar Vista area between 1994 and 2002 was 6 percent, or less than 0.75 percent per year. Most of this growth occurred between 1994 and 1998, when traffic was estimated to have grown an average of 4.5 percent, or 1.125 percent per year. These rates of growth are consistent with the growth factor used in the Draft EIR, discussed above. Further, LADOT has no record of performing the 1998 privately funded traffic survey of the Mar Vista area, and has not received a copy of this survey.

The data cited in this comment for Inglewood Boulevard appear to be from Figure 3-5 of Appendix K-2. However, this data represents the raw output of the traffic model; as described in Appendix 1B of the Traffic Study, contained in Appendix K-3 of the Draft EIR, this data was subject to a series of post-processing procedures to produce the final traffic volumes and turning movements used to analyze the potential significant impacts of the proposed project. The final post-processed traffic volumes and turning movements are presented in Appendix 2 of the Traffic Study, contained in Appendix K-4 of the Draft EIR.

The traffic volumes predicted by the model for the segments of Inglewood Boulevard in question are greater than the data presented in this comment.

## Comment 164-2

Phase 2 DEIR may grossly underestimate any currently remaining capacity of Centinela Boulevard Between National and Venice Boulevards if the City of Los Angeles lives up to Goal 14 of the Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey Community Plan and effectively “discourages non-residential commuter traffic on residential streets” of Inglewood Boulevard between National Boulevard and Venice Boulevard.

Based on LADOT's guidelines for “Excessive Through Traffic on Collector Streets and the privately-funded 1998 LADOT Traffic Survey, non-residential commuter cut-through traffic on Inglewood Boulevard between National and Venice Boulevards had already grown to approximately half of the total daily traffic on this street segment as far back as 5 years ago. And the volume of non-residential commuter cut-through traffic has increased substantially since then as a result of the steady deterioration in the level of service of the arterial street Centinela Boulevard.

The residents of Inglewood Boulevard between National and Venice Boulevards are currently prepare [*sic*] a petition to the City to stop all non-residential commuter cut-through traffic on Inglewood Boulevard between National and Venice Boulevards. If the City lives up to the claims its makes in Community Plans to be working “for a more livable Los Angeles” and specifically to Goal 14 of the Community Plans which states that the City should “Discourage non-residential traffic flow on residential streets and encourage community involvement in determining neighborhood traffic controls”, then a majority of the traffic currently using the residential collector portion of Inglewood Boulevard will be diverted back to the commuter arterial street of Centinela where it belongs.

This will increase traffic on Centinela and will result in less capacity remaining for new development-generated traffic.

Therefore, the City should:

1. Meet with Inglewood Boulevard residents, per Goal 14, to determine requirements to effectively discourage cut-through traffic, then
2. Implement effective cut-through commuter traffic barriers on the residential portion of Inglewood Boulevard, then
3. Re-measure any excess capacity remaining on Centinela Boulevard after cut-through traffic on Inglewood Boulevard has been directed back to its intended arterial street, then
4. Re-evaluate Playa Vista Phase 2 and Related Projects based on the actual measured remaining capacity,
5. Require developers to implement any infrastructure expansion measure determined via modeling as required to accommodate the developer's proposed traffic,

6. Measure the resulting new expanded excess capacity after those expansion measures are in place, and then
7. Give Playa Vista Phase 2 permission to generate new traffic up to that expanded excess capacity limit.

I am sure you will laugh at the above suggestions as being totally out to the question. However before you do, please answer the following questions.

If the City of Los Angeles does as it claims and requires every developer and every neighboring city to identify, via the City's modeling tools, the impacts of their traffic against worst-case scenarios and to mitigate the impacts of their generated traffic, and if every developer claims, as Playa Vista does, to fully mitigate those impacts, then:

Why has the level of service of our streets and freeways continually declined over the years?

Why do almost all of our arterial intersections and freeways now provide less than satisfactory (LOS "D") service during peak traffic hour?

Why are many intersections at LOS "F" (Failure) and subject to actual gridlock at any time?

Why do vehicle [*sic*] sit on Centinela, with idling engines polluting the air, through 3 signal changes before clearing the [*sic*] at Venice intersection?

Why does it take an hour to go 5 miles from Westwood to Culver City?

Why does the 405 move at 6 miles per hour in between 4:00 and 6:30 PM?

Considering the City's track record of managing traffic growth, does the City agree that something is wrong with the current traffic modeling and mitigation implementation process?

What is causing the continual deterioration of our transportation infrastructure's level of service?

How is the City planning to fix these problems and when?

## **Response 164-2**

The current existing capacity of Centinela Avenue between National and Venice Boulevards is constrained by the intersections of Centinela Avenue/Venice Boulevard and Bundy Drive/Ocean Park Boulevard. As presented in Table 115 of the Draft EIR, on page 812, the Centinela Avenue/Venice Boulevard intersection operates at LOS F in both the A.M. and P.M. peak hour; the Bundy Drive/Ocean Park Boulevard intersection operates at LOS E and F in the A.M. and P.M. peak hours, respectively.

The commentor raises specific comments relating to the existing traffic conditions on Inglewood Boulevard and suggests commuter cut-through traffic is a substantial portion of that existing traffic. Such traffic would be included within the existing operating conditions presented in Table 115 of the Draft EIR, on page 812.

The commentor suggests that a Neighborhood Traffic Assessment and Management Study be conducted specifically for Inglewood Boulevard within portions of the Mar Vista community, and then the potential impacts of the Proposed Project be re-analyzed. The Draft EIR contains an analysis of potential neighborhood impacts that could be caused by project traffic in Subsection 3.4.7 of Section IV.K.(1), Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR on page 872. As discussed in Subsection 3.4.7, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant impacts on neighborhood traffic in the Mar Vista area. As such, no further study would be required. However, in the event any unforeseen neighborhood traffic intrusion problems are reported after Project occupancy, LADOT will investigate the complaints and, if it is determined that the cut-through problem is attributed to the Project, LADOT will work with the affected residents, the local City Council office, homeowner's groups, and traffic engineering consultants, to design a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan to address the items of concern. If the traffic intrusion is determined to be unrelated to the Project, the neighborhood could still work with LADOT to develop a Neighborhood Traffic Plan funded through other means.

Please see Topical Response TR-5, Neighborhood Traffic Impacts, on page 458 for a discussion on the methodology, criteria for evaluation and the results of the evaluation associated with neighborhood traffic impacts. See Topical Response TR-6, Relationship with Community Plan Policies, on page 460 for an accurate description of Community Plan Policies and the actions that the City of Los Angeles has taken in recognition of the same.

The remainder of the comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

### **Comment 164-3**

Phase 2 should be required to fund measures necessary for protecting the Mar Vista Hill neighborhood, specifically the residential street of Inglewood Boulevard between National Boulevard and Victoria Avenue, and the residential street of Grand View Boulevard between National Boulevard and Venice Boulevard, from intrusion by Phase 1 and Phase 2 generated traffic.

Our rational for this request is as follows:

Although the area studied for both Phase 1 and Phase 2 traffic impacts covered a 100 square mile area, only residents within a 500 foot radius of the Phase 1 project were notified by the City of Los Angeles of the opportunity to review and comment on the potential traffic impacts to their neighborhoods from Phase 1 traffic before it was approved by the City.

Playa Vista Phase 1 is projected to generate 2.5 times the estimated traffic of Phase 2, therefore comments on Phase 1 should have been solicited from an even larger area than was done for Phase 2, but the City failed do this.

According to data and information provided by Playa Vista and its traffic consultant Kaku Associates (hardcopy available on request), to both the Mar Vista Community Council the Mar Vista Neighborhood Association and the Mar Vista Hilltop Neighbors Association on September 22, 2003, Phase 1 can be expected to be the source of approximately 75% of the traffic increases listed on the Phase 1 DEIR on Centinela and Inglewood Boulevards.

According to the data provided by Playa Vista and Kaku Associates, Playa Vista Phase 1 is expected to increase southbound AM Peak Hour traffic on Centinela Boulevard by:

690 vehicles between Ocean Park and National Boulevard

910 vehicles between National and Venice Boulevards (220 vehicles entering from National Boulevard)

440 vehicles between Venice and Washington Boulevards (470 vehicles leaving the southbound Centinela flow.)

Inglewood Boulevard by:

?? vehicle between National Boulevard and Venice (no data was provided )

620 between Venice and Washington Boulevard

We have the following questions:

To where do the 470 vehicles that leave the southbound Centinela flow between Venice and Washington Boulevards go?

- Examination of Phase 2 generated increases East/West on Venice would indicate that Phase 2 will cause little increase in Venice. Therefore it seems unlikely that Phase 1 would result in much east/west destination traffic on Venice either especially considering that their destination is likely to be the Commercial section of Phase 1 at the southern end of Centinela.
- It is likely that this traffic will continue south to the Phase 1 commercial section.

From where do the 620 vehicles that joins the southbound Inglewood Boulevard between Venice and Washington Boulevards come?

- It seems illogical to assume this is Venice westbound traffic turning southbound across Venice.

- It seems illogical to assume Venice eastbound traffic waiting until Inglewood before turning south to Playa Vista.
- Considering that the Centinela intersections at Ocean Park, Venice, Washington Place and Washington Boulevard are projected to be at Level of Service of E or F even after mitigation, and considering that commuters begin taking alternate routes at LOS D or worse, it can be assumed that this traffic will actually start using Inglewood Boulevard at National and Grand View Boulevard to avoid Centinela. If traffic is attempting to avoid Centinela between Venice and Washington Boulevard, then it can also be assumed that it will avoid Centinela between National and Venice by taking Grand View to Inglewood and Inglewood Boulevard residential streets.

Therefore it would be logical to assume that a major portion of the 620 vehicles being added to the southbound Inglewood Boulevard flow (probably at Venice) are the 470 vehicles that leave the southbound Centinela flow at Venice.

This increase appears to us to be quantification by the model of the additional cut-through traffic to be anticipated on Inglewood and/or Grand View resulting from Playa Vista Phase 1. (Data and Maps supporting these arguments were left with Joe Wang LADOT on 9/29/03, and are available on request to the return Email address.)

### **Response 164-3**

The commentor suggests that the Proposed Project be required to fund measures necessary for protecting the Mar Vista Hill neighborhood from traffic intrusion impacts. As discussed in Response 164-2, above, the Draft EIR contains an analysis of potential neighborhood impacts that could be caused by project traffic, and concludes that the Proposed Project would not result in any significant impacts on neighborhood traffic in the Mar Vista area. As such, no mitigation measures would be required. However, as stated in the Draft EIR, Technical Appendix K-1, Volume XX, pages 6 and 7 in the event any unforeseen neighborhood traffic intrusion problems are reported after Project occupancy, LADOT will investigate the complaints and, if it is determined that the cut-through problem is attributed to the Project, LADOT will work with the affected residents, the local City Council office, homeowner's groups, and traffic engineering consultants, to design a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan to address the items of concern. If the traffic intrusion is determined to be unrelated to the Project, the neighborhood could still work with LADOT to develop a Neighborhood Traffic Plan funded through other means. Please see Topical Response TR-5, Neighborhood Traffic Impacts, on page 458 for a discussion on the methodology, criteria for evaluation and the results of the evaluation associated with neighborhood traffic impacts.

The First Phase Playa Vista Project was addressed in a separate EIR (EIR No. 90-0200-SUB(C)(CUZ)(CUB), State Clearinghouse No. 90010510), certified by the City of Los Angeles in September, 1993, and Mitigated Negative Declaration/Addendum to the EIR, certified by the City of Los Angeles in December, 1995. The Draft EIR analyzed the traffic impacts of the

Proposed Village at Playa Vista Project assuming a full build out of the adjacent First Phase Project at Playa Vista, as well as all other known projects expected to be completed in the study area. Please see Topical Response TR-3, Related Projects, on page 453, for additional information on related projects and methodology.

The commentor incorrectly attributes the traffic increases referenced in this comment to the previously approved First Phase Project. These traffic increases are a result of the growth associated with other related projects throughout the area, including the 96 related projects analyzed as part of the Draft EIR, as well as other ambient growth occurring within the study area. The First Phase Project is one of the 96 related project analyzed in the Draft EIR (Related Project No. 40) and, as such, contributes to these traffic increases, but is not the primary contributor.

Other questions raised in this comment appear to relate to the traffic growth between 2003 existing conditions and the 2010 baseline conditions referenced above, and are unrelated to the Proposed Project. As such, the interpretations of this data offered by the commentor are associated with the ambient growth and growth occurring due to other related projects, and not of any impacts of the Proposed Project.

#### **Comment 164-4**

According to page 7 of 8 of LADOT's August 11, 2003, Inter-Departmental Correspondence from Jay W. Kim to Gordon Hamilton, Deputy Director Department of City Planning, titled Initial Traffic Impact Assessment of the Proposed Village at Playa Vista Project (EIR No. ENV-2002-6129-EIR) Phase 2 will be required to fund measures needed to protect four identified neighborhoods from Phase 2 generated traffic. The Mar Vista Hill neighborhood was not one of the identified neighborhoods. We are requesting that the Mar Vista Hill neighborhood be added to that list and that Playa Vista Phase 2, as the final phase of the Playa Vista Master Plan be required to fund cut-through traffic prevention measures determined by the residents of the Mar Vista Hill neighborhood in conjunction with LADOT as necessary prevent intrusion of all Playa Vista traffic.

#### **Response 164-4**

As discussed in Response 164-3, the analysis of potential neighborhood impacts contained in the Draft EIR indicates that there would be no significant neighborhood traffic intrusion impacts to the Mar Vista Community. Further, as stated above, in the event any unforeseen neighborhood traffic intrusion problems are reported after Project occupancy, LADOT will investigate the complaints and, if it is determined that the cut-through problem is attributed to the Project, LADOT will work to design a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan to address the items of concern. If the traffic intrusion is determined to be unrelated to the Project, the neighborhood could still work with LADOT to develop a Neighborhood Traffic Plan funded through other means.

**Comment 164-5**

Please explain the “Gravity Model” used to predict the direction of Playa Vista traffic trip distribution.

**Response 164-5**

The “Gravity Model” is a type of mathematical formulation which was utilized for trip distribution. The Gravity Model formulation is based on the Newton’s Laws of Gravity, and can be stated in the following simplified manner: “Trips from an origin to a destination are directly proportional to the magnitude of attractions in the destination traffic analysis zone (which is based on the number of employees or total employment available) and inversely proportional to the travel impedance between the origin and destination zones.” Please see Topical Response TR-1, Playa Vista Transportation Model, on page 445 and Topical Response TR-2, The Village at Playa Vista Trip Distribution, on page 451 for a further discussion of the Gravity Model, additional details on the Trip distribution model, and its role in the overall process.

**Comment 164-6**

Please explain the “Mode Split and Auto Occupancy Assumptions (GPF)” used in producing the Phase 2 traffic model.

**Response 164-6**

Please see Topical Response TR-1, Playa Vista Transportation Model, on page 445, for details on the overall process including the Mode Split component. Mode split refers to the method of travel (car, bus, train). The mode-split models used by SCAG are logit mode-split models. These models estimate the proportions of travelers that will use various modes of transportation (autos, transit, walk, bike). These proportions, in turn, are dependent upon the relative levels of service (such as costs, in-vehicle travel times, stop times, parking costs, access and egress times and dwell times) offered by each mode and the socio-economic characteristics of the trip-makers. The logit functions used by SCAG are complex mathematical formulations that state that the probability of choosing a particular mode for a given trip is based on the relative values of the costs and levels of service on the competing modes for the trip interchange under consideration. The SCAG mode split models also reflect the economic status of the traveler through a measure of vehicle ownership and income. The Playa Vista focused model uses the same SCAG model data set for mode splits, and uses SCAG assumptions for auto occupancy. The Mode Split Model component details are provided in the Draft EIR, Technical Appendix K-3, Volume XX, Appendix Volume 1B. Additional details regarding the mode split models are available in the respective documentation for the SCAG and General Plan Framework Travel Demand Forecasting Models.

## **LETTER NO. 165**

Praad Geotechnical, Inc.  
Daniel Pradel  
President & Chief Engineer  
5465 South Centinela Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90066-6942

### **Comment 165-1**

December 22, 2003

Following our telephone conversation with Ms. Charlotte DeMeo, of the Del Rey Association, we are enclosing a copy of our December 19, 2003, letter for your review. Please note that we object to having City of Los Angeles signs and parking restrictions on our property, which is located in Los Angeles County territory. We kindly request that the City of Los Angeles restore the curb and street signs to their prior condition.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me.

### **Response 165-1**

The comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

This issue is not related specifically to the Proposed Project or any impact of the Proposed Project. The comment will be referred to LADOT for their consideration.

### **Comment 165-2**

[Attachment: December 19, 2003, letter to Los Angeles County Department of Public Works]

Our business is located in County of Los Angeles territory. During our telephone conversation of November 26, 2003, I informed you that the City of Los Angeles, without previous warning, did the following:

- Painted red the curb in front of our business.
- Placed signs restricting parking in front of our business.

You indicated at the time that one of your engineers would look into it and call us back. We look forward to your engineers [*sic*] phone call and feedback. In addition, this morning the City of Los Angeles installed a large sign on our front yard. The sign is approximately 7-feet wide by 13 ½-feet high. Once again, the sign was placed without previous warning and right in front of the main entrance to our office.

We object to the above unilateral actions by the City of Los Angeles, since they are intrusive and detrimental to the use of our property and business. Furthermore, we object to having City of Los Angeles signs on our property which is located in the County territory. I kindly request that you take action and stop the City of Los Angeles from trespassing onto County property and have them remove the recently placed sign and restore the curb and street signs to their prior condition.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (310) 313-3111.

**Response 165-2**

The attachment supports statements in Comment 165-1. As such, the attachment is addressed in Response 165-1.

## **LETTER NO. 166**

Leslie Purcell  
11924 W. Washington Blvd.  
Los Angeles, CA 90066

### **Comment 166-1**

In regard to the Playa Vista Phase 2 DEIR:

I find that there are significant discrepancies in this document, as well as in the assumptions underlying the methodologies employed in its creation and conclusions. At the NOP public hearing in December of 2002, I, as well as others, stated our concerns that the land in the Phase 2 area remain as it was then (as is required by CEQA, I believe) during the EIR process. This did not happen, as was well documented in photographs and video by myself and others, including Kathy Knight and Patricia McPherson.

Documentary evidence shows Playa Capital's destruction of habitat (including pumping, grading and filling of a marshy ponded area used by many kinds of birds, including ducks, coots, and snowy egrets), massive stockpiling of soils and debris, as well as the ongoing use of large pieces of heavy equipment, which permanently changed the areas undergoing the EIR process. I believe that this activity and disturbance was done (illegally) without any CEQA review. When evidence of this ongoing activity was brought to the attention of the City of Los Angeles Building and Safety Department in the spring of 2003, and questions were raised as to the permitting of this activity, the City responded by issuing retroactive permits for the work that had been occurring for several months. This action is a subversion of the CEQA process, and calls into question the validity of the entire DEIR that the City has put forth for comment.

### **Response 166-1**

It is unclear to which "marshy ponded area" the commentor refers. However, it appears the reference is to the erosion control basin constructed as part of the annual erosion control plans approved by the City Department of Public Works to support construction of the First Phase Playa Vista Project.

As contemplated by the First Phase Playa Vista EIR, as construction progresses on the First Phase Project residential area, the Proposed Project site has been utilized to support First Phase construction activities. All activities have been conducted in compliance with local, state, and federal permits. The biological baseline for the Proposed Project is addressed in Topical Response TR-11, Grading, Erosion Control and Vegetation Maintenance Activity in the Project Area, on page 474.

**Comment 166-2**

The draining and filling of a wetland area (such as the marshy pond) requires a Federal 404 permit. It appears that wetland delineations used for the DEIR were not current, and should have been reevaluated, as was done for the Ballona areas under consideration for the recent State acquisition. 1 acre of wetland was cited in some places in the DEIR, while in others it was cited as .7 acres.

**Response 166-2**

As discussed in Subsection 2.1.1.1 of Section IV.D, Biotic Resources, of the Draft EIR on pages 523-524, in 1992, the Corps issued Permit No. 90-426-EV under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act for the “fill of a total of 16.1 acres of disturbed wetlands in various portions of the former Playa Vista Planning Area, including the Proposed Project site, for construction of the Freshwater Wetland System and a mixed-use development.... No further permit from the Corps is required for the Proposed Project.” This item is located in the reference library for the Final EIR. Within the Proposed Project Site, the Corps permitted the fill of 0.7 acre delineated as wetland, consisting of the Centinela Ditch and other isolated and degraded wetlands. As discussed in Subsection 2.1.2.2 of Section IV.D, Biotic Resources, of the Draft EIR on pages 525-526, “[i]n 1991, the CDFG issued a Streambed Alteration Agreement to the Applicant’s predecessor, which allows for the fill of the 16.1 acres of isolated and degraded wetlands as identified in the Corps Section 404 Permit within the Proposed Project area and the adjacent Playa Vista First Phase Project. This permit has been extended through June 2008.” Corp Permit No. 90-426-EV and CDFG Streambed Alteration Agreement No. 5-639-93 are contained in the Draft EIR Appendix G-1. As a result, a new wetland delineation is not required.

**Comment 166-3**

1. Cumulative impacts from other area developments, including the proposed Catellus “West Bluffs” development. Massive amounts of soil from the bluff is being hauled to the Playa Vista site, mainly to the east end of Phase 1, and is transported by many diesel trucks through the Phase 2 area, again as it is undergoing the EIR process. Was there any CEQA review of this construction/hauling activity, especially in regard to air pollution from so many diesel trucks? (Diesel is responsible for 70% of cancer-causing emissions according to this DEIR.)

**Response 166-3**

The activities described in this comment are not a component of the Proposed Project. The City of Los Angeles certified an EIR for the West Bluffs project on February 24, 1999. The project was later modified as described in an October 1999 Addendum. The project’s environmental documents, as modified, described the project’s impacts from soil export. The EIR was successfully defended against a litigation challenge in *Coalition for Concerned Communities, Inc., et al. v. City of Los Angeles*, Case No. BC 207782 (Los Angeles Sup. Ct.).

**Comment 166-4**

Also, the proposed Catellus “West Bluffs” development is incorrectly listed in this document as 120 houses.

**Response 166-4**

The number of houses described for this related project, Related Project 24, represents an earlier version of the Project that has since been slightly reduced to 114 single family homes. The reduction in the size of the Project would slightly reduce the cumulative impact analyses in the Draft EIR. The variation in the number of units would not alter any of the conclusions in the Draft EIR.

**Comment 166-5**

2. Where is the documented evidence for certain assumptions stating the need for more housing in this area of Los Angeles? In fact, there is an excess of housing on the Westside now, and much of it goes unleased and uninhabited, even as more is being built. What we need is more affordable housing, which is not primarily what Playa Capital intends to build.

**Response 166-5**

This comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration of decision-makers.

Table 101 on page 762 of Section IV.J., Population, Housing and Employment, of the Draft EIR, provides SCAG’s population forecast for several geographic areas that include the Project site. As shown in this table, SCAG is projecting that the population within the Westchester-Playa del Rey Community Plan Area is going to increase by over 9,200 people (16.8 percent growth) between the 2002 and 2010 timeframe. Looking at this issue from a broader regional context, Table 111 on page 794 of the Draft EIR indicates that the population within the Westside of Los Angeles and the South Bay is going to grow by over 56,000 people (8.2 percent growth) between 2002 and 2010. In contrast, the SCAG projected housing increase for the Community Plan area is 2,969 units (a 12.7 percent growth rate). (Please note that Table 111 portrays the increase in housing units as 2,696. A correction has been made to Table 111 to reflect the accurate number.) Table 98 on page 758 of the Draft EIR identifies the housing vacancy rate in 2000 for several geographic areas that include the Project site. As shown in this table, vacancy rates range from 3.6 percent to 5.7 percent with an average of 4.5 percent, and a Westchester-Playa del Rey Community vacancy rate of 3.6 percent. Housing markets functioning with vacancy rates in the 2 to 3 percent range are described as being very constricted; i.e., there is very little housing supply to meet the corresponding housing demand. As these vacancy rates show, there is going to be a considerable shortfall in the housing market if additional units are not constructed to accommodate the forecasted population growth.

Another indicator of the need for housing on the Westside can be found in the issue of jobs/housing balance. As described in Subsection 3.4.5 of Section IV.J., Population, Housing and Employment, of the Draft EIR, the Westside area is heavily jobs rich (the ratio of jobs to housing in the local Area is expected to be 2.76 in 2010), which means that there is a disproportionately high number of jobs relative to the number of housing units. This translates to the need for large numbers of people to commute to the Westside, which in turn creates traffic congestion and resultant air quality and noise pollution. Thus, increasing the housing supply on the Westside would contribute to reducing the jobs/housing imbalance and create a number of individual and community benefits.

Please refer to Section II.14, Corrections and Additions, of the Final EIR for the following revision located in Volume I, Book 2, Section IV.J, Population, Housing and Employment, p. 794. On Table 111, revise the 2002-2010 Increase in Housing Units for the Westchester-Playa del Rey Community Plan Area to reflect an increase of 2,969 units.

### **Comment 166-6**

3. The net loss of 60.9 undeveloped acres is a significant impact, both in habitat and open space for area residents and visitors. In the past several years, I have seen many hawks, kestrels, and a golden eagle hunting in the area that this proposed project would permanently destroy. Re-creation of a “riparian corridor” habitat and planting native vegetation on the bluff-side, after destroying the larger open space, is not a good trade environmentally. The DEIR admits that “this highly disturbed area still provides foraging opportunities for raptors and some marginal nesting habitat for common migrant birds”.

### **Response 166-6**

Section IV.D, Biotic Resources, of the Draft EIR on pages 547 and 552 state that “[t]he Urban Development Component of the Proposed Project would result in a net loss of foraging area for raptors such as Cooper’s hawk, but this loss is unlikely to affect long-term survival of the species *due to the restoration components of the Project and presence of more diverse foraging opportunities off-site in the nearby Ballona Wetlands*” (emphasis added). In considering potential impacts of loss of raptor foraging area, the probable size of the prey base and its capacity to support predators must be evaluated in addition to total acreage of land. The conclusion in the Draft EIR, quoted above, is based on an assumption that the increase in diversity of cover and native vegetation resulting from the Habitat Creation/Restoration components of the Proposed Project will increase the abundance of rodents, snakes, lizards, and small birds that form the food base for raptors, including Cooper’s hawk.

The remaining comment is noted and will be incorporated into the Final EIR for review and consideration by decision-makers.

**Comment 166-7**

4. The habitat value of the “riparian” corridor is questionable, as it lies between the steep side of the bluff and the proposed 4-lane roadway (up to 20,000 car trips a day cited in a Playa Vista presentation). The proposed building height next to the road is up to 112 feet, creating an artificial canyon-like setting that would hold the pollution from car exhaust, in addition to creating water quality, noise and light effects on habitat, plants and animals (not adequately addressed in the DEIR).

**Response 166-7**

The impact analysis in Section IV.D, Biotic Resources, of the Draft EIR evaluated the potential impacts of human activity, noise, glare (light) on wildlife that might occupy the Habitat Creation/Restoration component of the Proposed Project. As discussed in Subsection 3.3.5 of Section IV.D., on page 545, the Riparian Corridor and Bluff Restoration elements of the Project have the potential to provide habitat for special status species. Lighting and landscape buffers adjacent to the habitat areas would be addressed with design measures to protect the potential habitat values of these areas with respect to light, glare, and traffic noise. In addition, intrusion by humans and pets would be restricted. Without such measures, use of the Habitat Creation/Restoration Component of the Project by sensitive species could be limited. The mitigation measures described in Section IV.D, Biotic Resources, of the Draft EIR on page 551 are designed to minimize these impacts.

Section IV.C.(2), Water Quality, of the Draft EIR discusses the potential water quality impacts of the Proposed Project. As discussed in Subsection 3.4.1.2.8 of Section IV.C.(2), on page 505 of the Draft EIR, “With respect to water quality performance, the analysis presented above demonstrates that: (1) the water quality within the Freshwater Wetlands System will support the habitat required to be created and maintained therein; and (2) the Proposed Project will not materially affect the attainment of the specified habitat values. Further, the Proposed Project, on its own as well as in combination with the adjacent Playa Vista First Phase Project, will not significantly adversely impact water quality in Santa Monica Bay, the Ballona Wetlands, or the Ballona Creek Estuary, which conclusion is consistent with the goals for which the agencies issued their approvals for the Freshwater Wetlands System and established the Performance Criteria.”

Operational impacts attributable to travel along Bluff Creek Drive (i.e., the proposed 6-lane road referenced in the Comment), are analyzed in terms of carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations per SCAQMD procedures and practices. The SCAQMD recommends analyzing CO in cases such as the Proposed Project as CO is the largest single constituent and is considered to be the best indicator to assess changes in pollutant concentrations attributable to mobile-source emissions. Furthermore, it is the only pollutant from mobile sources for which standardized modeling methodologies for estimating localized concentrations have been developed and approved by the SCAQMD.

The intersection of Bluff Creek Drive and Lincoln Boulevard was analyzed as it is the location with the highest potential to yield a CO hotspot along Bluff Creek Drive since it is the location with the highest Project traffic and level of traffic congestion. All other locations along Bluff Creek Drive are anticipated to yield CO concentrations that are lower than the Bluff Creek Drive and Lincoln Boulevard intersection due to relatively reduced traffic volumes and traffic congestion. CO concentrations at this, as well as all other analysis locations were analyzed relative to national and state ambient air quality standards.

Consistent with SCAQMD's CO modeling protocol, all four corners of the intersection were modeled using a receptor distance of three meters for the one-hour analysis and seven meters for the eight-hour analysis. In addition, a low wind speed of 0.5 meter per second and a very stable stability class of G (i.e., stagnate conditions) were used in the analysis. These conditions are indicative of the conditions discussed in the comment (i.e., holding the pollution from car exhaust). All of this supports the notion that an artificial canyon-like setting that would hold the pollution would not occur.

As shown in Tables 17 through 20 of Section IV.B, Air Quality, in the Draft EIR, no significant impacts would occur at the intersection with the highest traffic volumes and worst level of service along Bluff Creek Drive (i.e., the intersection of Bluff Creek Drive and Lincoln Boulevard). As CO concentrations are lower when traffic volumes and congestion are reduced, no significant impacts would be anticipated to occur at any other locations along Bluff Creek Drive as the conditions yielding CO hotspots would not be worse than those occurring at the analyzed intersection. Consequently, the conditions along Bluff Creek Drive would not be significantly affected by CO emissions generated by the net increase in traffic which would occur under the Proposed Project. As the Proposed Project or cumulative traffic does not cause localized air quality impacts related to mobile sources, emissions were therefore concluded to be less than significant for the Proposed Project.

### **Comment 166-8**

5. 55 trees are listed as on-site in an Appendix document, and would be cut down for the proposed project, which would create more loss of habitat and nesting sites for many birds.

### **Response 166-8**

As discussed in Subsection 3.3.1 of Section IV.D, Biotic Resources, of the Draft EIR on page 542: "The Urban Development Component area is utilized by a number of common wildlife species for foraging and, in the case of birds, nesting during the breeding season. This habitat would be lost as a result of the Project, but replaced by the Habitat Creation/Restoration Component of the proposed Project, which is expected to establish higher quality, more diverse breeding and foraging habitat than presently occurs on-site." The rationale for this conclusion is provided in Subsection 3.4 of Section IV.D, Biotic Resources, on the Draft EIR on pages 546-547. As stated therein, the Habitat Creation/Restoration Component has potential to result in an increase in the overall diversity and abundance of wildlife species due to the increased diversity of habitats compared to existing conditions. Subtracting the existing 1.5 acres of native coyote

brush area that would be lost due to direct impacts of the Urban Development Component from the proposed 11.7-acre Habitat Creation/Restoration Area, the Proposed Project as a whole would result in a net gain of 10.2 acres of native habitat consisting of emergent marsh, willow scrub woodland, mixed riparian woodland, native grassland, and coastal sage scrub. The existing 1.5 acres of coyote brush, while dominated by the native coyote brush, is somewhat degraded by its small size and presence of invasive non-native species such as pampas grass. Abundance and diversity of native resident and migrant wildlife that currently forage and/or breed on the Project site would be expected to increase as a result of the increased acreage and structural diversity of the habitat. Furthermore, as envisioned by the design and landscaping concepts presented in Subsection 3.3.1.2.5 of Section IV.O, Visual Qualities (Aesthetics and Views), of the Draft EIR on pages 1167-1168, approximately 800 trees would be planted in the parkways and parks within the Proposed Project site.

#### **Comment 166-9**

6. Ballona Creek is cited as an impaired water body requiring special consideration according to the Clean Water Act. The proposed project would have impacts from urban run-off, including that of a potential rodent control program, on the Ballona Creek watershed.

#### **Response 166-9**

The Draft EIR provides a detailed analysis of potential impacts of the Proposed Project to the Ballona Creek (known as Ballona Channel or Ballona Estuary at the point where runoff from the Proposed Project enters that waterbody) in Subsection 3.4.1.2.5 of Section IV.C.(2), Water Quality, on page 478.

Subsection 4.0, Section IV.A, Earth, page 267 of the Draft EIR, includes a mitigation measure requiring rodent control during grading of the Proposed Project. As required in that mitigation measure, the rodent control program shall comply with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations, including those which serve to protect natural resources that could be affected through urban run-off.

#### **Comment 166-10**

7. Native American cultural resources have not been properly addressed by the current Playa Vista Phase 1 development, where a burial ground is currently being excavated, despite the wishes of tribal descendants that the burials be left in situ. An old agreement is being used for the Phase 2 DEIR, which is not appropriate. This whole Indian village site and burial grounds extended through the Ballona valley and up onto the bluffs, and should have been given a comprehensive assessment, as would be done with the EIS process.

**Response 166-10**

Section IV.P.(2), Archaeological Resources, of the Draft EIR addresses the impacts of the Proposed Project on archaeological resources and proposes mitigation measures, which when implemented would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. For additional information regarding these issues, please refer to Response to Letter No. 14.

The comprehensive consultation process leading up to execution of the Programmatic Agreement by the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), the California State Historic Preservation Office, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, with the concurrence of Vera and Manuel Rocha, interested Gabrielinos, and the Gabrielino/Tongva Tribal Council, is described in Subsection 2.1.1 of Section IV.P.(2), Archaeological Resources, of the Draft EIR on pages 1199-1202.

The National Historic Preservation Act requires the ACOE to consult with federally recognized Indian tribes. The ACOE went above and beyond the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act in consulting with Native Americans prior to extending the Programmatic Agreement. In October 2001, as part of its consultation responsibilities under the Programmatic Agreement, the ACOE made a concerted effort to identify all Gabrielino organizations that may have had an interest in the Playa Vista project. On June 7, 2001, a letter regarding the proposed extension of the Programmatic Agreement was sent to five Gabrielino groups: the Gabrielino People (Vera Rocha, Chief), the Gabrielino/Tongva Tribal Council (Anthony Morales, Chief), the Gabrielino/Tongva Indians of California (Martin Alcala, Chief), the Coastal Gabrielino/Digueno Indian Band (Jim Velasquez, Chief), and the Gabrielino/Tongva Indians of California (Robert Dorame, Chief). Vera Rocha (Chief, Gabrielino People) and the Gabrielino/Tongva Tribal Council were signatories to the Programmatic Agreement in 1991. No objections to the extension of the Programmatic Agreement were received. The California State Historic Preservation Office concurred with the extension of the Programmatic Agreement on September 24, 2001. The ACOE formally extended the Programmatic Agreement on October 11, 2001, to October 22, 2011.

**Comment 166-11**

8. The use of pile-drivers in the proposed construction could result in the destruction of Indian burial sites and artifacts.

**Response 166-11**

Potential impacts to archaeological resources, including impacts on Native American burials, associated with the Proposed Project are addressed in Section IV.P.(2), Archaeological Resources, of the Draft EIR, beginning on page 1199. Section IV.P.(2), Archaeological Resources, of the Draft EIR identifies and discusses the potential impacts on CA-LAN-62, CA-LAN-211/H, CA-LAN-1932H, and CA-LAN-2769, and concludes, on page 1224, that

implementation of the Programmatic Agreement and mitigation measures listed therein would reduce impacts on archaeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

The exact location of burials and other archaeological resources is not easily predicted, and on occasion human remains and artifacts are found during construction. As identified in the mitigation measures included in Subsection 4.0 of Section IV.P.(2), Archaeological Resources, of the Draft EIR on pages 1222-1223, efforts will be made to avoid human remains and other archaeological resources. In cases where human remains are encountered, the Applicant shall comply with the Programmatic Agreement and the requirements of the California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The Most Likely Descendant designated by the Native American Heritage Commission for Playa Vista has provided guidelines for the handling of human remains. The guidelines would be considered in connection with the handling of Native American remains discovered during construction of the Proposed Project.

As discussed in Subsection 2.2.3 of Section IV.P.(2), Archaeological Resources, of the Draft EIR on page 1212, “[u]nder the research program implemented by SRI, for the area subject to the Programmatic Agreement, 22 loci of cultural materials have been identified. Of these 22 loci, four are fully or partially located within the Proposed Project site.” Of these, only CA-LAN-62 and CA-LAN-211/H have been recommended to be eligible for the National Register. Given the location of these areas and the proposed uses of these areas under the Proposed Project, it is not expected that pile driving will take place in these areas.

### **Comment 166-12**

9. Developments over a certain size are now required to specify adequate sources of drinking water, particularly as the California allotment of Colorado River water is being more limited. Has water supply been adequately addressed, especially as it may affect other areas?

### **Response 166-12**

Section IV.N.(1), Water Consumption, of the Draft EIR addresses water supply and is supported by Appendix N-1b, which contains the Water Supply Assessment (WSA) prepared by LADWP for the Proposed Project pursuant to the Water Code, as amended by SB 610. SB 610 requires LADWP to prepare a comprehensive water supply assessment for every new development “project” (as defined by Section 10912 of the Water Code) within its service area. The water supply assessment evaluates the quality and reliability of existing and projected water supplies, as well as alternative sources of water supply and how they would be secured if needed. The requirements of SB 610 provide the means to ensure that the water supply needs have been carefully considered, relative to LADWP’s ability to adequately meet future needs. The WSA, approved by the LADWP on August 1, 2003 (Resolution #004030), and the Draft EIR conclude that sufficient water supplies for the Proposed Project will be available. The WSA prepared by LADWP includes the descriptions of water sources required by SB 610. SB 610 does not require LADWP to assess water supply availability outside of its service area. The WSA is included in

Appendix N-1b of the Draft EIR. The WSA with the final resolution attached has also been included in the Appendices of the Final EIR.

### **Comment 166-13**

10. Toxic issues and the toxic plume, in relation to the underlying aquifers, seismic hazard and liquefaction zones, and the greater Ballona watershed have not been adequately addressed in the DEIR.

### **Response 166-13**

The nature and extent of soil and ground water contamination at the Proposed Project site is discussed in detail in Subsection 2.2.3 of Section IV.I, Safety/Risk of Upset, of the Draft EIR on page 682. As it relates to the construction and operation of the Proposed Project, impacts associated with soil and groundwater contamination (including the plume) is addressed in Subsection 3.4.2 of Section IV.I, Safety/Risk of Upset, of the Draft EIR on page 723. In Subsection 2.2.2 of Section IV.A, Earth, of the Draft EIR on page 218, you will find an extensive discussion of seismic faults and other geological hazards (such as liquefaction) that could potentially impact the Proposed Project. Impacts associated with seismic hazards, including liquefaction, are addressed in Subsection 3.4.1.3 of Section IV.A, Earth, of the Draft EIR on page 254. The Draft EIR addresses impacts to the Ballona watershed in Section IV.C.(1), Hydrology, and Section IV.C.(2), Water Quality. Subsection 2.2.1 of Section IV.C.(1), Hydrology, of the Draft EIR on page 348, identified the regional (e.g., Santa Monica Bay and Ballona Creek Watershed) and local (off-site tributary) watershed areas associated with the Proposed Project. How the Proposed Project would affect those watershed areas, such as increase in flooding or change in pattern or amount of surface water, is discussed in Subsection 3.4.1 of Section IV.C.(1), Hydrology, of the Draft EIR on page 373. Subsection 2.2.1 of Section IV.C.(2), Water Quality, of the Draft EIR on page 412, identifies the main waterbodies (including those associated with the Ballona watershed) that directly or indirectly receive surface water from the Proposed Project site. The impacts to these waterbodies, as it relates to regulatory standards, from construction and the loads and concentrations from Proposed Project operation, are analyzed in Subsection 3.4.1 of Section IV.C.(2), Water Quality, of the Draft EIR on page 459.

### **Comment 166-14**

11. Adequate alternatives were not seriously considered (including the creation of a park and open space alternative), and assumptions were given about housing and job creation that bear little resemblance to reality.

### **Response 166-14**

The selection of Alternatives was based on guidelines presented in Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines. As indicated in Section 15126.6(a), “an EIR shall describe a range of

reasonable alternatives to the project... an EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation." The Draft EIR analyzes a reasonable range of alternatives in Section VII, Alternatives.

As further described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), the reasons for rejecting alternatives from detailed consideration include the following: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives; (ii) infeasibility; or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. The Draft EIR discusses the selection of alternatives and identifies alternatives considered but rejected, including a Regional Park option alternative, in Subsection 3.2 of Section VII, Alternatives on page 1263. As indicated, such an alternative would fail to meet nearly all of the Proposed Project's basic objectives, there is no indication that funding for such an alternative would be available, and implementation of this alternative is considered speculative. Therefore, this alternative was subsequently rejected from further analysis.

It is not clear which housing and job creation assumption is being called into question by the commentor. The Draft EIR provides the methodologies used to calculate the jobs/housing balance in Section IV.J, Population, Housing and Employment on page 742.

### **Comment 166-15**

For the above reasons, and in consideration of how little habitat and open space is left in the Los Angeles area, as well as the sensitivity of the Ballona watershed and Gabrielino-Tongva village and burial areas, it is incumbent upon the City of Los Angeles to engage in the Federal EIS process before allowing the Playa Vista Phase 2 development to go forward.

### **Response 166-15**

Section IV.D., Biotic Resources, of the Draft EIR addresses impacts of the Proposed Project on biotic resources, including the Ballona Wetlands. Section IV.P.(2), Archaeological Resources, addresses the impacts of the Proposed Project on archaeological resources and proposes mitigation measures, which when implemented would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

As discussed in Subsection 2.1.1.1 of Section IV.D, Biotic Resources, of the Draft EIR on page 523-524, in 1992, the Corps issued Permit No. 90-426-EV under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act for the "fill of a total of 16.1 acres of disturbed wetlands in various portions of the former Playa Vista Planning Area, including the Proposed Project site, for construction of the Freshwater Wetland System and a mixed-use development." No further federal permit is required to implement the Proposed Project. As a result, a "Federal EIS" process is not necessary.

**Comment 166-16**

The City has allowed illegal activities to occur during the CEQA process, and has then sanctioned those activities by issuing permits to cover them. The current DEIR is defective and the State CEQA process is not being properly followed. I therefore object to the unproven conclusions of the Playa Vista Phase 2 Draft EIR, and urge that a Federal EIS process begin, that would address these important issues that remain unanswered, and restore public confidence in the environmental review process.

**Response 166-16**

As contemplated by the First Phase Playa Vista EIR, as construction progresses on the First Phase Project residential area, the Proposed Project site has been utilized to support First Phase construction activities. All activities have been conducted in compliance with local, state, and federal permits. The biological baseline for the Proposed Project is addressed in Topical Response TR-11, Grading, Erosion Control and Vegetation Maintenance Activity in the Project Area, on page 474.

As discussed in Subsection 2.1.1.1 of Section IV.D, Biotic Resources, of the Draft EIR on page 523-524, in 1992, the Corps issued Permit No. 90-426-EV under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act for the “fill of a total of 16.1 acres of disturbed wetlands in various portions of the former Playa Vista Planning Area, including the Proposed Project site, for construction of the Freshwater Wetland System and a mixed-use development.” No further federal permit is required to implement the Proposed Project. As a result, a “Federal EIS” process is not necessary.