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I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of an Initial Study

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was enacted in 1970: to provide decision-makers and the public with information about environmental effects of proposed projects, as well as avoidance and minimization measures. The Bureau of Engineering Environmental Management Group (EMG) has determined the proposed project is subject to CEQA and no exemptions apply. Therefore, the preparation of an Initial Study (IS) is required.

An IS contains a preliminary analysis, which is conducted by the lead agency, in consultation with other agencies (responsible or trustee agencies, as applicable), to determine whether there is substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the IS concludes that the project, with mitigation, may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) should be prepared; otherwise the lead agency may adopt a Negative Declaration (ND) or Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND).

This IS has been prepared in accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code §21000 et seq.), the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, §15000 et seq.), and the City of Los Angeles CEQA Guidelines (1981, amended July 31, 2002).

B. Document Format

In this Final Initial Study, edits to the Draft Initial Study text are noted by strike through text for deletions and “underlined italicized text” for insertions as well as in a new added
This IS is organized into nine sections and two appendices. Technical studies or technical information prepared and used in support of the IS preparation and findings are provided under a separate cover as listed in Attachment A.

Section I, Introduction: provides an overview of the project and the CEQA environmental documentation process.

Section II, Project Description: provides a description of the project location, project background, and project components.

Section III, Existing Environment: provides a description of the existing environmental setting with focus on features of the environment which could potentially affect the proposed project or be affected by the proposed project.

Section IV, Potential Environmental Effects: provides a detailed discussion of the environmental factors that would be potentially affected by this project as indicated by the screening checklist in Appendix A.

Section V, Mitigation Measures - Standard Conditions and Regulatory Requirements: provides the standard conditions and regulatory requirements that would be implemented to ensure that potential adverse impacts of the proposed project would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Section VI, Preparation and Consultation: provides a list of key personnel involved in the preparation of this report and key personnel consulted.

Section VII, Determination – Recommended Environmental Documentation: provides the recommended environmental documentation for the proposed project; and,

Section VIII, References: provides a list of reference materials used during the preparation of this report.

Section IX, Responses to Comments: presents public and agency comments on the draft IS/ND, and the City’s responses to those comments. Revisions and Clarifications, and Comments and Responses: a new section which together with the Draft Initial Study comprises the Final IS/Negative Declaration (ND). This section provides any updates, clarifications, or modifications to the information in the Draft Initial Study in response to the comments received during the public review period. This section also includes comments received during the public review and responses.

Appendix A, Environmental Screening Checklist

Appendix B, Notice of Availability and Notice of Community Meeting
C. CEQA Process

Once the adoption of a Negative Declaration (or Mitigated Negative Declaration) has been proposed, a public comment period opens for no less than twenty (20) days, or thirty (30) days if there is state agency involvement. The purpose of this comment period is to provide public agencies and the general public an opportunity to review the initial study and comment on the adequacy of the analysis and the findings of the lead agency regarding potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. If a reviewer believes the project may have a significant effect on the environment, the reviewer should (1) identify the specific effect, (2) explain why it is believed the effect would occur, and (3) explain why it is believed the effect would be significant. Facts or expert opinion supported by facts should be provided as the basis of such comments.

After the close of the public review period, the Board of Public Works considers the ND or MND, together with any comments received during the public review process, and makes a recommendation to the City Council on whether to approve the project. One or more Council committees may then review the proposal and documents and make its own recommendation to the full City Council. The City Council is the decision-making body and also considers the ND or MND, together with any comments received during the public review process, in the final decision to approve or disapprove the project.

During the project approval process, persons and/or agencies may address either the Board of Public Works or the City Council regarding the project. Public notification of agenda items for the Board of Public Works, Council committees, and City Council is posted 72 hours prior to the public meeting. The Council agenda can be obtained by visiting the Council and Public Services Division of the Office of the City Clerk at City Hall, 200 North Spring Street, Suite 395; by calling (213) 978-1073, (213) 978-1137 or via the internet at https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=c.search&tab=cfi.

If the project is approved, the City will file a Notice of Determination (NOD) with the County Clerk within 5 days. The NOD will be posted by the County Clerk within 24 hours of receipt. This begins a 30-day statute of limitations on legal challenges to the approval under CEQA. The ability to challenge the approval in court may be limited to those persons who objected to the approval of the project, and to issues which were
presented to the lead agency by any person, either orally or in writing, during the public comment period.

As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and, upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services, and activities.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Location

The proposed project is located on the northern side of Magnolia Boulevard between Cahuenga Boulevard and Vineland Avenue in Council District 2 and in the North Hollywood – Valley Village community of the City of Los Angeles (Figures 1 and 2). The proposed project is on the Burbank 7.5-minute U.S. Geological Survey quadrangle (California-Los Angeles County 7.5-minute topographic map series).

B. Purpose

The purpose of the proposed project is to improve traffic flow, reduce traffic congestion, and provide street infrastructure improvements along Magnolia Boulevard. The widening of the north side of Magnolia would complement the City’s prior improvements on the south side in 2011.

C. Description

The City of Los Angeles (City) Bureau of Engineering proposes to widen a 2,600-foot stretch of the northern side of Magnolia Boulevard between Cahuenga Boulevard and Vineland Avenue to improve traffic flow and reduce traffic congestion. The proposed project would increase vehicular traffic safety by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane.

The right-of-way along this stretch of Magnolia Boulevard varies from 80 to 90 feet wide, with the northern side of the street generally consisting of a 25-foot-wide paved roadway and a sidewalk that varies in width from 15 to 25 feet along the alignment. In addition to one through lane eastbound and two through lanes westbound, Magnolia Boulevard has left-turn pockets at intersections and a parking lane on each side of the street. On the southern side of Magnolia Boulevard, the sidewalk is 7 feet wide. The southern side of this segment of Magnolia Boulevard was widened, reconstructed, and resurfaced in 2011.
Figure 1. Project Vicinity Map
Figure 2. Project Location Map (North Side of Magnolia)
The proposed project would reconfigure Magnolia Boulevard between Cahuenga Boulevard and Vineland Avenue to accommodate street parking on both sides, two travel lanes in each direction, and a center turn lane median. These changes would be accomplished by widening the northern half of the roadway by 7 feet to a width of 32 feet, within an existing 40-foot-wide alignment, and narrowing the existing sidewalks on the northern side to 8 feet wide (sidewalk width would vary). Proposed project improvements would include: concrete curbs, gutters, and 7-foot to 8-foot wide sidewalk; asphalt-concrete pavement; storm drains and sanitary sewers; street trees and lighting; and traffic signals. Two new crossings with pedestrian hybrid beacons will be added to increase pedestrian safety at Cartwright Avenue and Satsuma Avenue. Additionally, the road would be restriped and the reconfigured and upgraded roadway would meet Avenue II Street standards.

Construction of the proposed improvements is expected to start in January 2019 May 2020 and to be completed within 12 months. During construction, one lane in each direction would be maintained and on-street parking would not be available. Construction would include grading, shoring, and resurfacing, as well as concrete forming and concrete pours. Approximately 4618 street trees would be removed and 36 new trees will be planted, 26 power poles would be relocated, and other utilities would be relocated as needed. Parking availability after completion of the project would be the same as present.

Funding for the project would include both City local funds and federal Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds. Federal funding triggers a requirement to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in addition to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The analysis in this document assumes that, unless otherwise stated, the project would be designed, constructed, and operated following all applicable laws, regulations, ordinances, and formally adopted City standards including but not limited to:

- Los Angeles Municipal Code (Reference 25)
- Bureau of Engineering Standard Plans (Reference 33)
- Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction (Reference 1)
- Work Area Traffic Control Handbook (Reference 2)

III. EXISTING ENVIRONMENT

The proposed project area is a long-established urban community within the City of Los Angeles. According to the Circulation Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan, Magnolia and Cahuenga Boulevards are classified as Secondary Highways, while Vineland Avenue is classified as a Major Highway - - Class III. Along Magnolia Boulevard there are traffic signals at Vineland Avenue, Riverton Avenue, and Cahuenga Boulevard.
The parcels adjacent to the proposed project alignment are zoned for commercial and light industrial uses, and are occupied by shopping, small businesses, and multi-family residential buildings. The proposed project alignment is within the North Hollywood-Valley Village Community Plan area. Among the goals of the Plan are the development of highways and local streets in accordance with standards and criteria contained in the Highways and Freeways Element of the General Plan and the City’s Standard Street Dimensions Plan.

The proposed project alignment is in a former Redevelopment Project Area. The Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles (CRA/LA) is the Designated Local Authority and successor to the former Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles. While Assembly Bill (AB) x1-26 abolished redevelopment agencies in California, the land use authorities in the Redevelopment Plans remain in effect, and will continue to be administered by the CRA/LA until transferred to the Department of City Planning. The Redevelopment Plan states that streets in the Plan Area may be widened as necessary.

The North Hollywood (NoHo) Commercial and Artcraft District Overlay adopted July 16, 1995 also applies to the proposed project alignment. Artcraft zoning districts, as defined by the Los Angeles Department of City Planning, are enclaves where the artisan segments of the population may live, create, and market their artifacts.

IV. POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact as indicated by the checklist in Appendix A. A detailed discussion of these potential environmental effects follows.

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology / Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Land Use / Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population / Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities / Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
A. Aesthetics

**Scenic Vistas**

*A significant impact may occur if the proposed project introduces incompatible visual elements within a field of view containing a scenic vista or substantially alters a view of a scenic vista.*

The project is in an urbanized area; no scenic vistas exist on or near the project alignment. Parcels adjacent to the proposed project alignment are zoned for commercial uses, and are occupied by shopping centers, small businesses, and multi-family residential buildings. The proposed project would narrow the existing sidewalk on the northern side of Magnolia Boulevard; utilities would be relocated and approximately 16-18 street trees would be removed. The project would not introduce incompatible visual elements along Magnolia Boulevard. No scenic vista would be affected by the proposed project, so no mitigation measures or further evaluation are required.

**Scenic Resources**

*A significant impact may occur where scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway would be damaged by or removed for the proposed project. For purposes of this analysis, scenic resources include trees, rock outcrops, and historic buildings.*

The proposed project would be constructed within an older urban commercial streetscape. Scenic resources such as trees and historic structures are found in and adjacent to the proposed project alignment. Approximately 26 power poles within the project limits would be removed and re-installed. Some historic streetlights dating from the 1930s would be temporarily removed and re-installed. Non-historic light poles would be replaced with new light poles approved by the City. Approximately 16-18 trees would be removed and replaced in accordance with City policies. Magnolia Boulevard is a local secondary highway and there are no designated State Scenic Highways are near the proposed project alignment. The nearest officially designated State Scenic Highway is Angeles Crest Highway (State Route 2), located about 8 miles east of the project alignment. Because no scenic resources are present, no impacts on scenic resources would occur. No mitigation measures or further analysis of this issue are required.

**Visual Character and Quality**

*A significant impact may occur if the proposed project introduces incompatible visual elements to the project site or visual elements that would be incompatible with the character of the area surrounding the project site.*

The proposed project would not substantially change the existing visual character of the area within the project limits. Proposed project work would include narrowing the sidewalk to a width of 8 feet, widening, repaving, and restriping the northern side of Magnolia Boulevard to accommodate one additional through lane, and relocating utilities. Historical streetlights dating from the 1930s would be removed and
reinstalled.

Approximately 30 trees are located along Magnolia Boulevard, along with some shrubs, some hedges, and some other small-scale plantings within and adjacent to the project site. The trees along Magnolia Boulevard include four mature southern magnolias, several deciduous and evergreen broadleaf trees, and two fan palms. An estimated 16-18 street trees at various stages of growth within the proposed project right-of-way would be removed and replaced with young trees.

The design of the proposed project would be subject to review by the Board of Cultural Affairs Commissioners to ensure that it is aesthetically compatible with its surroundings. No substantial changes in visual character or quality of the proposed roadway segment are anticipated, so no impacts would occur. No mitigation measures or further analysis of this issue are required.

**Light and Glare**

A significant impact would occur if the proposed project caused a substantial increase in ambient illumination levels beyond the property line or caused new lighting to spill over onto light-sensitive land uses such as residential, some commercial and institutional uses that require minimum illumination for proper function, and natural areas.

The proposed project would relocate or replace existing light poles and traffic signals, but would not substantially increase ambient light levels. Historic light poles dating from the 1930s would be temporarily removed and then reinstalled after construction, while new street lighting and traffic signals would replace the modern light poles and traffic signals within the project alignment. No additional light poles or other lighting sources are proposed. Light emitted by new light poles and traffic signals would follow the design standards and guidelines of the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Street Lighting, and would be limited to the minimum levels necessary for safety. New light fixtures would be designed to prevent spill-over. No substantial new sources of light or glare are included in the project, so no lighting or glare impacts would occur. No mitigation measures or further evaluation are required.

Nighttime construction is not anticipated for the proposed project. Temporary impacts from construction lighting and signage are not expected. No mitigation measures or further evaluation are required.

**B. Agriculture and Forestry Resources**

The project alignment is not located within any State designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance identified in the California State Department Farmland Mapping and Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring databases. The project area is not zoned for agricultural uses. There is no forest land or timberland production zone within or near the project alignment. The project alignment lies within a well-established urban area that contains no observable agriculture or forestry resources. Because no farmland exists within the project limits, no impact on agriculture or forestry resources would occur as a result of the proposed project.
C. Air Quality

**Obstruct Implementation of Applicable Air Quality Plan**

*A significant impact may occur if the project was inconsistent with or obstructed implementation of the Air Quality Element of the City’s General Plan or the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP).*

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) is responsible for establishing the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone (O$_3$), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO$_2$), sulfur dioxide (SO$_2$), particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter (PM$_{10}$) and 2.5 microns or less in diameter (PM$_{2.5}$), and lead (Pb) under the Clean Air Act (CAA). USEPA also establishes emissions standards for on-road vehicles and off-road engines. USEPA has delegated enforcement of the NAAQS in California to regional and local air pollution control districts (APCDs).

In California, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the APCDs share responsibility for enforcing air pollution regulations. APCDs have primary responsibility for regulating stationary emissions sources and achieving ambient air quality standards. CARB has primary responsibility for establishing the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and for regulating mobile sources.

The proposed project is in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The SCAB includes Orange County and the urban portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties. South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the regional agency responsible for ensuring that federal and state ambient air quality standards are attained and maintained in the SCAB. Attainment of the NAAQS and CAAQS is determined via a network of regionally representative air quality monitoring stations located throughout the SCAB. Pollutants monitored include O$_3$, particulate matter, CO, NO$_2$, and SO$_2$. Table 1 summarizes the federal and State attainment status of criteria pollutants for the SCAB based on the NAAQS and CAAQS, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant / Averaging Period</th>
<th>National Area Designation</th>
<th>State Area Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>Maintenance – Serious</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone, 1-hour Average</td>
<td>Revoked</td>
<td>Non-Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone, 8-hour Average</td>
<td>Non-Attainment, Extreme</td>
<td>Non-Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulates &lt; 2.5 microns – 24-hour Average</td>
<td>Non-Attainment, Serious</td>
<td>Non-Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulates &lt; 2.5 microns – Annual Average</td>
<td>Non-Attainment, Moderate</td>
<td>Non-Attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulates &lt; 10 microns</td>
<td>Maintenance – Serious</td>
<td>Non-Attainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

In areas where the NAAQS are not attained (federal nonattainment areas), the CAA requires preparation of a State Implementation Plan (SIP) detailing how the State of
California (State) will attain the NAAQS within mandated timeframes. In response to this requirement, local air quality agencies, such as SCAQMD, in collaboration with other agencies, such as CARB and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), prepare Air Quality Management Plans (AQMPs) designed to bring the area into attainment with federal requirements. The AQMP for each nonattainment area is then incorporated into the SIP, which is submitted by CARB to USEPA for approval.


The AQMP proposes attainment strategies designed to bring the SCAB into attainment of the CAAQS and NAAQS. AQMP attainment strategies and control measures include mobile source control measures and clean fuel programs, and are enforced at the State and federal levels on engine manufacturers and petroleum refiners and retailers. SCAQMD also adopts AQMP control measures into the SCAQMD’s Rules and Regulations, which are then used to regulate sources of air pollution in the SCAB.

Construction of the proposed project would adhere to applicable regulations established by the SCAQMD and the City pertaining to fugitive dust control and daily hours of activity. Upon completion, the proposed project would not result in increases in criteria air pollutant emissions. Because the proposed project would not result in growth or emissions beyond the forecasts incorporated into the AQMP, the proposed project would not obstruct or conflict with its implementation.

The proposed project would have no impact on implementation of air quality plans and programs, and no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Potential Violations of Air Quality Standards**

*For purposes of this analysis, CEQA thresholds developed by SCAQMD were used as thresholds of significance to determine if the proposed project would result in impacts on air quality. A significant impact may occur if the proposed project violated any SCAQMD air quality standard.*

The SCAQMD has set thresholds of significance for reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NOₓ), CO, SO₂, and PM₁₀ emissions resulting from construction and operation in the SCAB. Table 2 presents the SCAQMD thresholds of significance for potential air quality impacts.
### Table 2 – Proposed Project Peak Daily Construction Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions Parameter</th>
<th>Emissions by Pollutant (lb/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Emissions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Construction Threshold (regional emissions)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed Threshold?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD LST, SRA #7 (local emissions)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed Threshold?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** ROG – reactive organic compounds; NOx – nitrogen oxides; CO – carbon monoxide; SO2 – sulfur dioxide; PM10 – particulates under 10 microns; PM2.5 – particulates under 2.5 microns. lb – pound; NA – not applicable; SCAQMD – South Coast Air Quality Management District; LST – Localized Significance Threshold; SRA – Source Receptor Area. Project emissions were estimated using the CalEEMod screening model.

### Construction Related Impacts

Construction sequence of the proposed project would consist of: mobilization, site preparation, site work, paving, finishing, and demobilization. Air quality impacts from construction activities would occur from: combustion emissions from fossil-fueled off-road equipment and on-road vehicles, volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from application of asphalt and pavement markings, fugitive dust emissions due to grading of exposed soils, and road dust. Off-road construction equipment for the activities described above could include, but would not be limited to, cranes, forklifts, front end loaders, dump trucks, welders, generators, off-road vehicles, graders, rollers, vibrators, dewatering equipment, pumps, and air compressors. Typical on-road vehicles would include, but would not be limited to, flat bed and haul trucks, concrete trucks, and asphalt trucks. These emissions sources would primarily use diesel fuel, resulting in combustion exhaust emissions in the form of VOC, CO, NOx, sulfur oxides (SOx), PM10, and PM2.5.

Earth-disturbing activities, such as excavation and grading, would also generate PM10 and PM2.5. Paving and architectural coating activities would generate VOC emissions. Emissions were quantified for both on-site construction equipment and for off-site sources (haul trucks) transiting within the SCAB. Estimated peak-day emissions assume overlaps of construction tasks, based on the anticipated construction schedule and equipment utilization.

The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association’s (CAPCOA), California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), Version 2013.2.2, was used to quantify emissions from anticipated construction activities (CAPCOA 2013). The CalEEMod model is approved by the SCAQMD. CalEEMod uses the emission factors for off-road equipment and on-road vehicles using the CARB OFFROAD model and EMFAC2011 model. Project construction-related criteria air pollutant emissions estimated using CalEEMod were compared to SCAQMD’s regional daily emission thresholds for determination of significance. Emission calculations assume that the proposed project would comply with SCAQMD’s Rule 403, Fugitive Dust (SCAQMD 2005a), by implementing the rule-stipulated best available control measures to minimize fugitive dust emissions.
Table 2 summarizes construction emissions for a peak construction day, on which the greatest number of construction equipment would be used and a considerable amount of haul trips would take place. The data demonstrate that at no time during construction of the proposed project would maximum daily emissions exceed any applicable SCAQMD thresholds of significance for regional emissions. Therefore, regional air pollutant emissions generated by construction of the proposed project could not cause a violation of an air quality standard or contribute to an existing violation. This would be a less-than-significant, temporary impact. No mitigation measure or further analysis is required.

Although construction emissions are anticipated to be below SCAQMD thresholds, contractors would be required to follow all applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations, including Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) and Rule 431 (Diesel Equipment), to minimize air quality impacts. Contractors, for example, would water dusty areas and minimize the tracking of soil from unpaved dirt areas to paved roads.

Localized Significance Threshold

SCAQMD developed the Localized Significance Threshold (LST) methodology to assist CEQA lead agencies in analyzing local air quality impacts from simpler projects (SCAQMD 2008a). The LST methods allow users to determine, in lieu of conducting dispersion modeling, if a project would cause or contribute to an exceedance of the applicable ambient air quality standard. The LST methods are based on maximum daily allowable on-site emissions, the total area of the emissions source, the ambient air quality in each Source Receptor Area (SRA) in which the emission source is located, and the distance to the nearest exposed individual. The LST methods include look-up tables for emissions of NO\(_2\), CO, PM\(_{10}\), and PM\(_{2.5}\). If proposed project emissions are less than the LST values, then the proposed activity is considered not to violate or substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality standard.

SCAQMD’s LST methods were used in this analysis to evaluate ambient air quality impacts from proposed project construction. The project site encompasses an area of approximately 3 acres; the LST analysis conservatively assumed a 2-acre site because emissions spread over a slightly smaller area would be more concentrated and would produce more conservative results than emissions spread over a larger area. Distance to the nearest sensitive receptor was assumed to be 25 meters because that is the smallest source-receptor distance provided for the LSTs.

Project emissions were compared to the project-specific LST values in Table 2 to determine the significance of project impacts. Table 2 shows that emissions from construction of the proposed project would not exceed any applicable local threshold, and, therefore, could not result in a violation of an air quality standard.

Air quality impacts resulting from construction of the proposed project would be less than significant, so no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.
Operational Impacts

The proposed project would not create any new sources of motor vehicle traffic, but could induce some motorists to alter their routes. Air pollutant emissions would not increase overall due to operation of the proposed project, and could decrease if proposed project improvements resulted in more efficient traffic operations, but could be marginally higher along Magnolia Boulevard if vehicle volumes increased. Operational impacts would be negligible, and no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase in Criteria Air Pollutants

A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the SCAB exceeds federal or state ambient air quality standards and has been designated as an area of non-attainment by the USEPA or California Air Resources Board. The SCAB is a non-attainment area for CO, NO\textsubscript{2}, O\textsubscript{3}, PM\textsubscript{10}, and PM\textsubscript{2.5}.

The region of analysis for cumulative effects on air quality is the SCAB, which is in nonattainment for O\textsubscript{3}, PM\textsubscript{10}, and PM\textsubscript{2.5}. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period. Therefore, the construction and operational impacts of related projects in the area surrounding the project area would be cumulatively significant, within the SCAB, if their combined construction or operational emissions would exceed the SCAQMD daily emission thresholds.

The proposed project would not have significant adverse cumulative air quality impacts under CEQA. Per SCAQMD guidance (SCAQMD 2003), impacts are considered to be cumulatively considerable if they exceed the project-specific air quality significance thresholds. Construction of the proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for regional emissions and would not exceed local significance thresholds for criteria pollutants and, therefore, is not considered to be cumulatively considerable. Operational emissions of the proposed project would be negligible and, therefore, are not considered to be cumulatively considerable.

In addition, the proposed project has a relatively short construction schedule of 12 months, so any construction impacts would be short in duration and unlikely to overlap substantially with other projects in the vicinity. Lastly, the proposed project would be small in scale compared to other area projects.

Collectively, because the proposed project construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds and would have a short construction timeframe, and because proposed project operational emissions would be negligible, no significant adverse cumulative air quality impacts would occur. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

Sensitive Receptors

A significant impact may occur if construction or operation of the proposed project generated pollutant concentrations to a degree that would significantly affect sensitive receptors.
This analysis looked at populations particularly vulnerable to the effects of air pollution to assess whether the proposed project would expose these sensitive receptors—residents, children, the elderly, the chronically ill, and other sensitive individuals—to substantial pollutant concentrations. The analysis identified residences, schools, day-care centers, and other locations where these vulnerable residents could be exposed. The nearest such uses to the project alignment are multi-family residential units on both sides of Magnolia Boulevard.

Diesel particulate matter (DPM) is one of the components of ambient PM\textsubscript{10} and is classified as a toxic air contaminant by CARB. PM\textsubscript{10} emissions from diesel combustion were used as a surrogate for DPM in this analysis. The nearest sensitive receptor could be within 25 feet of the project alignment, and PM\textsubscript{10} construction emissions would not exceed the LSTs for sensitive receptors, as detailed in Table 2. PM\textsubscript{10} emissions along Magnolia Boulevard would not increase substantially due to project operations. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Create Objectionable Odors Affecting a Substantial Number of People**

During construction, sources of odor are diesel emissions from construction equipment and VOC from sealant applications or paving activities. These odors would be temporary and localized. Nonetheless, applicable best management practices such as those in SCAQMD Rule 431 (Diesel Equipment) would, in addition to minimizing air quality impacts, also help minimize potential construction odors.

Although offensive odors rarely cause physical harm, they can be unpleasant and lead to considerable distress among the public. This distress may generate citizen complaints to local governments and air districts. Any project that could frequently expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors would be deemed to have a significant impact.

According to CARB’s *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook*, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include sewage treatment plants, landfills, recycling facilities, and manufacturing facilities (CARB 2005). Short-term objectionable odors during construction of the proposed project would be associated with the use of diesel-powered construction equipment and on-road vehicles. During construction activities, odors would mostly occur on-site, and would be short-term and transient. Any odors generated from routine maintenance during project operation would also be minor and transient. In addition, SCAQMD Rules 1108 and 1108.1 limit the amounts of VOCs in cutback asphalt and emulsified asphalt products sold within the air district, further reducing the potential for odor impacts during short-term paving activities. Therefore, construction and operation of the proposed project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people.

Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.
D. Biological Resources

The project site is a segment of a secondary highway located in the eastern portion of San Fernando Valley, an urban area of more than 50 square miles. The nearest substantial areas of natural habitat are found in the Verdugo Hills, about 4 miles to the northeast, and the Hollywood Hills, about 2 miles to the south.

**Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species**

A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would remove or modify habitat for any species identified or designated as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulation, or by the state or federal regulatory agencies cited.

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), California Natural Diversity Database (CDFW 2018) lists occurrences (Attachment A) of Nevin’s barberry (*Berberis nevinii*), San Fernando Valley spineflower (*Chorizanthe parryi* var. *fernandina*), slender-horned spineflower (*Dodecahema leptoceras*), southwestern willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*), least Bell’s vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*), and coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*), which are federally or State-listed as Endangered or Threatened species, within the Burbank topographic quadrangle. Of these species, only the San Fernando Valley spineflower is known to occur within one mile of the project alignment. The project alignment includes no native habitat that could include the plant species. The bird species occur in habitats (e.g., riparian woodlands, coastal sage scrub) not found near the project alignment. No impact has been identified. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Riparian Habitat, Wetlands, and Natural Communities**

A significant impact may occur if riparian habitat or any other sensitive natural community were to be adversely modified. A significant impact may occur if federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, would be modified or removed.

No riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities exist on or near the proposed project alignment. No wetlands exist on or near the project alignment. The proposed project is not located in a Significant Ecological Area (SEA) or other natural community containing riparian habitat or sensitive biological resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact riparian habitats, wetlands, or sensitive natural communities. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Interference with Movement or Migration**

A significant impact may occur if the proposed project interferes or removes access to a migratory wildlife corridor or impedes the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

The proposed project is located in an urban area of Los Angeles, and no wildlife corridors or nursery sites are located on or near the proposed project alignment. No sensitive habitats were identified within or near the project limits. The project area is highly urbanized and heavily used and does not provide significant habitat for wildlife.
The proposed project is not expected to have an impact on habitat suitable for wildlife movement or migration.

**Consistency with Applicable Plans**

*If the proposed project would cause an impact that is inconsistent with local regulations pertaining to biological resources. A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would be inconsistent with mapping or policies in any conservation plans.*

No habitat conservation plan is known to exist on or near the project alignment. The Los Angeles Municipal Code protects certain species of trees native to the City. These trees include most oak trees, Southern California black walnut, western sycamore, and California bay. No heritage or protected tree species are present within the boundaries of the proposed project. City policies also specify replacement ratios when street trees are removed. Because the north side of Magnolia Boulevard would be widened, the existing street trees would need to be removed. Approximately 30 trees are located along Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland Avenue and Cahuenga Boulevard, of which an estimated 46 street trees within the proposed project right-of-way would be affected. The street trees within the project footprint include four mature southern magnolia trees. New street trees would be planted along the newly widened street. All removed trees would be replaced at a 2:1 ratio, as required by City policy. Replacement trees would take several years to attain the size and canopy of the existing street trees. This short-term loss of tree canopy would be a less-than-significant impact. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (50 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Section 10.13) implemented the 1916 convention between the United States and Great Britain for the protection of birds migrating between the U.S. and Canada. The MBTA made it illegal for people to "take" migratory birds, their eggs, feathers, or nests. Take is defined in the MBTA to include by any means or in any manner, any attempt at hunting, pursuing, wounding, killing, possessing or transporting any migratory bird, nest, egg, or part thereof. The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act affords additional protection to all bald and golden eagles. In total, 836 bird species are protected by the MBTA, 58 of which are legally hunted as game birds that are subject to migratory game bird regulations issued by the USFWS. A migratory bird is any species or family of birds that live, reproduce or migrate within or across international borders at some point during their annual life cycle. Removal of trees, shrubs, or other vegetation that could support nesting birds during the typical nesting season (i.e., February 1 through August 31) could negatively impact local bird populations and violate the MBTA.

To address the potentially significant impacts of construction on nesting birds, several standard conditions would be carried out, including:

**SC-BIO-1**: If any trees, shrubs, or other vegetation that could support nesting bird species would be removed during the typical nesting season (i.e., February 1 through August 31), preconstruction nest surveys should be conducted to
determine if birds are actively nesting within the proposed project alignment.

**SC-BIO-2:** Construction work near active bird nests would be avoided until the young have left the nest.

**SC-BIO-3:** As feasible, removal of vegetation would be completed outside the nesting season.

With standard conditions incorporated, construction impacts to migratory birds would be considered less than significant.

E. Cultural Resources

A historical resource is defined in Section 15064.5(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines as any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript determined to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California. Resources listed in or determined eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), included in a local register, or identified as significant in a historic resource survey are also considered historical resources pursuant to CEQA.

The criteria for listing on the California Register are defined in Section 5024.1 of the Public Resource Code (PRC) and provide the basis for evaluating historic properties eligible for listing on the California Register. Specifically, California Register criteria state that eligible resources must (1) be associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage; or (2) be associated with the lives of persons important to our past; or (3) embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction; represent the work of an important creative individual; or possesses high artistic values; or (4) have yielded or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

Resources listed on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) are automatically listed in the California Register. The criteria for listing on the National Register (defined in 36 CFR 60.4 of the National Historic Preservation Act) provide the basis for evaluating historic properties. Properties eligible for the National Register include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Similar to the California Register, the National Register eligibility criteria include properties (A) that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or (B) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or (C) that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or (D) that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

Under CEQA, a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as a result of a project or development is considered a significant impact on
the environment. Substantial adverse change is defined as physical demolition, relocation, or alteration of a resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of the historical resource would be materially impaired. Direct impacts are those that cause substantial adverse physical change to a historic property. Indirect impacts are those that cause substantial adverse change to the immediate surroundings of a historical resource, such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired.

In accordance with CEQA (15064.5 (b)(4)), a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Building (Standards) shall be considered as mitigated to a level of less than significant impact on historical resources.

**Previous Cultural Resources Investigations**

A record search request was submitted to the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), located at California State University, Fullerton, on January 3, 2018. The results of the record search completed by SCCIC staff on January 29, 2018, indicate that 22 cultural resources studies have been conducted within a 0.25-mile search radius of the project alignment, as shown in Table 3. Of these, one previous study (LA-10180) occurred within the project site, while 21 studies are within the 0.25-mile search radius but outside the project site.

**Table 3. Previous Surveys and Reports within 0.25-Mile of Project Site**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report # / Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Relevant Identified Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA-00075 1975</td>
<td>An Archaeological Reconnaissance of the Barham Property, City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>Within (w/i) 0.25 mile (mi.) of project site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Leonard, Nelson N. III Types: Archaeological, Field Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Anonymous Types: Archaeological, Field Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-02816 1993</td>
<td>Native American Place names in the Vicinity of the Pacific Pipeline: Part 2: Gaviota to the San Fernando Valley: Draft</td>
<td>w/i 0.25 mi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: King, Chester Types: Other Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-03496</td>
<td>Draft Environmental Impact Report Transit Corridor Specific Plan Park Mile Specific Plan Amendments</td>
<td>w/i 0.25 mi</td>
<td>19-000159, 19-001945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Anonymous Types: Management Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Romani, John F. Types: Archaeological, Field study, Literature search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-03773</td>
<td>Preliminary Assessment of Potential Impacts and</td>
<td>w/i 0.25 mi</td>
<td>19-000007, 19-000159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Previous Surveys and Reports within 0.25-Mile of Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report # / Year</th>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Relevant Identified Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Evaluation of Cultural Resources Along Proposed Transit System Alignment Alternatives in the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Singer, Clay A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type: Archaeological, Field Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Anonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type: Archaeological, Field Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Hill, James N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type: Other Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-06906 2000</td>
<td>Nextel Communications Wireless Telecommunications Service Facility CA-5690f/north Hollywood, Los Angeles County</td>
<td>w/l 0.25 mi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Billat, Lorna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type: Architectural / Historical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-07568 1978</td>
<td>Palaeontological Resource Survey and Impact Evaluation for a Proposed Rapid Transit System in the City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>w/l 0.25 mi</td>
<td>19-000009, 19-000159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Bernor, Raymond L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type: Other Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: McKenna, Jeanette A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type: Archaeological, Field Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: McKenna, Jeanette A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Types: Architectural / Historical Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-08247 2000</td>
<td>The Project Proposes to Rehabilitate the Pavement at the Caltrans Shop 7 Equipment Service Center in North Hollywood to Replace the Existing Fence With a Security Fence Along the Perimeter of the Facility and to Install High Mast Lighting</td>
<td>w/l 0.25 mi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Sylvia, Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Types: Archaeological, Field Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Gust, Sherri and Heather Puckett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type: Archaeological, Architectural / Historical, Evaluation, Excavation, Monitoring, Other Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Previous Surveys and Reports within 0.25-Mile of Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report # / Year</th>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Relevant Identified Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA-08254 2004</td>
<td>Results of a Phase 1 Cultural Resources Investigation of the Proposed Los Angeles Department of Water and Power River Supply Conduit, Los Angeles County, California</td>
<td>w/I 0.25 mi</td>
<td>19-001945, 19-003304, 19-003307 19-003789, 19-100281, 19-150416 19-186685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: McKenna, Jeanette A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type: Archaeological, Field Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-10177 2008</td>
<td>Relocation of Phil’s Diner, Los Angeles (North Hollywood), CA</td>
<td>w/I 0.25 mi</td>
<td>19-173061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Archaeological, Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-10180 1981</td>
<td>Determination of Eligibility Report, North Hollywood Redevelopment Project</td>
<td>w/I project site, w/I 0.25 mi</td>
<td>19-170966, 19-170967, 19-173061 19-186585 19-186642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Hatheway, Roger G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type: Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Gust, Sherri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type: Archaeological, Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-11747 2006</td>
<td>Programmatic Agreement Compliance Report, twenty-first Reporting Period, July 1, 2005-- March 31, 2006</td>
<td>w/I 0.25 mi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Sakai, Rodney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type: Architectural / Historical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-11748 2003</td>
<td>Programmatic Agreement Compliance Report Fifteenth Reporting Period July 1-- December 31, 2002</td>
<td>w/I 0.25 mi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Sakai, Rodney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type: Architectural / Historical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authors: Wallace, James, Dietler, Sara, and Kry, Linda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type: Archaeological, Field Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-13170 2014</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Assessment of the Burbourn Project, North Hollywood, Los Angeles, County, California (BCR Consulting Project No. TRF1408)</td>
<td>w/I 0.25 mi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Brunzell, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type: Archaeological, Architectural / Historical, Field Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previously Recorded Cultural Resources

Two cultural resources have been previously recorded within a 0.25-mile radius of the proposed project site. Of those, one has been documented adjacent to the project site, as shown in Table 4.
Table 4. Cultural Resources Located within 0.25-Mile of the Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-19-170971</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
<td>5257 Denny Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-186642</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
<td>East Valley New High School #18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: a - Eligibility: National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), or Local Eligibility; b - Location: Within or Adjacent to project property

Historic Architectural Resources

LA-10180. The El Portal Theatre located at 5265-5271 Lankershim Boulevard was built in 1926. Security Trust Savings Bank located at 5303 Lankershim Boulevard was constructed in 1926. Phil’s Diner was constructed in 1926 and is located at 5230 Lankershim Boulevard. The Southern Pacific Depot is located at 5351 Lankershim Boulevard and was constructed in 1896. All four of these resources were found eligible for the National Register in this evaluation.

Historical Resources

*A significant impact may result if the proposed project caused a substantial adverse change to the significance of a historical resource.*

As indicated above, two cultural resources have been previously recorded within 0.25 mile of the proposed project site (Table 4). The improvements proposed under this project would not affect any of these resources.

In addition to the record search completed by SCCIC, described above, the findings of the SurveyLA Historic Resources Survey Report prepared for the North Hollywood-Valley Village Community Plan Area were reviewed in January 2018.

SurveyLA identified Magnolia Boulevard covering the proposed project site as the Magnolia Commercial Planning District, and it was noted that the commercial buildings within this district generally have compromised integrity but may warrant special consideration in the planning process. Based upon a reconnaissance survey, some properties adjacent to the project site that are more than 50 years of age and possess integrity may be considered to be historical resources pursuant to CEQA. The proposed project would replace and enlarge existing sidewalks adjacent to properties that may qualify as historical resources. The proposed project would not introduce new elements into the streetscape or result in a change of setting, and thus would have a less-than-significant impact on historical resources.

Additionally, SurveyLA identified the Magnolia Boulevard street lights as potentially eligible for listing in the National Register and the California Register for their association with the early commercial development of the North Hollywood central commercial area if they were installed in 1925. Pending further research, the street lights are assumed to be historical resources for the purposes of CEQA. The proposed project would restore and reinstall the street lights, following the Standards. The impacts would be considered less than significant, and no other mitigation measures are required.
Archaeological Resources

A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource which falls under the CEQA Guidelines section cited above.

An archaeological resource is defined in Section 15064.5(c) of the CEQA Guidelines as (1) a site, area, or place determined to be historically significant, as defined in Section 15064(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, or as (2) a unique archaeological resource defined in Section 21083.2 of the PRC as an artifact, object, or site that (a) contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions of public interest, or (b) that has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest or best example of its type, or (c) that is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

The results of the record search provided by SCCIC do not indicate that any archaeological resources within the project limits have been previously identified. An archaeological field survey of the proposed project alignment did not identify any archaeological resources. Most of the proposed project alignment is hardscaped or landscaped. A vacant lot on the northwestern corner of Magnolia Boulevard and Harmony Avenue contains structural debris that does not appear to consist of historic archaeological resources. While archeological resources were not observed within the project site, archaeological resources may be discovered during ground disturbance activities within native soils.

Standard specifications for public works projects stipulate, “If discovery is made of items of archaeological or paleontological interest, the Contractor shall immediately cease excavation in the area of discovery and shall not continue until ordered by the Engineer” Standard Specs Section 6-3.2. Potential impacts on archaeological resources would be less than significant with implementation of the standard specifications.

Paleontological Resources and Geologic Features

A significant impact may occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the proposed project would disturb unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features.

Dibblee geological maps were reviewed to determine if fossil-bearing formations are present within the project site. The project alignment is not within an area known to contain paleontological resources. The geology of the project site is characterized by younger Quaternary Alluvium. Shallow excavations in the younger Quaternary Alluvium throughout the proposed project alignment are unlikely to uncover significant vertebrate fossils. Deeper excavations in areas that extend down into older sedimentary deposits may encounter significant fossil vertebrate remains.
Standard specifications for public works projects stipulate, “If discovery is made of items of archaeological or paleontological interest, the Contractor shall immediately cease excavation in the area of discovery and shall not continue until ordered by the Engineer.” Standard Specs Section 6-3.2. Potential impacts on paleontological resources would be less than significant with implementation of standard specifications.

Burial Sites and Cemeteries

A significant impact may occur if grading or excavation activities associated with the proposed project would disturb interred human remains.

No known burial sites are located within the proposed project alignment. A Sacred Lands File (SLF) record search request and Assembly Bill (AB) 52 consultation list request were submitted to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on behalf of the lead agency contact. The NAHC responded that the SLF search was negative. The NAHC provided a list of five local Native American contacts for information on Tribal Resources located within or near the project area. The Native American consultation letters were sent to the Tribal contacts on behalf of the lead agency contact once on February 14, 2008. Out of these, the City received one response from Kizh Gabrieleno Band of Missions Indians recommending the presence of a Native American Monitor present during all ground disturbing activities. A telephone conference between the City and the Gabrieleno Band of Missions Indians took place on April 18, 2018 from 1 pm to 2 pm. A set of standard mitigation measures were sent to the City for incorporation into the environmental document.

Although human remains are not anticipated to encountered within the proposed construction area, human remains may be encountered during ground-disturbing activities in native soils. Standard specifications for public works projects stipulate, “If discovery is made of items of archaeological or paleontological interest, the Contractor shall immediately cease excavation in the area of discovery and shall not continue until ordered by the Engineer.” Standard Specs Section 6-3.2. Potential impacts on human remains would be less than significant with implementation of Standard Specifications.

F. Geology and Soils

Fault Rupture

A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within a State-designated Alquist-Priolo Zone or other designated fault zone and appropriate building practices were not followed.

The project alignment is not in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, so the potential for ground surface rupture impacting the project is considered low. The new lane, sidewalk, curb, and gutter would be constructed in accordance with City of Los Angeles design standards by licensed construction contractors. No impact would occur. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

Seismic Ground-Shaking
A significant impact may occur if the proposed project design did not comply with building code requirements intended to protect people from hazards associated with strong seismic ground shaking.

The potential impacts of ground-shaking are present throughout southern California, and the intensity along the project alignment would be the same as for large parts of the City of Los Angeles and the region. The nearest fault is approximately 2 miles from the project alignment. The proposed project does not include construction of any structures, so it would not expose people or structures to substantial impacts from seismic ground shaking. No impact would occur. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

Seismic-Related Ground Failure

A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would be located in an area identified as having a high risk of liquefaction and appropriate design measures required within such designated areas were not incorporated into the project.

The project alignment is shown on the State of California Seismic Hazard Zones map as being in an area of potential liquefaction. During design, a geotechnical investigation would address potential geologic hazards, and corrective measures would be identified. These measures, if any, would limit ground failure from liquefaction. The project impact would be considered less than significant. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

Landslide

A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in a hillside area with soil conditions that would suggest high potential for sliding and appropriate design measures were not implemented.

The project alignment is not in an Earthquake Induced Landslide Seismic Hazard Zone, and is located on level ground where landslides would not occur. No Impact would occur. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

Erosion

A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to expose large areas to the erosion effects of wind or water for a prolonged period.

The project alignment is entirely paved, and would remain so after the proposed project is completed. Construction activities such as excavation and grading would temporarily expose surface soils to erosion. Soil exposure would be temporary and short-term, and applicable Department of Building and Safety erosion control techniques would limit potential erosion.

In accordance with standard specifications, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would control erosion and sedimentation during construction. Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be undertaken to control runoff and erosion from earthmoving activities such as excavation, grading, and compaction. Implementing such control measures would reduce soil erosion and loss of topsoil.
The proposed project would completely pave the proposed project alignment except for the tree wells. Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Unstable Soils**

*A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were built in an unstable area without proper site preparation or design features to provide adequate foundations for project buildings, thus posing a hazard to life and property.*

During project design, a geotechnical investigation would be undertaken to identify potential geologic hazards and, if needed, corrective measures would be identified and implemented.

**Expansive Soils**

The soils underlying the proposed project alignment are not highly expansive. Prior to construction, a geotechnical investigation would provide a detailed soil profile of the proposed project alignment and would provide construction if any were warranted.

The proposed project is in an area identified as having alluvium soils. Prior to any construction and as a standard practice, a geotechnical evaluation would be prepared which would prescribe methods, techniques, and specifications for: site preparation, treatment of undocumented fill and/or alluvial soils, fill placement on sloping ground, fill characteristics, fill placement and compactions, temporary excavations and shoring, permanent slopes, treatment of expansive soils, and treatment of corrosive soils. Design and construction of the proposed project would conform to recommendations in the geotechnical evaluation. No impacts would be anticipated, and no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Septic Systems**

*A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were built on soils that were incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal system, and such a system was proposed.*

The project area is served by the City’s wastewater collection, conveyance, and treatment systems. The proposed project would not include features that would generate wastewater. No impact would occur. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**G. Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

**Emissions Generation**

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are known as greenhouse gases (GHGs); their accumulation in the atmosphere regulates the earth’s temperature (Association of Environmental Professionals 2007). Human activities involving combustion of fossil fuels have elevated the concentration of GHGs in the atmosphere above natural levels. Scientific evidence indicates a correlation between increasing global
temperatures and global climate change over the past century and human-induced levels of GHGs.

GHGs have varying amounts of global warming potential (GWP), which is the ability of a gas or aerosol to trap heat in the atmosphere. By convention, CO₂ is assigned a GWP of one. In comparison, methane (CH₄) has a GWP of 25 (meaning that CH₄ has a global warming effect 25 times greater than CO₂ on an equal-mass basis) (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC] 2007). To account for their GWP, GHG emissions are often reported as CO₂ equivalent (CO₂e). CO₂e is calculated by multiplying each GHG emission by its GWP and summing the results.

GCC is expressed as changes in the average weather of the earth, as measured by change in wind patterns, storms, precipitation, and temperature. California’s AB 32, the *Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006*, identifies GCC as a “serious threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and the environment of California.” Because increases in the atmospheric concentrations of GHGs have been linked to GCC, California has acted to reduce GHG emissions in an effort to minimize further climate changes.

The State CEQA Guidelines set forth considerations for assessing the significance of impacts from GHG emissions on the environment. The Guidelines do not specify significance thresholds, and allow the lead agencies discretion in how to address and evaluate significance. To provide guidance to local lead agencies, SCAQMD proposed a threshold of 3,000 metric tons per year (mty) of CO₂e for commercial facilities (SCAQMD 2008b).

GHG impacts from proposed project construction would primarily result from the combustion of fossil-fueled off-road equipment and on-road vehicles. CalEEMod was used to quantify CO₂e emissions from anticipated construction activities. Estimated CO₂e emissions were compared to SCAQMD’s proposed GHG threshold to determine significance.

Under air quality operational impacts, no sources of direct emission, except routine street and sidewalk maintenance, would be associated with the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

**Consistency with Adopted Plans**

*A significant impact may occur if the proposed project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG.*

The proposed project would comply with all federal, State, and local regulations to reduce the emissions of GHG. The proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD’s threshold for GHG, and thus would not have a significant impact on GHG emissions. Additionally, the proposed project would enhance recreational open space within the City of Los Angeles and promote alternative modes of transit within the community. The lighting on the bridge would be provided by LED lights. These elements of the proposed project are consistent with objectives of the City of Los Angeles GreenLA Climate Action Plan to reduce the city’s contribution to climate change (City of Los
Angeles 2009). Consequently, The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted to reduce the emissions of GHGs, including AB 32 and the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan (CARB 2014).

Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

H. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The hazardous materials information presented in this section is based on the Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prepared for the proposed project (Sapphos, January 2018), which included a site reconnaissance conducted on January 10, 2018 as well as reviews of historic topographical and fire insurance maps, a review of historic aerial photographs, and searches of relevant governmental permitting and hazardous waste site databases. The ESA identified some historic and existing auto-related and metal plating uses within and near the proposed project alignment; historic chromium contamination of ground water near the project alignment has been remediated to the satisfaction of regulatory agencies, and no other known subsurface contamination exists in the project area. Pole-mounted electric power transformers along the alignment may contain polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), the utility poles themselves may contain creosote or other wood preservatives, and older buildings adjacent to the proposed project footprint may have building materials that contain asbestos or building surfaces coated with lead-based paints.

Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials

A significant impact may occur if the proposed project involved the use or disposal of hazardous materials as part of its routine operations and would have the potential to generate toxic or otherwise hazardous emissions.

No routine bulk hazardous materials transport, use, or disposal would occur as a result of the proposed project, and hazardous materials storage would not occur. The construction of the proposed project would require routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials; however, transport would occur according to applicable regulations such as the federal Hazardous Materials Transportation Law 49 United States Code §5101 et seq., the U.S. Department of Transportation regulations 49 CFR Subpart H, §172-700, and California Department of Motor Vehicle regulations on Hazardous Cargo. Construction would occur pursuant to County code requirements. In the unlikely event that contamination was encountered during construction, standard practices would be followed for proper removal and disposal. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts on hazards and hazardous materials regarding to creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and no mitigation measures are required.

Upset or Accident Conditions

A significant impact may occur if the proposed project involved a risk of accidental explosion or used substantial amounts of hazardous materials as part of its routine operations that could pose a hazard to the public under accident or upset conditions.
Grading and excavation to widen the roadway may disturb gas pipelines to adjacent commercial and residential users and lead to a leak, fire, or explosion and related hazards. Compliance with Title 8, Section 1541, of the California Code of Regulation (CCR), regarding notification of and coordination with the pipelines’ owners and operators (through the DigAlert program), and their approval and monitoring of activities near the pipelines would avoid damage to these lines and prevent the creation of hazards to adjacent areas.

Construction activities would involve the use of hazardous materials such as paints, thinners, solvents, acids, curing compounds, grease, oils, and other chemicals, which could pose risks to construction workers or lead to soil or groundwater contamination if accidentally released. However, handling of hazardous materials would be in accordance with the Toxic Substance Control Act (TSCA), Hazardous Material Transportation Act (HMTA), Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA), and Californian Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP). These regulations ensure the proper transport and on-site storage and use of hazardous materials, and procedures to implement in the event of a spill. Potential impacts would be mitigated to below a level of significance with the implementation of standard condition HAZ-1.

**SC-HAZ-1:** During excavation and grading, notify and obtain approval from the gas pipelines’ owners and operators (through the DigAlert program), and conduct and monitor activities near the pipelines to avoid damage and subsequent release.

**Hazardous Emissions Near Schools**

*A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school site and were projected to release toxic emissions which pose a hazard beyond regulatory thresholds.*

The nearest school, East Valley High School, is located more than 0.25 mile from the western end of the project alignment. Handling of hazardous materials would be in accordance with the TSCA, HMTA, RCRA, CUPA, and CalARP. These regulations ensure the proper transport of hazardous materials to minimize releases, on-site storage and use, and procedures to implement in the event of a spill. No impact would occur. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Recognized Environmental Concerns**

*A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were included on an agency list of unremediated hazardous or contaminated sites.*

The area surrounding and including the project alignment was employed for agricultural uses during the late 1800’s, including peach, pear, and walnut orchards, which could have resulted in the soils being contaminated with inorganic pesticide residues (e.g., lead, arsenic). During the early 1900s, an electric trolley line was located along Vineland Avenue to the west of the project alignment, and a railroad line ran along an east-west alignment to the north of the project alignment. A historic gas station and automobile repair shop were located to the north of Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N)
Magnolia Boulevard, as was a chrome plating shop (M&R Plating Corporation); local groundwater contaminated with hexavalent chromium was remediated up until 2014. A gas station with underground storage tanks is now located on the northwestern corner of Magnolia Boulevard and Cahuenga Boulevard.

The project alignment is not listed in the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker system, which includes leaking underground fuel tanks as well as spills, leaks, investigations, and cleanup sites, or the USEPA’s database of regulated facilities. The Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor Data Management System, which includes CORTESE sites, and the HAZNET database both identified M&R Plating Corporation at 10939 Magnolia Boulevard as a Large Quantity Generator for sludges from electroplating operations with compliance evaluations on 11/04/1992, 11/07/2006, and 06/04/2009. The site is listed as a Cleanup Program Site for aquifer contamination with a case closure date of 12/22/2014. On 12/23/2003, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, issued a letter that no further requirements would be necessary for chromium VI impacts from this site on the San Fernando Valley Groundwater Basin. No other listed sites are located within or adjacent to the proposed project alignment. No impact would occur. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Aircraft Hazards**

*A significant impact may occur if the proposed project site were located within a public airport land use plan area, or within two miles of a public airport, and would create a safety hazard. A significant impact may occur if the project would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area because of its location near a private airstrip.*

The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and would not create a safety hazard. The proposed project is not located near a private airstrip. No impact would occur. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Emergency Access**

*A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to substantially interfere with roadway operations used in conjunction with an emergency response plan or evacuation plan or would generate sufficient traffic to create traffic congestion that would interfere with the execution of such plan.*

The proposed project would not alter the adjacent street system. As applicable, any traffic detour plans during construction would be included in an approved Traffic Control Plan, which would address emergency response or emergency evacuation for implementation during construction. The proposed project would widen Magnolia Boulevard to add an additional eastbound lane to relieve traffic congestion in the area. One traffic lane in each direction would remain open during construction. The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.
Wildland Fires

A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in a wild land area and poses a significant fire hazard, which could affect persons or structures in the area in the event of a fire.

The proposed project alignment is not located within a wild land or in a very high fire hazard severity zone. No impacts would occur. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

I. Hydrology and Water Quality

Surface Water Quality Standards and Waste Discharge Requirements

A significant impact may occur if the proposed project discharged water which did not meet the quality standards of agencies which regulate surface water quality and water discharge into storm-water drainage systems. A significant impact also may occur if a project included potential sources of water pollutants and had the potential to substantially degrade water quality.

Construction

No potential sources of water quality degradation are anticipated during construction. During construction, the proposed project would comply with applicable storm water management requirements for pollution prevention. Construction practices would include erosion control, spill prevention and control, solid and hazardous waste management, and dust control to reduce the discharge of pollutants from construction areas to the storm water system. No impacts related to potential discharge into surface water or changes in water quality have been identified. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

Operations

No new, operational sources of water quality degradation are anticipated in conjunction with the project. After construction is complete, the quality of runoff from the street would be comparable to the quality of current runoff. The proposed project would not degrade water quality. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

Groundwater Supplies

A project would normally have a significant impact on groundwater supplies if it were to result in a demonstrable and sustained reduction of groundwater recharge capacity or change the potable water levels sufficiently that it would reduce the ability of a water utility to use the groundwater basin for public water supplies or storage of imported water, reduce the yields of adjacent wells or well fields, or adversely change the rate or direction of groundwater flow.

The proposed project would not use existing groundwater resources nor would it interfere with groundwater recharge. Changes to the groundwater supply are not
anticipated due to the proposed project. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Drainage Patterns and Capacity**

*A significant impact may occur if the volume of runoff were to increase to a level which exceeded the capacity of the storm drain system serving a project site. A significant impact may also occur if the proposed project would substantially increase the probability that polluted runoff would reach the storm drain system.*

The proposed project would not change the volume of storm water runoff. The proposed project alignment is in a fully developed portion of the City of Los Angeles, and is paved and impermeable. No streams or river courses are located on or adjacent to the project alignment. During grading and excavation, erosion control measures would be in place to minimize erosion of the exposed soils. Runoff from the project alignment would be directed towards existing or newly constructed storm drains. The site is currently impermeable, so the amount of surface runoff would not increase due to the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the proposed project alignment during either construction or operation. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Erosion or Siltation**

*A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in a substantial alteration of drainage patterns that resulted in a substantial increase in erosion or siltation during construction or operation of the project.*

The proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. No streams or rivers are present within the project limits. The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. As discussed earlier, the project would result in temporary soil disturbance activities during construction during which time a storm water pollution prevention plan for the control of soil erosion and sediment runoff would be implemented. The project would be constructed in accordance with applicable requirements of the municipal code, including grading requirements. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Flooding**

*A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in increased runoff volumes during construction or operation of the proposed project that would result in flooding conditions affecting the project site or nearby properties. A significant impact may occur if the proposed project placed housing within a 100-year flood zone. A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within a 100-year flood zone and would impede or redirect flood flows. A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in an area where a dam or levee could fail, exposing people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death.*

The proposed project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area.
The proposed project alignment is not located within a 100-year flood zone. The proposed project is a roadway improvement project and would not place any housing along the project alignment in addition to those in existence. The FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Number 060137 0040 C, dated December 2, 1980, indicates the project alignment is located in Flood Zone C, an area of minimal flooding. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow

A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located in an area with inundation potential due to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

The project alignment is not located in an area subject to this risk. The Inundation and Tsunami Hazard Areas map (Exhibit G) of the Safety Element of the Los Angeles City General Plan (adopted by City Council November 26, 1996) identifies the project site as being located in an inundation area in the event that Hansen Dam failed. As all dams and reservoirs in the city have been retrofitted pursuant to the 1972 State Dam Safety Act, a dam failure is unlikely.

The project site is located approximately 13 miles northeast of the Pacific Ocean at an approximate elevation of 600 feet, making inundation by a tsunami unlikely. There are no nearby enclosed waterbodies where a seiche could form. The project site is flat and no potential source of mudflow has been identified. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

J. Land Use and Planning

Physical Condition

A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were sufficiently large or otherwise configured in such a way as to create a physical barrier within an established community.

The proposed project would narrow the existing sidewalk on the north side of Magnolia Boulevard to accommodate one additional eastbound through lane. During construction, one through lane in each direction would be maintained and no detours are proposed. The proposed project would not introduce a physical barrier and would not physically divide established communities along Magnolia Boulevard between Cahuenga Boulevard and Vineland Avenue; therefore, no impact would occur. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

Consistency with Adopted Plans

A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were inconsistent with the General Plan, or other applicable plan or with the site’s zoning if designated to avoid or mitigate a significant potential environmental impact.

The lands immediately surrounding the proposed project alignment are designated as Community Commercial in the City of Los Angeles General Plan, with the corresponding zoning code of C4-1-CA. Other land use designations within 1.5 block
around the project footprint include Low Residential, Medium Residential, and Commercial Manufacturing, with the corresponding zoning codes of R1-1, R3-1VL, and CM-1VL, respectively. The proposed project would not conflict with any City of Los Angeles land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect, as proposed project elements would conform with the existing land use designations.

The project site is within the North Hollywood-Valley Village Community Plan (Community Plan) area. The Community Plan specifies a “special emphasis on the improvement of the south side of Magnolia Boulevard between Lankershim Boulevard and Vineland Avenue to an avenue (II).” A subsequent project, completed in 2011, upgraded the south side of this segment to accommodate two eastbound through lanes. The proposed project would widen the northern side of this segment to match the improvements made to the south side, consistent with the Community Plan’s circulation goal; therefore, no circulation impacts would occur.

According to the Complete Streets Manual (City of Los Angeles 2014), the sidewalk for a secondary boulevard should be 15 feet wide, with a 7.5-foot wide walkway. The project would reduce the width of the project to from 7 to 8 feet wide. Therefore, the sidewalk widths would not meet the standard. This impact is less than significant, however, because the sidewalk along Magnolia Boulevard is wide enough to accommodate existing and anticipated pedestrian volumes.

In summary, the proposed project would be substantially consistent with the City of Los Angeles General Plan and the North Hollywood-Valley Village Community Plan, and would not conflict with any zoning ordinance. Overall project impacts on consistency with adopted plans would be less than significant. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Habitat Conservation Plans**

*A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were located within an area governed by a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), and would conflict with such plan.*

The area surrounding the project site is completely developed. There are no HCPs or NCCPs near the proposed project alignment. The proposed project is not located in a County of Los Angeles SEA. The proposed project thus would not conflict with any HCPs or NCCPs. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

K. Mineral Resources

**Availability of Known Mineral Resources of Value**

*A significant impact may occur if the project were located in an area used or available for extraction of a regionally important mineral resource, if the project converted an existing or potential present or future regionally important mineral extraction use to another use, or if a project affected access to such a site.*
The State Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) requires that the State Mining and Geology Board (SMGB) map areas in California that contain regionally significant mineral resources. The project area lies on the southern edge of a zone classified as MRZ-2 – a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or there is a high likelihood of their presence and development should be controlled (City of Los Angeles General Plan Conservation Element). The project site is not located within an area that contains mineral resources that are known to be of value to the region or residents of the State. Furthermore, the purpose of SMARA is to limit new development in areas containing significant mineral deposits. The proposed project converts existing sidewalks to a new traffic lane and would include no new development of open lands. It (a) is not located in an area used or available for mineral extraction, (b) would not convert an existing or future mineral extraction use to another use, and (c) would not affect access to such a site, so it would have no impact on known mineral resources. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

Loss of Availability of a Locally Important Mineral Resource Recovery Site

A significant impact may occur if a project were located in an area used or available for extraction of a locally-important mineral resource and the project converted such a resource to another use or affected access to such a site.

The project site is located on the edge of an area classified as MRZ-2, as noted above. It is not located within an area that contains known mineral resources. The City has not designated a locally significant mineral resource on the site (City of Los Angeles General Plan Conservation Element). The proposed project would have no impact on known mineral resources. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

L. Noise

Compliance with City Noise Standards

A significant impact may occur if the project generated noise levels exceeding the standards for ambient noise as established by the General Plan and Municipal Code or exposed persons to that increased level of noise.

Construction Noise

The City of Los Angeles’ Noise Ordinance states that construction and industrial machinery shall not exceed a maximum of 75 dBA\(^1\) at a distance of 50 feet, except where compliance is technically infeasible. In addition, construction activities are restricted during different hours of the day - no person shall perform any construction or repair work that makes loud noises that disturb persons occupying sleeping

---

\(^1\) The decibel (dB) noise metric describes the amplitude of a sound. The A-weighting network (dBA) approximates the frequency response of an average young human ear to most ordinary sounds. Judgments of the relative loudness or annoyance of a sound correlate well with their A-weighted sound levels. Typical noise levels include: normal speech about 65 dBA at 3 feet, library about 30 dBA, and a lawn mower about 95 dBA at 3 feet. Building envelopes with windows closed typically reduce noise by at least 25 dB.
quarters in any place of residence between the hours of 9:00 p.m. of one day and 7:00 a.m. of the following day. Furthermore, the code prohibits any person other than an individual homeowner engaged in the repair or construction of his single-family dwelling from performing any construction or repair work on land occupied by residential buildings, or within 500 feet of land so occupied, before 8:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on any Saturday or at any time on any Sunday.

Proposed project construction activities would require the use of construction equipment, including powered construction equipment. Ambient (outdoor) noise levels would temporarily increase when construction equipment is operating. Construction noise would be audible to nearby residents. Noise generated by construction activities would be intermittent and temporary. During construction, ambient noise levels would increase at the closest sensitive receptors, which are the exteriors of residences within 50 feet of the project footprint. Construction noise levels at 50 feet may vary from 81 to 84 dBA during construction of the proposed road widening and sidewalk improvements. This projected noise level would exceed the City noise standard of 75 dBA on a temporary basis. With the implementation of the following standard conditions, construction noise would be in compliance with the City’s Noise Ordinance, and the impact would be less than significant.

**SC-NOI-1:** The use of construction methods and equipment that provide the lowest level of noise impact.

**SC-NOI-2:** Turning off equipment when not in use and minimizing idling equipment.

**SC-NOI-3:** Restricting truck loading, unloading, and hauling operations so that noise and vibration are kept to a minimum near residences to the greatest possible extent.

**SC-NOI-4:** Where feasible, the use of temporary noise barriers, as needed, to protect sensitive receptors against excessive noise from construction activities involving large equipment and by small items such as compressors, generators, pneumatic tools, and jackhammers. Noise barriers can be made of heavy plywood, moveable insulated sound blankets, or other best available control techniques.

**SC-NOI-5:** Restricting construction activities to daytime hours.

**SC-NOI-6:** Locating construction lay-down and staging areas in industrial zones. If industrially zoned areas are not available, commercial zones may be used, or locations at least 100 feet from any noise-sensitive land use (e.g., residences).

**Operational Noise**

The City of Los Angeles’ Noise Ordinance states that ambient noise levels are not to exceed 50 decibels, A-weighted (dBA) at residential land uses and 60 dBA at commercial land uses from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

Noise levels generated by operation of the improved Magnolia Boulevard alignment would be like existing conditions. Increases in traffic noise from the proposed project would be negligible because traffic volumes would increase very slightly as a result
of the proposed project, and corresponding changes in noise levels are logarithmic in nature. Furthermore, although traffic operations would be moved slightly closer to the land uses on the northern side of Magnolia Boulevard, the shift would increase ambient noise levels by less than 1 dB, which is well below a perceivable amount. Therefore, the operations noise of the proposed project is expected to result in less-than-significant impacts on ambient noise levels. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Vibration**

*A significant impact may occur if the project were to expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.*

Construction activities associated with the project could generate ground-borne vibration from use of heavy equipment. These effects would be temporary and short-term in nature and would comply with applicable vibration and noise standards. Project impacts would not be excessive and would be less than significant. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Community Noise Level**

*A significant impact may occur if the project were to substantially and permanently increase the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project.*

The existing land uses along the project corridor include residential, commercial, and light-industrial mixed uses as well as a church. These land uses are mostly mixed together along both sides Magnolia Boulevard within the project limits. The noise sensitive land uses - residential and church - have no outdoor use areas directly exposed to the dominant noise source of traffic noise.

Noise levels at residential land uses on both sides of Magnolia Boulevard were measured with Type I sound level meters between January 24 and January 25, 2018. The daytime average equivalent exterior sound levels along the proposed project alignment were measured at 70 to 74 dBA during the peak noise hour. Interior noise levels at the residences can be assumed to be in the range of 45 to 49 dBA or lower.

As noted above, noise levels generated by operation of the improved Magnolia Boulevard alignment would be like existing conditions. Increases in traffic noise from the proposed project would be negligible because traffic volume increases due to the proposed project would be marginal. Furthermore, although traffic operations would be moved slightly closer to the land uses on the northern side of Magnolia Boulevard, the shift would increase ambient noise levels by less than 1 dB, which is well below a perceivable amount. Therefore, the operations noise of the proposed project is expected to result in less-than-significant impacts on ambient noise levels. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.
Aircraft Noise

For projects within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport, or in the vicinity of a private airstrip, a significant impact may occur if the project were to expose the public to excessive noise levels from aircraft. However, the project would not be located in such areas, and would have no impact on aircraft noise. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

M. Population and Housing

Population Growth

A significant impact may occur if population growth is induced in an area, either directly or indirectly, such that the population of the area may exceed the planned population of that area.

Population density is managed by the City of Los Angeles’ land use and planning designations and building codes. The proposed project would not involve changing the City’s land use and planning designations to a more intense use and therefore would not induce substantial population growth. The proposed project is designed solely to improve traffic conditions and would have no impact on population growth, either directly or indirectly. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

Displace Existing Housing or Substantial Numbers of People

A significant impact may occur if the project resulted in a net loss of 15 or more single-family dwellings or 25 or more multi-family housing dwellings.

The proposed project would be constructed within the existing public right-of-way and would not displace any housing. Thus, the project would have no impact on housing and would not displace any people. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

N. Public Services

Fire Protection

A significant impact may occur if the City of Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) could not adequately serve the proposed project based on response time, access, or fire hydrant or water availability.

The proposed project alignment is served by City of Los Angeles Fire Station 60, located at 5320 Tujunga Avenue, about 0.83 mile away. The proposed project would not result in an increase in population, and thus would not generate a need for new or altered fire protection facilities. The proposed project would be constructed in accordance with applicable fire codes set forth by the State Fire Marshall & LAFD. Therefore, the proposed project would not be a fire hazard and would not exceed the capacity of the LAFD to serve the site or other areas with fire protection services. The nearest local fire responders would be notified, as appropriate, of traffic control plans during construction to coordinate emergency response routing during
construction work. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Police Protection**

*A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to result in an increase in demand for police services that would exceed the capacity of the police department responsible for serving the site.*

The proposed project would not require additional police protection. No impacts on increase in police service demand would occur, and no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Schools**

*A significant impact may occur if the proposed project includes substantial employment or population growth that could generate demand for school facilities that exceeded the capacity of the school district responsible for serving the project site.*

The proposed project would improve traffic flow, reduce traffic congestion, and provide street infrastructure improvements along Magnolia Boulevard. The proposed project is not growth-inducing, either directly or indirectly, and would therefore not increase the demand for schools in the project area. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Parks**

*A significant impact may occur if the recreation and park services available could not accommodate the population increase resulting from the implementation of the proposed project.*

The proposed project would not result in a population increase. No impacts on recreation and park services would occur. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

**Other Public Facilities**

*A significant impact may occur if the project would generate growth such that public facilities would be affected. Projects that do not result in a net increase of 75 residential units normally would not have a significant impact on public facilities.*

The project is not a growth-inducing project, and would not result in a net increase in residential units. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

O. Recreation

**Increase Use of Existing Parks**

*A significant impact may occur if the proposed project includes substantial employment or population growth that may generate demand for public park facilities that exceed the capacity of existing parks.*
Parks near the project alignment include North Hollywood Park, Valley Village Park, and Whitnall Highway Park (North and South). The nearest of these parks are North Hollywood Park and Valley Village Park, both located approximately 0.5 mile west of the project’s western boundary at Vineland Avenue and Magnolia Boulevard. The proposed project would not directly or indirectly lead to population growth. The proposed project thus would not lead to an increased use of parks. No mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

Require Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities

The proposed project would not include or require a recreational facility. No impact would occur, and no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

P. Transportation/Traffic

Q. Utilities and Service Systems

Exceed Wastewater Treatment Requirements

A significant impact may occur if the proposed project exceeds wastewater treatment requirements of the local regulatory governing agency.

Wastewater in the project area is treated through the Donald C. Tillman Water Reclamation Plant located at 6100 Woodley Avenue in Van Nuys. The plant treats approximately 80 million gallons of wastewater per day (MGD). The proposed project is not expected to directly or indirectly induce population growth such that it would generate additional wastewater; therefore, no mitigation measures or further analysis are required.

Require Construction of New Water or Wastewater Facilities

A significant impact may occur if the proposed project resulted in the need for new construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities that could result in an adverse environmental effect that could not be mitigated. In addition, a significant impact may occur if the volume of storm water runoff from the proposed project increases to a level exceeding the capacity of the storm drain system serving the project site. Furthermore, a significant impact may occur if the proposed project’s water demands would exceed the existing water supplies that serve the site. A significant impact may also occur if the proposed project would increase wastewater generation to such a degree that the capacity of facilities currently serving the project site would be exceeded.

The proposed project would not generate additional wastewater such that new water or wastewater facilities would be required. Approximately 16-18 street trees within the project footprint would be removed and replanted, requiring supplemental watering for plant establishment, but long-term water requirements for landscaping would remain largely unchanged.

Water could be used during construction for fugitive dust control, a standard practice among similar projects. This water is typically portable, and would be provided via
water trucks by the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. The amount of water used during construction would be minimal, and water use for fugitive dust control would end upon project completion.

Other than temporary construction water use, the proposed project would not include new water uses. The proposed project thus would not use additional water or generate additional wastewater that would exceed existing capacity.

No right-of-way would be acquired to accommodate the roadway modifications, and no new impervious surfaces would result from the proposed project. The proposed project thus would not increase demands on the storm drain system serving the project site. The proposed project would readjust existing catch basins and maintenance holes, congruent to the sidewalk reconfiguration. The existing storm water facilities in the area are adequate to serve the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures or further analysis of these issues are required.

**Landfill Capacity**

*A significant impact may occur if the proposed project were to increase solid waste generation to a degree that existing and projected landfill capacities would be insufficient to accommodate the additional waste. Further, a significant impact may occur if the proposed project would generate solid waste that was in excess of or was not disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations.*

City of Los Angeles standards for public works require demolition debris to be recycled where feasible, so impacts associated with construction debris would be less than significant. After construction, the project would not generate substantial amounts of solid waste. The project would be designed, constructed, and operated in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, ordinances, and City standards for roadway projects. Thus, no impacts related to solid waste regulations would occur. No mitigation measures or further analysis of this issue are required.

**R. Mandatory Findings of Significance**

Based on the foregoing, it has been determined that:

The project could have *would not pose a high* potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. With incorporation of the standard conditions, the impacts would be reduced to the level of insignificance.

The project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. “Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed together with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

The project does not have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to
the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.

The project does not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

V. STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

No project-specific mitigation measures were identified. The following standard conditions would be incorporated into the construction specifications.

A. Regulatory Requirements

Over 900 species of migratory birds are protected under the federal *Migratory Bird Treaty Act* (MBTA) (Title 33, *United States Code*, Section 703 et seq.; see also Title 50, *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 10) and Section 3503 of the *California Department of Fish and Game Code* protects the nests of all birds (except English sparrows and European starlings).

**SC-BIO-1:** If any trees, shrubs, or other vegetation that could support nesting bird species would be removed during the typical nesting season (i.e., February 1 through August 31), preconstruction nest surveys should be conducted to determine if birds are actively nesting within the proposed project alignment.

**SC-BIO-2:** Construction work near active bird nests would be avoided until the young have left the nest.

**SC-BIO-3:** As feasible, removal of vegetation would be completed outside the nesting season.

B. Construction Notes (G-001)

**SC-HAZ-1:** During excavation and grading, notify and obtain approval from the gas pipelines’ owners/operators (through the DigAlert program), and conduct and monitor activities near the pipelines to avoid damage and subsequent release.

C. Construction General Conditions

**SC-NOI-1:** The use of construction methods and equipment that provide the lowest level of noise impact.

**SC-NOI-2:** Turning off equipment when not in use and minimizing idling equipment.

**SC-NOI-3:** Restricting truck loading, unloading, and hauling operations so that noise and vibration are kept to a minimum near residences to the greatest possible extent.

**SC-NOI-4:** Where feasible, the use of temporary noise barriers, as needed, to protect sensitive receptors against excessive noise from construction activities involving large equipment and by small items such as compressors, generators, pneumatic tools, and jackhammers. Noise barriers can be made of heavy plywood, moveable insulated sound blankets, or other best available control techniques.

**SC-NOI-5:** Restricting construction activities to daytime hours.

D. Construction General Requirements, Section 01562
SC-NOI-6: Locating construction lay-down and staging areas in industrial zones. If industrially zoned areas are not available, commercial zones may be used, or locations at least 100 feet from any noise-sensitive land use (e.g., residences).

VI. NAMES OF PREPARERS

City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering Environmental Management Group

Maria Martin, Group Manager Environmental Affairs Officer
Billy Ho, Environmental Specialist III
Winnie Lam Ramnik Mungra, Project Manager

Parsons

Anne Kochao, Project Manager
Bruce Campbell, Principal Planner and Air Quality Specialist
Laura Florinash, Traffic Engineer
Nak Kim, Traffic Engineer
Thanh Luc, Noise Specialist
Greg Berg, Noise Specialist
Tony Hui, Environmental Planner

Sapphos Environmental, Inc.

Carrie Chasteen, Cultural Resources Specialist
Shudeish Mahadev, Ph.D., Hazardous Material Specialist

VII. DETERMINATION - RECOMMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

A. Summary

The proposed project would widen the northside of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland Avenue and Cahuenga Boulevard to accommodate two through lanes in each direction, with left-turn pockets and on-street parking on each side. Construction of the proposed project would temporarily constrain traffic flow, although one through lane in each direction would remain open during construction. Construction activities would result in temporary localized increases in noise and air pollutant emissions. Additionally, some hazardous materials would be temporarily present on the site in bulk quantities. Historic light posts would be removed during construction and reinstalled, and no other known cultural resources would be affected. Street trees would be removed during construction and replaced in accordance with City policies. Utilities would be relocated or rerouted as needed. The proposed project would not alter local land uses, change the surface hydrology or drainage patterns, or affect public services in the project vicinity. Following construction, the proposed project would have no substantial impacts on noise or air quality, but would have a slight beneficial effect on traffic flows within the proposed project alignment. With implementation of the standard conditions identified above, all potential project impacts would be less than significant. The initial study concluded that the proposed project would result in no impacts and/or less-than-significant impacts on aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, land use / planning, mineral resources, population / housing, public services, recreation, and utilities / service systems. Potentially significant environmental impacts have been
identified in the areas of air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology / soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards & hazardous materials, noise, and transportation / traffic. Compliance with City Standard Construction Specifications, Standard Conditions and Regulatory Requirements will lessen these impacts to a less than significant level.

B. Recommended Environmental Documentation

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent that will render such effects to be environmentally insignificant. As such, a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

Prepared By:  
Anne Kochaon, QEP  
Parsons Transportation Group Inc.

Approved By:  
Gary Lee Moore, P.E.  
City Engineer

By:  
Maria Martin  
Environmental Affairs Officer  
Environmental Management Group
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IX. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC AND AGENCY COMMENTS, REVISIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS, AND COMMENTS AND RESPONSES:

This section summarizes the public outreach activities on the Draft Initial Study (IS) / Proposed Negative Declaration (ND) for the Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Cahuenga Boulevard to Vineland Avenue Project. Responses to public comments received during the public review period is also provided herein.

Public and Agency Review Process

The following discussions summarize the public involvement actions associated with the public circulation for the Draft IS/ND of the proposed project.

Document Circulation

The Notice of Availability of the Draft IS / Proposed ND for the Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) – Cahuenga Boulevard to Vineland Avenue Project (Attachment A) was issued on August 23, 2018. The notice was sent to affected public agencies, stakeholders, and residents and properties within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site. The document was circulated for public review and comment for a period of 30 days, from August 23, 2018 to September 24, 2018. The Draft IS/ND was also available for public review and comment on the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering website at https://eng.lacity.org.

Hard copies of the Draft IS/ND were available at the following public locations:

- Council District 2 – North Hollywood District Office
  5240 N. Lankershim Boulevard, Ste 200
  North Hollywood, CA 91601

- Los Angeles Public Library - North Hollywood Branch
  5211 Tujunga Avenue
  North Hollywood, CA 91601

- Los Angeles Public Library - Studio City Branch
  12511 Moorpark Street
  Studio City, CA 91604

- Los Angeles Public Library – Valley Plaza Branch
  12311 Vanowen Street
  North Hollywood, CA 91605

At the request of Council District 2, the public review period was extended from September 28, 2018 to December 28, 2018, for a total public review period of 131 days.

Newspaper Public Notice

The City posted the Notice of Availability of the Draft IS / Proposed ND for the proposed project in the LA Times on August 23, 2018. A proof of publication is provided in Appendix B.
Community Meeting

Two community meetings were held on November 19, 2018: one at Poquito Mas at 2:30 p.m. for local business owners and the other at the North Hollywood Senior Center at 6:30 for the general public and residents. These meetings were held to present the project’s background and purpose and the environmental analysis and findings. A total of six people attended each meeting. Meeting notices were sent to residents and property owners within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site. The meeting notice is provided in Appendix B.

Response to Public Comments

During this public circulation period, LABOE received a total of 50 comments on the Draft IS/ND from public and agency stakeholders, as follows:

- Public agency: 1
- Organization: 2
- General public: 47

Comments received during the public review period covered the following topics and issues:

- Pedestrian and cyclist safety
- Use of taxpayer money
- Supporting multi-modal transit options
- Vision Zero community initiative
- Public Safety

Each public comment was individually reviewed and addressed with a formal response. The scanned letters are provided below with the numbered comments marked in the margin. Responses to those comments follow each letter.
September 25, 2018

Billy Ho
City of Los Angeles
1149 S. Broadway, Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Subject: Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) - Cahuenga Boulevard to Vineland Avenue
SCE#: 2018081059

Dear Billy Ho:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on September 24, 2018, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse
Response to Comment Letter p-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>The OPR letter is not a comment letter, but an acknowledgement that the draft IS/ND was sent to selected State of California agencies for their comments. No comments on the project were subsequently received from State agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Mr. Ho,

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this project.

As this is a road capacity project, the City as lead agency will need to study the impacts of adding this capacity to vehicle-miles traveled (VMT), per SB 743 (2013) which plainly eliminated level-of-service as the metric of significance as regards CEQA transportation analysis.

The City must also account for the impact that induced demand caused by this new capacity will have on VMT, greenhouse gas emissions, criteria air quality pollution and traffic crashes.

The Governors Office of Planning and Research has issued a technical advisory to lead agencies to assume that every 1% increase in capacity will generate a 1% increase in VMT. The City should follow this guidance.

The link is here: http://opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf

Please confirm receipt of my letter.

Best,

Carter

CARTER RUBIN
Mobility and Climate Advocate
Healthy People & Thriving Communities Program

NATURAL RESOURCES
DEFENSE COUNCIL
1314 SECOND STREET
SANTA MONICA, CA 90401
T 310.434.2300
CRUBIN@NRDC.ORG
NRDC.ORG
**Response to Comment Letter O-1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-1-1:</td>
<td>The City has prepared the Draft Initial Study (IS) / Proposed Negative Declaration (ND) in full compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines, including updates related to Senate Bill (SB) 743. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, <em>Determining the Significance of Transportation Impacts</em>, addresses the use of vehicle-miles traveled (VMT). Subsection c, Applicability, states that, “A lead agency may elect to be governed by the provisions of this section immediately. Beginning on January 1, 2020, the provisions of this section shall apply statewide.” Thus, the use of VMT rather than Level of Service in determining the significance of traffic impacts is not mandatory for an IS/ND prepared in 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-1-2:</td>
<td>The City analyzed the potential traffic impacts of the proposed project on pp. 40-45 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND. Given the short distance (0.5 mile) over which improvements would occur and the minimal effects of the project on congestion at the Cahuenga Boulevard and Vineland Avenue intersections with Magnolia Boulevard, which effectively control capacity along the project alignment, the City does not expect proposed improvements to induce substantial demand. The traffic analysis (Tables 7 and 8) found that the project would have no effect on peak-hour vehicle-to-capacity (v/c) ratios at the Vineland Avenue intersection and only a 4 percent (a.m.) to 5 percent (p.m.) improvement in the peak-hour v/c ratios at the Cahuenga Boulevard intersection. Greenhouse gases, air pollution, and traffic safety were evaluated based on projected future traffic volumes predicted by the traffic study for the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Comment Letter O-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-2:</td>
<td>The commenter’s request for consultation in the event of ground disturbance by the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-1
SARAH ALEXANDER

11/28/2018
City of Los Angeles Mail - I am opposed to widening of Magnolia Blvd

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

I am opposed to widening of Magnolia Blvd

sarah alexander <sasainla2@gmail.com>
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org

Sent from my iPhone

Response to Comment Letter P-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-1:</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-2
DAVID ARETSKY

City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments
Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

danger d <danger3d@gmail.com> Wed, Sep 19, 2018 at 1:50 AM

To: "billy.ho@lacity.org" <billy.ho@lacity.org>
Cc: "ciclavalley@gmail.com" <ciclavalley@gmail.com>, "jackie.keene@lacity.org" <jackie.keene@lacity.org>, "karol.rossian@lacity.org" <karol.rossian@lacity.org>

I am writing because I am opposed to the widening of the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland and Cahuenga. This project does not improve safety conditions for those that use the roadway and puts vulnerable populations at increased risk of injury. Whatever happened to Vision Zero?

This is a growing and vibrant area that needs to serve everyone’s needs safely. Please prioritize projects that saves lives over seconds.

Thank you,
David H. Aretsky
5654 Oakdole Ave.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

--
danger3d@gmail.com

Response to Comment Letter P-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-2-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-2-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City found that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that traffic safety will not be improved by the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-2-3</td>
<td>Vision Zero is a citywide initiative in Los Angeles that makes public safety the highest priority on streets to end all traffic-related deaths and serious injuries by 2025. The Vision Zero Action Plan identifies specific projects at high-priority intersections and along high-priority corridors to achieve its goals. The project is consistent with this citywide initiative as it would not conflict with any planned Vision Zero projects and would enhance vehicular safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-2-4</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-3
JAMES ASKEW

City of Los Angeles Mail - Fwd: Magnolia Widening Project

Fwd: Magnolia Widening Project

Jackie Keene <jackie.keene@lacity.org>  
To: Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>  
Wed, Sep 12, 2018 at 4:27 PM

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: James Askew <jamesaskewfornoho@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Sep 11, 2018 at 7:18 PM
Subject: Magnolia Widening Project
To: "PaulStoriale@NoHoNC.org" <PaulStoriale@nohonc.org>, Sahag Yedalian <sahag.yedalian@lacity.org>, Jackie Keene <jackie.keene@lacity.org>

All,

Why wasn't this brought to the NC by the Bureau of Engineering? We learned of it because a stakeholder alerted us - that's pretty embarrassing frankly, and as the purported point of contact between the city government and stakeholders this is exactly the kind of thing we should be telling them about.

I'll be filing a statement opposing this widening in my personal capacity - it's out of line with the idea of Vision Zero and it's just going to make Magnolia more dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers alike - but it would have been great to have an opportunity to discuss it and take a position on it as a Neighborhood Council. Sadly, the comment period closes before we can do that.

http://eng.lacity.org/magnolia

---

James Askew, Treasurer and District 1 Residential Representative
NoHo Neighborhood Council

http://NoHoNC.org
http://facebook.com/jamesaskewfornoho
Response to Comment Letter P-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-3-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s concern about project notifications is acknowledged. The City provided public notice of the availability of the Draft IS/Proposed ND in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements and with City CEQA policies. Once the Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering (LABOE) became aware of the high level of public interest in this project, the comment period was extended, for a total period of 131 days, and two community meetings were held on November 19, 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-3-2</td>
<td>The Vision Zero Action Plan has identified specific projects on high-priority corridors and at high-priority intersections to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety in the City, and the project would not conflict with those safety initiatives. The Draft IS/Proposed ND indicates on p. 7 that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. As indicated in Item #16(f) in Appendix A of the IS/ND, Environmental Screening Checklist, the City has determined that the project would have no adverse effects on pedestrian or bicyclist safety. The comment offers no substantive evidence that would alter that determination. Please note that, subsequent to the submittal of this comment, the City extended the public review period to provide additional time for members of the community to submit comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-4
JAMES ASKEW

9/24/2018  City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments
2 messages

James Askew <jamesaskewfornoho@gmail.com> Fri, Sep 21, 2018 at 10:17 AM
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org
Cc: "PaulStoriale@NoHoNC.org" <PaulStoriale@nohocnc.org>, Jackie Keene <jackie.keene@lacity.org>, Sahag Yedalian <sahag.yedalian@lacity.org>, visionzero@lacity.org

Mr. Ho,

Please find attached a letter opposing the widening of Magnolia Boulevard. I have attached it in Word and PDF format for your convenience.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at this email. I have copied several neighborhood stakeholders on this email and the catch all email address for Vision Zero Los Angeles.

Thanks for your consideration and all the work you do for our city.

--
James Askew, Treasurer and District 1 Residential Representative
NoHo Neighborhood Council

http://NoHoNC.org
http://facebook.com/jamesaskewfornoho

2 attachments

- Magnolia Blvd Opposition Letter .pdf 88K
- Magnolia Blvd Opposition Letter .docx 13K

James Askew <jamesaskewfornoho@gmail.com> Fri, Sep 21, 2018 at 2:25 PM
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org
Cc: "PaulStoriale@NoHoNC.org" <PaulStoriale@nohocnc.org>, Jackie Keene <jackie.keene@lacity.org>, Sahag Yedalian <sahag.yedalian@lacity.org>, visionzero@lacity.org

All,

Please see the revised letter of opposition - I have corrected a reference in footnote 1.
[Quoted text hidden]

2 attachments

- Magnolia Blvd Opposition Letter REVISED.docx 13K
- Magnolia Blvd Opposition Letter REVISED.pdf 88K
James Askew  
5718 Camellia Ave #104  
North Hollywood, CA 91601  
917-254-0081  
jamesaskewformoh@gmail.com

21 September 2018

City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Bureau of Engineering, EMG  
1149 S. Broadway, Suite 600  
Los Angeles, CA 90015  
Attn: Billy Ho

Dear Mr. Ho,

My name is James Askew. I am a North Hollywood resident who has lived in the community for six years. I use Magnolia Boulevard on a regular basis as both a motorist and a pedestrian. I am also a member of the NoHo Neighborhood Council, but I write to you solely on my personal behalf and my views and opinions expressed in this letter do not reflect those of the NoHo Neighborhood Council or its members.

I am writing to oppose the Magnolia Boulevard street widening project as proposed in the 8/13/18 Initial Draft Report. In general, I find that the report’s aim to “increase vehicular traffic safety” fails to take into account the needs of the community and prioritizes automobile traffic at the expense of the residents of the community. Below, I will outline my specific concerns with the report itself and the project as a whole.

1) The Report Contains a Fundamental Defect in its Analysis

In Section IV-G (page 29), there is a fundamental defect in the report. Notably, the GHG Section on “Consistency with Adopted Plans” is clearly copied and pasted from a report that has nothing to do with this project. This section of the report outlines improvements to a bridge project which would feature LED lights and alternative transit. This is clearly inapplicable to the project at hand, and its inclusion in this report is troubling and speaks to a lack of care in the preparation and analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the current project.

2) The Report is Conclusory Regarding Sidewalk Width

In Section IV-J (page 35), the report explicitly acknowledges that the proposed redesign would reduce the sidewalk width below the recommendation for Avenue II under the Los Angeles Complete Street Design Guide.¹ The report goes on to attest that this impact will “not be significant” as the reduced width is expected to handle anticipated pedestrian volumes. However, no data is given to support this, and it directly contradicts the proposed Transit Neighborhood

¹ See Page 18 of L.A. Street Design Guide.
Plan for the area surrounding the Orange Line station at North Hollywood. In the absence of better data outlining anticipated future usage of the area by pedestrians, this element of the report is conclusory and unsupported.

On a personal note, I have two young children (ages 5 and 23 months) and one of the features my family loves about this community is its walkability. That said, we avoid sidewalks that are narrow because they are difficult to navigate with a stroller and with a young child who is walking on a narrow sidewalk with minimal separation from traffic that routinely drives at speeds approaching 40mph or higher. Turning this side of Magnolia Boulevard into yet another narrow sidewalk makes it harder for us (and people like us) to enjoy the community in which we live.

3) The Proposed Street Design Raises Substantial Speed Concerns

The Los Angeles Complete Street Design Guide states that the target speed for a street designated as Avenue II should be 30mph. However, Magnolia Boulevard is already signed at 35mph within the city limits. Traffic Engineers generally note that an increase in lanes will not lead to a reduction in speeds; in fact more lanes are often associated with higher speeds, increasing the risk of injury to drivers, pedestrians and cyclists. When coupled with the state’s infamous 85% law (a law that requires speed limits to be set at the 85th percentile of prevailing local traffic) and a lack of commitment to speed enforcement by LAPD, this will almost certainly lead to the speed limit on Magnolia boulevard creeping up to 40mph within a decade. We have already seen this take place on streets in our community and throughout the city. As is well established, higher speeds are associated with increased fatality rates and injury rates, and the report fails to take this into account despite its focus on safety for vehicular traffic.

4) The Proposed Street Design Ignores Vision Zero Goals

Relatedly, Los Angeles has committed to a Vision Zero goal by 2025. This means streets should be designed with safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists in mind. This street design - a seven lane wide road with minimal design elements to help pedestrians safely navigate it - is a complete repudiation of this goal. There is no discussion of, for example, pedestrian bump outs which help to throttle traffic where it intersects with pedestrians, lower turn speeds and give pedestrians a smaller roadway to cross. Nor is there any discussion of using Leading Pedestrian Intervals at the three signalized intersections to allow pedestrians a chance to enter the roadway early and gain physical priority over automobiles. Lastly, there is no discussion of narrowing lane widths to create bike lanes to enhance safety for cyclists. Indeed, the road design looks like

---

3 See www.kearneyhub.com/opinions/otheropinions/how-california-cranks-up-its-speed-limits/article_4717e7e922-914e-11e9-99d1-0872f2b1f6d.html (despite being L.A.'s most dangerous street, speed limits increased because of state law)

4 http://visionzero.lacity.org/what-is-vision-zero-la/
something that might have been proposed in the 1960s and fails to take into account any modern street design improvements.

5) The Proposed Design Removes 16 Street Trees

Street trees in our highly urban community are necessary for shade, cooling, and in helping to reduce GHGs. This plan establishes that 16 mature trees will be removed and replaced with young trees. While I appreciate the attempt to mitigate the loss, this is a 20-30 year project to grow those new trees into mature trees, assuming that the trees are maintained by the city. This is an area of NoHo that is particularly lacking in tree coverage, so the removal of 16 - even if replaced by young trees at the end of the project - will have a substantial impact on the streetscape.

6) Public Outreach Has Been Minimal

When Great Streets L.A. proposed a redesign of Lankershim Boulevard, that team took substantial steps to engage the community. They attended neighborhood events, hosted a pop-up event showing a proposed street design to the community, and attended at least two different NC meetings. Even after all that, they hosted further forums within the community at the request of the Councilmember to ensure stakeholders were given a chance to engage with the proposed redesign. In contrast, this design was sent to the NC and Councilmember via US mail and posted at local libraries. There have been no attempts to hold meetings in order to discuss the design with the public. I have no doubt that people on all sides would appreciate a chance to engage on the issue now, rather than be surprised when they suddenly discover lane closures and a fait accompli widening. The community deserves a chance to weigh in on this.

For the above mentioned reasons, I must ask BOE to revise its report (particularly Secs IV-G and IV-J) and resubmit it for consideration. In doing so, I strongly encourage BOE to look at a better street design that will incorporate modern safety elements, control the speed to 30mph as outlined for Avenue-II designated streets, and better mitigate the loss of important trees to our community.

Thank you for your consideration and everything you do for our city.

Best Regards,
James Askew

cc: Paul Storiale, NoHo NC
    Jackie Keene, Councilmember Paul Krekorian’s Office
    Sahag Yedalian, Councilmember Paul Krekorian’s Office
    Vision Zero L.A.
### Response to Comment Letter P-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| P-4-1   | The Draft IS/Proposed ND is intended to provide information to the City’s decision-makers prior to their approval of the project. One of the purposes of public and agency review is to afford an opportunity for them to comment on the accuracy and completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND prior to approval of the Final IS/ND.  
The text of the first paragraph on page 28 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND is revised to read:  
*The proposed project would comply with all federal, State, and local regulations to reduce GHG emissions. The proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD’s threshold for GHG, and thus would not have a significant impact on GHG emissions. Consequently, the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted to reduce the emissions of GHGs, including AB 32 and the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan (CARB 2014).  
Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.* |
| P-4-2   | The City acknowledges the commenter’s concerns about sidewalk widths. As noted in the comment, the City’s Complete Street Design Guide recommends a width of 15 feet for this class of roadway. This aspirational goal of the City is not based solely on pedestrian safety. Sidewalks perform a variety of functions, and may accommodate pedestrian furniture, signage, street trees, planters, and other features. The City’s design recommendations identify 4 zones of the sidewalk (Frontage Zone, Pedestrian Zone, Amenity Zone, and Flex Zone), and are intended to provide sidewalk widths that can easily accommodate the full range of sidewalk amenities.  
With regard to safety, the Americans with Disabilities Act recommends a minimum sidewalk width of 3 feet. A 7-foot to 8-foot wide sidewalk can accommodate 2-way pedestrian traffic with some additional width for other sidewalk amenities. The width of the sidewalk is not a traffic safety factor given that pedestrians may be present on the edge of the sidewalk nearest to the traffic regardless of the width of the sidewalk.  
Most interactions between pedestrians and motor vehicles occur where pedestrians attempt to cross the street. Marked crosswalks are provided at the Cahuenga Boulevard, Riverton Avenue, and Vineland Avenue signalized intersections. |
| P-4-3   | The City has no plans to increase the speed limit on Magnolia Boulevard, nor – as the comment indicates – is a higher speed limit appropriate for this class of roadway. The comment’s assertion that adding a second through lane, which is consistent with the street’s Secondary Highway designation, would lead to substantially higher vehicle speeds is an assumption not supported by available information.  
Furthermore, most pedestrian – vehicle interactions would occur at the three signalized intersections where pedestrians are attempting to cross Magnolia Boulevard in a crosswalk on a red light. Motorists on Magnolia Boulevard would not be traveling at the posted speed limit under the specific circumstances where pedestrians would be at risk. |
| P-4-4   | The Vision Zero Action Plan has identified specific projects on high-priority corridors and at high-priority intersections to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety in the City, and the project would not conflict with those safety initiatives.  
The Complete Streets Design Guide and Vision Zero program both provide recommended design concepts which City engineers may incorporate into a project to address specific mobility and safety concerns, as well as design “best practices” suitable for incorporation into any project. Similarly, bicycle lanes and on-street parking are design options that City staff may consider, depending on demand and on available rights-of-way and funding. The comment takes exception to the design of the project rather than to the potential environmental impacts of the project. |
| P-4-5   | The Draft IS/Proposed ND addresses street tree removal and replacement several times, including in the Project Description on page 6, Scenic Resources on p. 8, Visual Character and Quality on p. 9, and Biological Resources on p. 17. The Draft IS/Proposed ND indicates (p. 17) that the street trees removed during construction of the project would be replaced in accordance with existing City policies, which require trees to be replaced at a ratio of 2:1.  
As noted on p. 9 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the trees to be removed are “at various stages of growth” and are not all mature. The trees to be removed include several small trees, small fan palms, and some trees in poor health; collectively these trees provide a limited area of canopy and shade. They are a minor visual element of the overall streetscape. |
The sizes and types of replacement trees to be planted have not yet been determined, but trees with moderate to high growth rates can grow 2 to 3 feet per year with proper care, so 5 to 10 years is a more reasonable timeframe for replacing the existing tree resources. The City has determined that this minor temporary impact on biological and aesthetic resources would be less than significant.

The proposed Magnolia Boulevard project is not a redesign of this street, but rather a minor widening, completing a project that began in 2008 with the widening of the south side of Magnolia Boulevard. The City provided public notice of the availability of the Draft IS/Proposed ND in accordance with CEQA requirements and with City CEQA policies. Once the LABOE became aware of the high level of public interest in this project, and subsequent to the submittal of this comment letter, the comment period was extended and community meetings were held.

The Final IS/ND is intended to provide information to the City’s decision-makers prior to their approval of the project. One of the purposes of public and agency review of the Draft IS/Proposed ND is to afford an opportunity for them to comment on its accuracy and completeness prior to approval of the Final IS/ND. Public review presumes some revisions to the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and whether it would be recirculated prior to being certified as final is at the discretion of the City as lead agency for CEQA documentation.
**Comment Letter No. P-5**  
**NARINEH AWANESSI**

9/27/2018  
City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

**Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments**

narineh.awanessi <navaness@gmail.com>  
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org  
Cc: karodorosian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org, ciclavally@gmail.com

I am writing because I am opposed to the widening of the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland and Cahuenga. This project does not improve safety conditions for those that use the roadway and puts vulnerable populations at increased risk of injury.

This is a growing and vibrant area that needs to serve everyone’s needs safely. Please prioritize projects that saves lives over seconds.

Signed,

Narineh Avanessi  
5303 Satsuma Ave #118  
North Hollywood, CA 91601  
Sent from my iPhone

---

**Response to Comment Letter P-5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-5-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-5-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City found that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-5-3</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Comment Letter No. P-6**  
**BETTE BILLET**
Response to Comment Letter P-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-6-1</td>
<td>Under CEQA, a public hearing or meeting during the public review period is not required for a ND; this community meeting was a supplemental effort by the City to inform the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-6-2</td>
<td>The issues raised in the comment are economic concerns that are outside the scope of CEQA documentation. The loss of revenue by businesses along the alignment, while of concern to the City, is not an environmental issue. Similarly, incidental damage to buildings from construction activities is an economic rather than an environmental issue. The City would take appropriate measures during the short construction period for the project to minimize disruption of local businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-6-3</td>
<td>Two community meetings were held on the proposed project during the public review period. Under CEQA, a public hearing or meeting during the public review period is not required for a ND; these community meetings were a supplemental effort by the City to inform the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-6-4</td>
<td>On-site posting is among the legal options for public notice about the project. In addition, the Notice of Availability for the project was advertised in a local newspaper and posted at the County Clerk’s office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-6-5</td>
<td>See response to comment P-6-3 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-6-6</td>
<td>Under CEQA, a public hearing or meeting during the public review period is not required for a ND. By extending the public comment period and presenting the project at a Neighborhood Committee meeting, the City went over and above the legal requirements for public notification. Adequate time and information were provided to facilitate public comment on the accuracy and completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-6-7</td>
<td>The purpose of the public comment period is to receive comments on the accuracy and completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND. The bidding and contracting processes are not part of the environmental review. The City will continue to keep the community informed about the progress of and schedule for the project in accordance with standard City processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-7
RICHARD BOURNE

Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Richard Bourne <richard.bourne@pdgc.com>
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org
Cc: karo.torossian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org, ciclavalley@gmail.com

Mon, Sep 17, 2018 at 1:22 PM

I am writing because I am opposed to the widening of the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland and Cahuenga. This project does not improve safety conditions for those that use the roadway and puts vulnerable populations at increased risk of injury.

This is a growing and vibrant area that needs to serve everyone’s needs safely. Please prioritize projects that saves lives over seconds.

The city has more than enough roads, which cost more and more in maintenance each year. Let’s focus on investments that increase productive activity rather than increase costs.

Richard Bourne
363 S Berendo
Work in the Media district

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message or its attachments. If you think you received this message in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message from your system.

Response to Comment Letter P-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-7-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-7-2</td>
<td>The Draft IS/Proposed ND indicates on p. 7 that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. As indicated in Item #16(f) in Appendix A of Draft IS/Proposed ND, Environmental Screening Checklist, the City has determined that the project would have no adverse effects on pedestrian or bicyclist safety. The comment offers no substantive evidence that would alter that determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-7-3</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinions about current trends in the project area and about how the City should prioritize projects are acknowledged. No further response is required with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-7-4</td>
<td>The proposed project is consistent with the City’s long-term mobility plans, which seek to maintain the productivity of the community into the future by investing both in road improvement projects and in other modes of travel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-8  
RICHARD BOURNE

Maglolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments  

Richard Bourne <rpbourne@gmail.com>  
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org  
Cc: jackie.keene@lacity.org, craneravenoho@gmail.com, ciclavalley@gmail.com, karotroossian@lacity.org

I am writing because I am opposed to the widening of the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland and Cahuenga. This project seems to have no positives, while increasing the chance of local injuries and fatalities. It costs precious capital and maintenance dollars that could be better used in just about any capacity.

I work and shop in the area, but if the roads all become speedways I'll probably choose to spend my time and money elsewhere.

Richard Bourne

Response to Comment Letter P-8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-8-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged. No further response is required with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-8-2</td>
<td>The comment makes an unsupported assumption that adding a lane of traffic would adversely affect pedestrian safety. The City is responsible for enhancing both mobility and safety in the community and must balance competing demands on available resources. The City believes this project improves traffic flows without adversely affecting pedestrian safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-8-3</td>
<td>The City acknowledges the commenter’s concerns. The City is responsible for enhancing both mobility and safety in the community and must balance competing demands on available resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-9
VICTOR BOYCE

12/6/2018
City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Victor Boyce <sixspeedcam@yahoo.com>       Thu, Dec 6, 2018 at 12:04 PM
To: Billy Ho@lacity.org
Cc: karo.torossian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org, craneravenoho@gmail.com, ciclvalley@gmail.com

I am writing because I am opposed to the widening of the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland and Cahuenga. This project does not improve safety conditions for those that use the roadway and puts vulnerable populations at increased risk of injury.

This is a growing and vibrant area that needs to serve everyone's needs safely. Please prioritize projects that saves lives over seconds.

Signed,

Victor H Boyce
14231 Emeita St SO 91401

Sent from my iPhone

Response to Comment Letter P-9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-9-1</td>
<td>The commenter's opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-9-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND the City found that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-9-3</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter's opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Comment Letter P-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-10-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-10-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City found that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-10-3</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Comment Letter P-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-11-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-11-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND found that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-11-3</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-11-4</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-12
BRAD CARR

12/26/2018
City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments
1 message

Brad Carr <bradcarr@gmail.com>  
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org
Cc: karo.torossian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org, craneravenoho@gmail.com, ciclavallley@gmail.com

Mon, Dec 24, 2018 at 10:17 AM

I am writing because I am opposed to the widening of the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland and Cahuenga. This project does not improve safety conditions for those that use the roadway and puts vulnerable populations at increased risk of injury. In addition, I’m concerned about the safety for those who use the sidewalks.

I regularly walk to work. I live in Valley Village and work at Endemol Shine North America in the building at 5161 Lankershim. The Magnolia North side sidewalk just west of Tujunga (same block as the 7 Eleven and across from the NoHo dinner) is beyond narrow. See attached photo. Anyone with a disability would have a difficult time making it through this block. Due to the obstruction of light poles and zero setback of the buildings, the obstructions make it near impossible for a wheelchair to get through here. I encourage you to take a walk during your lunch break. Bring a tape measure and experience this sidewalk.

Please don’t widen the road. Please don’t increase vehicular speed. Please don’t increase the danger to bikers and pedestrians. This is a growing and vibrant area that needs to serve everyone’s needs safely. Please prioritize projects that saves lives over seconds.

Thank you,

Brad Carr
11856 Hartsock St.
Valley Village, CA 91607
323-653-7988

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ik=0c15bae64e&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-fk%3Af%1%2020758165342662835&simpt=msg-fk%3Af%1%20207581653...
### Response to Comment Letter P-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-12-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-12-2</td>
<td>The Draft IS/Proposed ND indicates on p. 7 that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. As indicated in Item #16(f) in Appendix A of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, <em>Environmental Screening Checklist</em>, the City has determined that the project would have no adverse effects on pedestrian or bicyclist safety. The comment provides no substantive evidence that would alter that determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-12-3</td>
<td>As indicated in Item #16(f) in Appendix A of Draft IS/Proposed ND, <em>Environmental Screening Checklist</em>, the City has determined that the project would have no adverse effects on pedestrian or bicyclist safety. The comment provides no substantive evidence that would alter that determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-12-4</td>
<td>The City appreciates the commenter’s observations about conditions on Magnolia Boulevard and the commenter’s opinions about accessibility for those with disabilities. No further response is required with respect to the accuracy or completeness of Draft IS/Proposed ND.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-12-5</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinions about current trends in the project area and about how the City should prioritize projects are acknowledged. No further response is required with respect to the accuracy or completeness of Draft IS/Proposed ND.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Comment Letter P-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-13-1</td>
<td>The comment makes an unsupported assumption that adding a lane of traffic would adversely affect pedestrian safety. The City is responsible for enhancing both mobility and safety in the community and must balance competing demands on available resources. The City believes this project would improve traffic flows without adversely affecting pedestrian safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-13-2</td>
<td>The City is responsible for enhancing both mobility and safety in the community and must balance competing demands on available resources. The City believes this project would improve traffic flows without adversely affecting pedestrian safety.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Comment Letter P-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-14</td>
<td>Under CEQA, a public hearing or meeting during the public review period is not required for a ND. By extending the public comment period and presenting the project at a Neighborhood Committee meeting, the City went over and above the legal requirements for public notification. Adequate time and information were provided to facilitate public comment on the accuracy and completeness of Draft IS/Proposed ND.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-15
YANG CHONG

11/26/2018 City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Yang Chong <yanguchong@hotmail.com> Thu, Nov 15, 2018 at 11:35 AM
To: “Billy Ho @lacity.org” <Billy.ho@lacity.org>
Cc: “karo.torossian@lacity.org” <karo.torossian@lacity.org>, “jackie.keene@lacity.org” <jackie.keene@lacity.org>, “craneravenoh@gmail.com” <craneravenoh@gmail.com>, “ciclavalley@gmail.com” <ciclavalley@gmail.com>

Please don't widen the streets anymore. Look what happens when you make a city pedestrian friendly, ie Downtown LA.

Cities with freeways as streets are just not very popular.

It’s people who do not live in the neighborhood that think this is a good idea. They just want to speed through North Hollywood as fast as possible with no concern for people who actually live there.

Let’s make North Hollywood a top class city. It’s bad enough that Lankershim has languished because it has not been made people friendly. Let’s not do the same to Magnolia.

I live in North Hollywood, btw. Please feel free to reach out to me.

Thank You

Response to Comment Letter P-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-15</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinions about the appropriateness of the project, the character of the neighborhood, and the intentions of motorists are acknowledged. No further response is required with respect to the accuracy or completeness of Draft IS/Proposed ND.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-16
JOSHUA COHEN

Mon, Sep 24, 2018 at 12:36 PM

To Whom It May Concern:

I write to oppose the widening of the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineyard and Cahuenga to accommodate additional vehicular capacity. So doing does not improve safety conditions for those that use the roadway and puts vulnerable populations at increased risk of injury. It is a radical departure from the Vision Zero principles, which the City so recently espoused. All the data indicates that adding vehicular capacity and speed causes more death and injury, not less, particularly when at the expense of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, which is what is most sorely needed. This is particularly true of the San Fernando Valley, which falls behind of other parts of Los Angeles in its protection of vulnerable road users.

This a growing and vibrant area that needs to serve everyone’s needs safely. This City has a duty to put the lives of vulnerable road ahead of shaving seconds off drivers’ commutes. Failing to do so is a relinquishment of the public trust.

Respectfully,

Joshua C. Cohen
Cohen Law Partners
Attorneys at Law
4929 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 412
Los Angeles, CA 90010
Tel. 323-937-7105
Fax: 323-937-0958
email: josh@cohenlawpartners.com
website: www.losangelesbicycleattorney.com

Please note we do not accept service of any kind via electronic mail. Any correspondences related to service is not to be deemed a waiver or acceptance of service of any documents unless expressly stated.

Information contained in this electronic communication and any attachments transmitted within is confidential and may contain information that is legally privileged. It is only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, release, retransmission, copying, dissemination or other use of, or taking any action in reliance upon, this communication, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this
### Response to Comment Letter P-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-16-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-16-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City found that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-16-3</td>
<td>Vision Zero is a citywide initiative in Los Angeles that makes public safety the highest priority on streets to end all traffic-related deaths and serious injuries by 2025. The Vision Zero Action Plan identifies specific projects at high-priority intersections and along high-priority corridors to achieve its goals. The project is consistent with this citywide initiative as it would not conflict with any planned Vision Zero projects and would enhance vehicular safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-16-4</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City found that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that safety would not be improved or that the San Fernando Valley falls behind other parts of Los Angeles in its protection of vulnerable road users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-16-5</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Bl, North Hollywood street widening project

9/18/2018

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Magnolia Bl, North Hollywood street widening project

Manny Figueras <manny_figueras@yahoo.com>
To: "billy.ho@lacity.org" <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Mon, Sep 17, 2018 at 6:07 PM

Mark Goldman owner of Advance Liquidators Furniture 10631 Magnolia Bl, North Hollywood 818-402-4200 cell Our company has been in North Hollywood for 35 years. Please call me I have an opinion and suggestion. Thanks

Response to Comment Letter P-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-17</td>
<td>City staff are available during regular business hours to listen to the opinions and suggestions of business owners in the project area. However, the purpose of the public review period is to allow individuals and organizations to comment on the completeness and accuracy of Draft IS/Proposed ND. No further response is required with respect to the accuracy or completeness of Draft IS/Proposed ND.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Comment Letter No. P-18**  
**KEVIN FLANAGAN**  

**Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments**  
Kevin Flanagan <smaug@maugslair.com>  
To: "billy.ho@lacity.org" <billy.ho@lacity.org>  
Cc: karo.torossian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org, ciclavalley@gmail.com  

I just came across the proposal for this project and I am strongly opposed. I live a couple blocks north of Magnolia on Satsuma, so use this street via bike, car or feet every day. One of the appealing things about the neighborhood is it's walkability; reducing the size of sidewalks to make room for faster cars is only an improvement for the drivers speeding through my neighborhood, not for the people who live and work there. The proposal mentions improvements to vehicle safety, what about safety for other, much more vulnerable street users? My own daily experience is that Magnolia needs more crosswalks, not wider lanes. Please do not take action on this car-centric project and instead investigate a plan more in line with Vision Zero!  

Thank you,  
Kevin Flanagan  
5303 Satsuma Ave #115  
North Hollywood, CA, 91601  

---  

**Response to Comment Letter P-18**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-18-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-18-2</td>
<td>The City appreciates the commenter’s observations about conditions in the project area. Sidewalks on the south side of Magnolia Boulevard along the project alignment are 7 feet wide. The proposed project would narrow the sidewalk on the north side of Magnolia Boulevard to a width of 7 to 8 feet. The sidewalks would still be adequate for pedestrian use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-18-3</td>
<td>In Appendix A, <em>Environmental Screening Checklist</em>, Section #16, Item “f”, of Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City indicated its finding that the proposed project would not decrease the safety of pedestrian facilities in the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-18-4</td>
<td>The City appreciates the commenter’s observations about conditions in the project area. Within the project alignment, Magnolia Boulevard has crosswalks at Vineland Avenue, Riverton Avenue, and Cahuenga Boulevard. Additional mid-block crosswalks would unnecessarily impede the flow of traffic while not substantially contributing to pedestrian safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-18-5</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged. The Vision Zero program has identified specific projects to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety in the City, and the project would not conflict with those safety initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-19

ANDY FREELAND

9/18/2018

City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Andy Freeland <andy@andyfreeland.net>
To: Billy Ho@lacity.org
Cc: karo.torossian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org

I am writing because I am opposed to the widening of the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland and Cahuenga. This project does not improve safety conditions for those that use the roadway and puts vulnerable populations at increased risk of injury.

This is a growing and vibrant area that needs to serve everyone’s needs safely. Please prioritize projects that save lives over seconds.

Andy Freeland
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Response to Comment Letter P-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-19-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description, page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that traffic safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-19-3</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Comment Letter P-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-20-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-20-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City found that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that traffic safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-20-3</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-21
SCOTT GARNER

11/26/2018

City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Scott Garner <scott.garner@gmail.com>         Sat, Nov 17, 2016 at 10:30 AM
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org
Cc: karotorossian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org, craneravenohd@gmail.com, ciclavalley@gmail.com

I am writing because I am opposed to the widening of the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland and
Cahuenga. This project does not improve safety conditions for those that use the roadway and puts vulnerable
populations at increased risk of injury.

This is a growing and vibrant area that needs to serve everyone’s needs safely. Please prioritize projects that saves lives
over seconds.

Signed,
Scott Garner
10700 Octave Lane
North Hollywood, CA

Response to Comment Letter P-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-21-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| P-21-2  | As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City found that vehicular safety would
be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not
provide any additional information to support the claim that traffic safety would not be improved. |
| P-21-3  | We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required. |
Response to Comment Letter P-22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-22-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-22-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City found that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that traffic safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-22-3</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-23
ROSS HOPPE

9/17/2018
City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Ross Hoppe <rosshoppe@gmail.com>  Mon, Sep 17, 2018 at 8:26 AM
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org
Cc: karo.torossian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org, cclavalley@gmail.com

Good Morning,

I am writing to strongly oppose the widening of the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland and Cahuenga.

As a resident of the area who regularly walks, bikes, and patronize businesses on and around this stretch of Magnolia, I am deeply concerned that widening the street will only add traffic and encourage faster speeds. As a city with a Vision Zero plan, we should be moving in the opposite direction - narrowing streets, placing calming measures, and increasing space for alternative transit (walking, cycling, scooting...). The better solution for this stretch would be to remove a west bound lane of travel, lower the speed, and add in bike lanes.

Let's look to the future in terms of both growth and safety.

Ross

--
Ross Hoppe
11820 Chandler Blvd #3
Valley Village CA 91607

Response to Comment Letter P-23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-23-1</td>
<td>The commenter's opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-23-2</td>
<td>The City analyzed the potential traffic impacts of the proposed project on pp. 40-45 of Draft IS/Proposed ND. Given the short distance (0.5 mile) over which improvements would occur and the minimal effects of the project on congestion at the Cahuenga Boulevard and Vineland Avenue intersections with Magnolia Boulevard, which effectively control capacity along the project alignment, the City does not expect proposed improvements to induce substantial new demand. The traffic analysis (Tables 7 and 8) found that the project would have no effect on peak-hour vehicle-to-capacity (v/c) ratios at the Vineland Avenue intersection and only a 4 percent (a.m.) to 5 percent (p.m.) improvement in the peak-hour v/c ratios at the Cahuenga Boulevard intersection. With regard to average vehicle speeds, the distance between signalized intersections is about 0.25 mile (about 30 seconds at 30 miles per hour), and thus vehicles have limited time and distance over which to accelerate and decelerate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-23-3</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the preferred balance between motor vehicles and other travel modes is acknowledged. The Vision Zero program has identified specific projects to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety in the City, and the project would not conflict with those safety initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-24
KEVIN HOPPS

12/6/2018

City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Kevin Hopps <kevin.hopps@sbglobal.net>
To: "Billy.Ho@lacity.org" <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Thu, Dec 6, 2018 at 11:56 AM

Please do not do this. Please do not widen Magnolia Boulevard. | P-24-1

I understand there is a plan to widen the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland and Cahuenga. It is also my understanding that this will not improve safety conditions for those using the street and that it is more likely to put drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists in greater danger, risking lives instead of saving them. | P-24-2

I oppose this project and hope that we can start showing some vision when we deal with our Zero Vision goals. | P-24-3

Thank you for considering my concerns and wishes,

Kevin Hopps
12015 Kling Street #111
Valley Village, CA 91607

Response to Comment Letter P-24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-24-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-24-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City found that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that traffic safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-24-3</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged. Vision Zero is a citywide initiative in Los Angeles that makes public safety the highest priority on streets to end all traffic-related deaths and serious injuries by 2025. The Vision Zero Action Plan identifies specific projects at high-priority intersections and along high-priority corridors to achieve its goals. The project is consistent with this citywide initiative as it would not conflict with any planned Vision Zero projects and would enhance vehicular safety.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Comment Letter P-25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-25-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-25-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City found that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that traffic safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-25-3</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-26
LUKE KLIPP

9/17/2018
City of Los Angeles Mail - Opposed to Magnolia widening

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Opposed to Magnolia widening
1 message

Luke Klipp <lukehkipp@gmail.com> Mon, Sep 17, 2018 at 10:06 AM
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org
Cc: karo.torossian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org

Good morning,

I am writing to express my opposition to the LADOT's BSS proposed widening of the north side of Magnolia Blvd, between Vineland and Cahuenga. At a time when the City of LA has approved a Vision Zero Action Plan and a Mobility Plan, this project will do nothing to improve safety conditions for those that drive along Magnolia while it actually makes this street much more dangerous for those walking and biking along it.

Furthermore, I request a response demonstrating the City's plan for tree replacement along the sidewalk where trees will necessarily have to be removed to widen the roadway. If I do not receive a response to this point of information, I will be submitting a FOIA request relating to the City's street tree replacement plan for this and all other roadway widenings in the past 5 years and 5 years to come. The City simply cannot afford to be tearing out trees along its rights-of-way at a time when our climate is in crisis and our urban heat island effect is putting the health and safety of our most vulnerable residents at increased risk.

LA needs to reconsider its decades-long approach to street widenings as a "solution" to congestion and to instead invest in giving people options to having to drive in their cars. Narrowing a sidewalk and removing dozens of street trees is not only not a solution - it's creating even more of a problem.

I look forward to your response. Thank you.

Regards,
Luke H. Klipp

----
email: lukehkipp@gmail.com
phone: (415) 203-3102

Work like you don't need the money,
Love like you've never been hurt, and
Dance like nobody's watching.
Response to Comment Letter P-26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-26-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged. No further response is required with respect to the accuracy or completeness of Draft IS/Proposed ND.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-26-2</td>
<td>The Vision Zero program has identified specific projects to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety in the City, and the project would not conflict with those safety initiatives. One of the goals of the proposed project is to improve traffic and pedestrian safety in the project area. By providing an additional through lane, the proposed project would improve vehicular safety without affecting pedestrian safety. In Appendix A, Environmental Screening Checklist, Section #16, Item “f”, of Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City indicated its finding that the proposed project would not decrease the safety of pedestrian facilities in the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-26-3</td>
<td>The City appreciates the commenter’s concerns about street trees along the proposed project alignment. The City’s plan is to implement its existing street tree policies. In several places in Draft IS/Proposed ND, including Scenic Resources on p. 8, Visual Character and Quality on p. 9, and Biological Resources on p. 17, Draft IS/Proposed ND indicates that the street trees removed during construction of the project would be replaced in accordance with existing City policies, which require trees to be replaced at a ratio of 2:1. Because the existing trees would be replaced, the project would not contribute long-term to an urban heat island effect or to climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-26-4</td>
<td>The City appreciates the commenter’s concerns about congestion and loss of street trees, and notes again that Draft IS/Proposed ND makes clear that trees removed during project construction would be replaced. This street-widening project is part of a long-term City program to improve sub-regional mobility in the project area, and is consistent with City plans to improve pedestrian safety and alternative modes of travel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Response to Comment Letter P-27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-27-1</td>
<td>This is not a comment, but rather a quote of text from Draft IS/Proposed ND. No further response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-27-2</td>
<td>Given that the existing street trees are of various species and sizes, the replacement trees would be of various species, and the sizes of the replacement trees are still to be decided, the number of years would differ for each tree, and no specific response can be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-27-3</td>
<td>The new trees would be spaced as evenly as possible along the alignment, to the extent that existing side streets, driveway cuts, and other existing street features allow. The trees would be placed along the curb with the tree wells extending into the sidewalk area as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-27-4</td>
<td>Trees are both aesthetic and biological resources. Street tree canopies provide low-quality nesting, roosting, and foraging habitat for a limited number of generally common urban bird species. And the aesthetic value of a tree is not directly related to the size of the canopy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Comment Letter P-28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-28-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-28-2</td>
<td>The Draft IS/Proposed ND indicates on p. 7 that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. As indicated in Item #16(f) in Appendix A of Draft IS/Proposed ND, Environmental Screening Checklist, the City has determined that the project would have no adverse effects on pedestrian or bicyclist safety. The comment provides no substantive evidence that would alter that determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-28-3</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the value of intersection level of service (LOS) in traffic impact analysis is noted. LOS is a long-standing, widely used, and substantially accurate measure of traffic congestion. It is not outdated, but rather its use as a measure of significance in environmental documents has been found to focus mitigation efforts on capacity at the expense of other aspects of traffic impacts. The use of VMT rather than LOS in determining the significance of traffic impacts under CEQA is not yet mandatory, and the City has elected to use LOS to evaluate the traffic impacts of this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-28-4</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinions about current trends in the project area and about how the City should prioritize projects are acknowledged. No further response is required with respect to the accuracy or completeness of Draft IS/Proposed ND.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-29
LIZ LANAHAN

11/26/2018
City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Liz L <liz.lanahan@gmail.com>  
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org

Hi, I am writing about the proposed Magnolia boulevard widening! Please don't widen this boulevard! I live in this area without a car and I feel like widening the street between Cahuenga and Vineland would be awful for everyone who lives nearby without cars, or people who want to walk around their apartment and feel safe. Just last night I was trying to cross the north side of Magnolia to the south at Magnolia/Vineland (going to the pizza place across the street while I waited for my prescription at Walgreens to be field). These few blocks of Magnolia have some of the strongest pedestrian life in North Hollywood, and there were people at every corner of the intersection. The pedestrian walk sign went on and me and the other three or four people began to cross. But a driver in the right turn lane almost killed us! We had to jump back because he did a right turn at forty miles an hour without checking to see if there was anyone he should look out for!

Basically, cars already move way too fast on Magnolia. I feel like if you're driving you get frustrated at having to wait at a light, but most of the times the cars blow by very fast. I bike almost everywhere for my commute to work, to valley college, to get groceries etc, and it's extremely frustrating if I have one destination on Magnolia, then I have to hug the (dangerous and narrow) bike lane on Vineland up to the Chandler bike path, then ride along it as my east-west route until I get to the point where I can take a side street down to my second destination on Magnolia. The sidewalks are already too narrow and there are often pedestrians, so I don't like to stay on the sidewalk because I don't want to bother people walking. But biking on Magnolia is truly terrifying! If it were not for Chandler I would avoid this area altogether.

I fear that widening the street would kill any pedestrian life that already exists. If you do not believe me, please walk the several blocks along Magnolia between Vineland and Cahuenga and think about how it would feel if the cars were going even faster. I guess it's about who you want the city to be helpful for - people who live in the area and spend money at the shops and pay rent or property taxes in the area? Or people who are driving through really fast and want to go even faster?

Magnolia boulevard is not a freeway alternative, it's a lively boulevard full of amenities and apartments. If people want to drive 40 mph they can go on the 134 or something. But if people want to live without a car they have no choice but to be fearful of people who drive too fast without looking on these roads!

Response to Comment Letter P-29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-29</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged. The purpose of the public review is to provide the public and other governmental agencies an opportunity to review and comment on Draft IS/Proposed ND. Statements in support of or in opposition to the project, anecdotes about the character of the neighborhood, and concerns external to the elements of the project should be directed to City officials in an appropriate forum, such as when the City considers the approval of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-30
JONATHAN MATZ

11/26/2018
City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments
Jonathan Matz <jonathanmatz@gmail.com> Thu, Nov 15, 2018 at 11:33 AM
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org
Cc: karo.torossian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org, craneravenoho@gmail.com, ciclavalley@gmail.com

I am writing because I am opposed to the widening of the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland and Cahuenga. This project does not improve safety conditions for those that use the roadway and puts vulnerable populations at increased risk of injury. Adding lanes will only increase the number of cars on the street and the gridlock automatically resulting from that increase. Instead, using streetspace for non-automotive mobility options would be safer and healthier.

This is a growing and vibrant area that needs to serve everyone’s needs safely. Please prioritize projects that save lives over seconds.

Signed,
Jonathan Matz

Response to Comment Letter P-30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-30-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-30-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City found that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that traffic safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-30-3</td>
<td>The city appreciates the commenter’s opinion on the safety and health of non-automotive mobility options. However, as this is not a comment related to the appropriateness or completeness of Draft IS/Proposed ND, no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-30-4</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Magnolia Boulevard Widening

Ronald Meyer <ron@ronmeyer.info>
To: billy.ho@lacity.org
Cc: karo.frossian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org

I am writing because I am opposed to the widening of the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland and Cahuenga.

This project does not improve safety conditions for those that use the roadway and puts vulnerable populations at increased risk of injury.

This is a growing and vibrant area that needs to serve everyone’s needs safely. Traffic should be slower as people are crossing Magnolia Blvd. in increasing numbers.

To widen the street does not significantly improve travel time, but would destroy the livability of neighborhood with drivers who disregard the speed limit. Honor the pledge of Vision Zero.

Please prioritize projects that saves lives over seconds. Auto drivers are not paying attention to people crossing streets anymore.

Ron

RONALD MEYER

12244 La Maida Street
Valley Village, CA 91607

Home & Office Phone: 818-506-7530
Mobile Phone and Texting: 818-388-7250
## Response to Comment Letter P-31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-31-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-31-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City has found that vehicular safety would be increased by adding one spot an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that traffic safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-31-3</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that people are crossing Magnolia Boulevard in increasing numbers, or identify where these crossings are occurring. Because this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-31-4</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion of neighborhood livability is acknowledged. Additionally, the project purpose is not to increase travel time; as stated in the Project Description, pages 3-4 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the purpose of the proposed project is to improve traffic flow, reduce traffic congestion, and provide street infrastructure improvements along Magnolia Boulevard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-31-5</td>
<td>Vision Zero is a citywide initiative in Los Angeles that makes public safety the highest priority on streets to end all traffic-related deaths and serious injuries by 2025. The Vision Zero Action Plan identifies specific projects at high-priority intersections and along high-priority corridors to achieve its goals. The project is consistent with this citywide initiative as it would not conflict with any planned Vision Zero projects and would enhance vehicular safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-31-6</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion prioritizing projects that enhance safety. Additionally, the commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that drivers are not paying attention to people crossing streets. Because this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-32  
KATERINA MOORE

11/27/2018  
City of Los Angeles Mail - karo.torossian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org, craneravenoho@gmail.com

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

karo.torossian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org, craneravenoho@gmail.com

Katerina Moore <katerina.e.moore@gmail.com>
To: billy.ho@lacity.org

Mon, Nov 26, 2018 at 4:55 PM

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing because I am opposed to the widening of the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland and Cahuenga. As a bicycle commuter and frequent user of Magnolia Blvd, I believe that this project does not improve safety conditions; conversely, it puts the most vulnerable populations at increased risk. Wider streets = faster cars = more and more deadly collisions.

This is a growing and vibrant area that needs to serve everyone’s needs safely. And it’s 2018, not 1950. More people are walking, scootering, biking, and taking public transit. Let’s support those options, not discourage them by widening a street for the benefit of private automobile users. We need to prioritize projects that saves lives over seconds.

Thank you,

Katerina Davidovich

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-32-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-32-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City found that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that traffic safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-32-3</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area, supporting various modes of transportation, and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-33  
LORENZO MUTIA

Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Lorenzo Mutia <1nmufia@yahoo.com>  
To: "Billy.Ho@lacity.org" <Billy.Ho@lacity.org>  
Cc: "karororossian@lacity.org", "jackie.keene@lacity.org", "ciclavalleyl@gmail.com" <ciclavalleyl@gmail.com>

I am writing because I am opposed to the widening of the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland and Cahuenga. This project does not improve safety conditions for those that use the roadway and puts vulnerable populations at increased risk of injury.

Widening the road will do little to improve traffic conditions anyway. That money should be used to improve the circulation of other modes other than driving like walking, biking, transit, and et cetera. It goes against Vision Zero and will only add to the thousands of lane miles that this city spends hundreds of millions trying to fix but to no end.

Lorenzo Mutia  
8400 Snowden Avenue, Panorama City, CA 91402

Response to Comment Letter P-33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-33-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City found that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-3</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the use of the money is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33-4</td>
<td>Vision Zero is a citywide initiative in Los Angeles that makes public safety the highest priority on streets to end all traffic-related deaths and serious injuries by 2025. The Vision Zero Action Plan identifies specific projects at high-priority intersections and along high-priority corridors to achieve its goals. The project is consistent with this citywide initiative as it would not conflict with any planned Vision Zero projects and would enhance vehicular safety.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9/24/2018

City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Hi Billy,

Please find attached a response to the Initial Study for the Magnolia Boulevard (N) widening.

Cheers

-Marven Norman <menorman@gmail.com>

To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org
Cc: Karo.torossian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org, ciclavalley@gmail.com

Mon, Sep 24, 2018 at 12:32 PM

1 message

Attachments:

la-city_magnolia-bldv_sept18.pdf

336K
24 September 2018

Mr. Billy Ho, Environmental Specialist II
City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Bureau of Engineering, EMG
1149 S. Broadway, Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Re: Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Initial Study

Dear Mr. Ho,

I’m writing you today in response to the Initial Study that was prepared and available for review covering the Magnolia Boulevard widening (N) – Cahuenga Boulevard to Vineland Avenue. After reviewing the documents, I find significant discrepancies between the project as described and various enacted plans and policies of the City in several different areas that would rise to the level of a significant impact, yet no mitigation measures are proposed.

The most serious issue is the widening itself. Magnolia Boulevard is designated as an Avenue II which per the City’s Complete Street Design Guide (CSDG), should have a roadway width of 56 feet total at 28 feet per side. Yet, the IS states that the plan is to widen the north side of Magnolia Blvd. to 32 feet, which is six feet beyond the width as adopted in the CSDG. The justification given for this is to match previous work that was done in 2011 on the south side of Magnolia. However, the previous work was completed prior to the City’s adoption of the CSDG in 2014, so using that segment as the reference to match with the current project makes no sense and due to it being against the policies, also represents an unmitigated impact under Issue 16 section a).

The IS also mentions that the sidewalks will be narrowed from a present width of between 15 to 25 feet to as narrow as seven feet, which is eight feet less than the width specified in the CSDG for a sidewalk on an Avenue II. Yet, the IS documentation provides no justification for this action and there isn’t even any discussion of Issue 16 section f) at all, which is supposed to address whether the proposed project would “conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian traffic, or would otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities”. While an “X” has been placed in the “No Impact” box of section f) in the checklist at the end of the IS, that cannot be considered a credible finding. Not only is the proposal counter adopted City policies, it also lacks supporting documentation that conclusion.

Furthermore, the addition of lanes constitutes a detrimental impact to Level of Traffic Stress for bicyclists which in turn also runs against adopted City policies aimed at both increasing bicycle usage and safety. Since section f) deals with pedestrian and bicycle impacts, we similarly do not have any documentation of how the project is able to provide the stated “No Impact” to bicyclists even though it clearly includes features that a known to have a significant impact on bicyclists.

Finally, the stated intent is to provide two travel lanes. However, adding travel lanes is a feature known to increase the speed of motorists and has the potential to result in a V_20 that is higher than the 30 MPH target speed for an Avenue II. The potential increase in speed poses a safety hazard and is incongruent with the desire to retain on-street parking through the area. That is a detrimental result for safety which
constitutes an unmitigated significant impact under issue 16 section d) and will result in the creation of a deficient condition for which the City could be liable in the future.

To address all these issues, the City needs to do several things. First, the desire to match previous work that is not compliant with current standards represents an unmitigated impacted under 16 section a). The City needs to go back to the drawing board and propose a project that meets current policies. Additionally, the City needs to complete a new review with documentation for 16 section f) on how the proposed project will mitigate the detrimental and significant impacts to people who travel by bike or foot in the corridor. This should’ve been part of the traffic study from the beginning, but nothing in the provided traffic study gave any indication as to how the project would impact bicyclists and pedestrians. Therefore, a new study which at a bare minimum, tabulates any LOS impacts to bicyclists and pedestrians needs to be completed. But a more wholistic approach that uses tools like the Fehr and Peers Active+ would be better and more in line with City policies. But BLOS and pedestrian LOS are the absolute minimum necessary. Finally, the City also needs to decide if there are to be two travel lanes or on-street parking as the presence of both represents a significant impact under 16 section d).

It is imperative that the City address all these issues. As people continue to die on the streets and the planet gets warmer, not doing so presents significant impacts to a multitude of users and a step backward on numerous City policies aimed at improving safety in the transportation network and reducing GHGs. By failing to address these issues, the City leaves several unmitigated significant impacts and dangerous features that threaten to undermine stated commitments.

Sincerely,

Marven E. Norman
### Response to Comment Letter P-34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-34-1</td>
<td>This general comment is followed by several specific comments that expand on the issues it raises. The responses to the individual comments are deemed to fully address the general issues raised in this introductory paragraph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-34-2</td>
<td>The City of Los Angeles Complete Street Design Guide (CSDG) is not a policy document with specific goals and objectives, but rather it “provides a compilation of design concepts and best practices” from which City engineers can pick and choose desirable features within the budgetary constraints of the project. The CSDG goes on to say that, “due to specific and operational characteristics associated with any given street, any proposed street improvement project must still undergo a detailed technical analysis” (CSDG, p. 3). Furthermore, Magnolia Boulevard’s classification as an Avenue II roadway is simply a change in the nomenclature used to distinguish streets for planning purposes. Avenue II was previously classified as Secondary Highway, which included roadway widths of 46 ft. to 70 ft.; not all newly classified streets will have the exact roadway width recommended by their new classification. Finally, under the new classification of Avenue II, the intended number of lanes is 1-2 in each direction, which is what the completed project would achieve. See response to Comment P-34-2. The project’s not adhering to all of the “compilation of design concepts” presented in the CSDG does not rise to the level of a significant impact on the environment, and thus does not change the conclusions of the Draft IS/Proposed ND with respect to significance of environmental impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-34-3</td>
<td>The statement in Section IV P of the IS that the project is “entirely consistent with adopted City of Los Angeles policies, plans, and programs for transportation systems and facilities” is revised to state that the proposed project is “substantially” consistent with City plans, policies, and programs since the project would not achieve the recommended sidewalk width.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-34-4</td>
<td>As stated in Section IV P of the IS, “the proposed project would be designed and constructed in accordance with the LADOT design guidelines and standards.” Because no new features, such as bus, bike, or pedestrian facilities, will be added, the project would not affect the potential for road hazards. See also response to Comment P-34-4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-34-5</td>
<td>A Traffic Analysis was conducted following the LADOT guidelines to analyze impacts from project construction and operation. Effects on existing congestion would be incremental but beneficial and overall, the project would have a very small but beneficial impact on traffic congestion. Less traffic congestion would create safer conditions for bicyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-34-6</td>
<td>See response to Comment P-34-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-34-7</td>
<td>The comment identifies a potential public safety concern based on the assertion that the proposed project would substantially increase traffic speeds, but this assertion is not supported by facts or reasoned argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-34-8</td>
<td>See response to Comment P-34-4. The project would have no impact with regards to Issue 16 d), “substantially increase hazards due to design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment),” because as stated in Section IV P of the IS, “the proposed project would be designed and constructed in accordance with the LADOT design guidelines and standards.” Because no new features, such as bus, bike, or pedestrian facilities, will be added, the project would not affect the potential for road hazards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-34-9</td>
<td>Issue 16 a) discusses conflicts with “an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system [emphasis added].” Thus, this item in the Checklist focusses solely on measures of effectiveness, rather on design aspects of the proposed project. The proposed project is not in conflict with such performance measures, and thus a determination of “No Impact” is appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-34-10</td>
<td>Issue 16 f) covers impacts that would conflict with “adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities,” or would “otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.” The proposed project would have very little impact on the bicyclist / pedestrian environment. At present, the width of the outside lanes on the northern and southern sides of Magnolia Boulevard are 16 feet to 18 feet wide. Post-project the outside lanes would be no less than 18 feet wide, maintaining or slightly increasing the separation between pedestrians and vehicles and providing the same or wider area for bicyclists. Sidewalks would vary in width from 8-12 feet, but the separation between vehicles in the outside lane and the near edge of the sidewalk would be the same or greater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-34-11</td>
<td>The Fehr &amp; Peers Active+ software is a GIS-based tool used for project prioritization within bicycle and pedestrian planning. The City does not perceive a need to quantitatively analyze bicycle or pedestrian levels of service since the project would not decrease bicycle resources along the alignment, sidewalk pedestrian capacity would remain adequate, and the proposed project would not generate new bicycle or pedestrian traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-34-12</td>
<td>The project would have no impact with regards to Issue 16 d), “substantially increase hazards due to design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment),” because as stated in Section IV P of the IS, “the proposed project would be designed and constructed in accordance with the LADOT design guidelines and standards.” Because no new features, such as bus, bike, or pedestrian facilities, will be added, the project would not affect the potential for road hazards. On-street parking, in the presence of either one or two through lanes of traffic, is a typical street configuration in Los Angeles and would not constitute a significant impact on public safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-34-13</td>
<td>The city appreciates the commenter’s summary of the items discussed. This general comment is addressed more specifically in responses to Comments P-34-2 through P-34-15.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-35
BRENDAN REGULINSKI

9/19/2018

City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Brendan Regulinski <bregulinski@gmail.com>       Tue, Sep 18, 2018 at 4:33 PM
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org
Cc: karor.torossian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org, ciclavalley@gmail.com

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing because I am opposed to the widening of the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland and Cahuenga. This project does not improve safety conditions for those that use the roadway and puts vulnerable populations at increased risk of injury.

This is a growing and vibrant area that needs to serve everyone’s needs safely. Please prioritize projects that save lives over seconds.

Signed,
Brendan Regulinski
Los Angeles, Ca 90041

---

Response to Comment Letter P-35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-35-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-35-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City has determined that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-35-3</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-36

STACEY RIFKIN

Magnolia Blvd Widening

9/24/2018
City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Blvd widening

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Stacey Rifkin <staceyclement@me.com>
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org

Mon, Sep 24, 2018 at 10:32 AM

Absolutely in favor! I live on Cartwright Ave just between Vineland and Cahuenga off Magnolia so the traffic affects us greatly and is only getting worse. A widening of magnolia would be an incredible thing and help set up this burgeoning area of town for years to come.

Stacey Rifkin

---

Response to Comment Letter P-36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-36</td>
<td>The City appreciates the commenter’s support of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Matt Ruscigno <mattruscigno@gmail.com>
Reply-To: mattruscigno@gmail.com
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org
Cc: karororossian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org, craneravenoho@gmail.com

I am writing because I am opposed to the widening of the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland and Cahuenga. As both a public health expert and a user of Magnolia Blvd, I believe that this project does not improve safety conditions; conversely it puts the most vulnerable populations at increased risk.

wider streets = faster cars = more and more deadly collisions

This is a growing and vibrant area that needs to serve everyone’s needs safely. And it’s 2018, not 1950. More people are walking, scooting, biking, and taking public transit. Let’s support those options, not discourage them by widening a street for the benefit of private automobile users.

Please prioritize projects that saves lives over seconds.

thank you for your time,
Matt Ruscigno, MPH, RD

Response to Comment Letter P-37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-37-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City has determined that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-37-3</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area, supporting various modes of transportation, and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-38
ZACHARY RYNEW

9/14/2018
City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Magnolia

Zachary Rynew <zachary@la-bike.org>  
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org

Hi Billy,

I’m looking for more information on this project regarding its stewardship. Is this strictly BOE or is LADOT, BSS or CD2 involved in this project?

Zachary
--

Zachary Rynew  
Communications and Volunteer Coordinator

LA - BIKE. ORG  
634 S. Spring Street, Suite 825  
Los Angeles, CA 90014  
www.la-bike.org

Office: 213.629.2142 x125  
Email: zachary@la-bike.org

---

Response to Comment Letter P-38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-38</td>
<td>According to the City’s project management team, BOE will assume stewardship responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-39
ZACHARY RYNEW

Zachary Rynew <zachary@la-bike.org>
To: Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Thanks for getting back to me. On the page, it is stated that:

“...The proposed project would increase vehicular traffic safety...”

I read the entire report and didn't see any information in regards to this. Do you have data to back this up?

Response to Comment Letter P-39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-39</td>
<td>The City has no data on vehicular traffic safety specific to the project alignment. It is a general concept in transportation engineering that improvement in the traffic level of service and decreased congestion – which the proposed project would achieve – is associated with a decrease in some common types of collisions, such as rear-end and sideswipe collisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The commenter’s opposition to the project and opinion about the quality of the project’s environmental evaluation are acknowledged. The City has no data on vehicular traffic safety specific to the project alignment. It is a general concept in transportation engineering that improvement in the traffic level of service and decreased congestion – which the proposed project would achieve – is associated with a decrease in some common types of collisions, such as rear-end and sideswipe collisions. Appendix A, Environmental Screening Checklist, Section #16, Item “f”, of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City indicated its finding that the proposed project would not decrease the safety of pedestrian facilities in the project area; the comment offers no support for its assertion that overall safety would worsen as a result of the proposed project.

The proposed project is one piece in a community-wide program to improve mobility, and its benefits would not be fully realized until other improvements are in place. Individually, the project would improve mid-block traffic conditions. Other improvements on adjacent road segments and at nearby intersections would be required to fully realize the beneficial effects of the proposed project at the intersections of Magnolia Boulevard with Vineland Avenue and Cahuenga Boulevard.
Comment Letter No. P-41
CHRIS SCHAPER

11/27/2018
City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Billy Ho <billy.ho@lacity.org>

Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

cdschaper@yahoo.com <cdschaper@yahoo.com>
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org
Cc: karo.torossian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org, craneravencho@gmail.com, ciclavalley@gmail.com

Mon, Nov 26, 2018 at 1:21 PM

I am writing because I am opposed to the widening of the north side of Magnolia Boulevard between Vineland and Cahuenga. This project does not improve safety conditions for those that use the roadway and puts vulnerable populations at increased risk of injury.

This is a growing and vibrant area that needs to serve everyone’s needs safely. Please prioritize projects that saves lives over seconds.

Signed,

Chris schaper
2370 Hidalgo Ave LA, 90039

---

Response to Comment Letter P-41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-41-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-41-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City has determined that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that traffic safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-41-3</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Comment Letter P-42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-42-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-42-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City determined that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-42-3</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-43
NEEL SODHA

Response to Comment Letter P-43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-43-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-2</td>
<td>In Section P on p. 43 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the text states, “Once constructed, the project would not increase traffic volumes”; this statement is supported by the traffic study for the proposed project. As stated in the project description, page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that pedestrians and cyclists would be endangered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-3</td>
<td>Vision Zero is a citywide initiative in Los Angeles that makes public safety the highest priority on streets to end all traffic-related deaths and serious injuries by 2025. The Vision Zero Action Plan identifies specific projects at high-priority intersections and along high-priority corridors to achieve its goals. The project is consistent with this citywide initiative as it would not conflict with any planned Vision Zero projects and would enhance vehicular safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-43-4</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s interest in projects that would enhance pedestrian and cyclist safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Comment Letter P-44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-44-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-44-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City has determined that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-44-3</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area, prioritizing projects that enhance safety, and continuing multi-modal planning in Los Angeles. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Comment Letter P-45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-45-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-45-2</td>
<td>As stated in the project description on page 7 of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, the City has determined that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. The commenter does not provide any additional information to support the claim that traffic safety would not be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-45-3</td>
<td>We appreciate the commenter’s opinion about safety in the area and prioritizing projects that enhance safety. However, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-45-4</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged. While we appreciate the commenter’s opinion about focusing on multi-modal transportation, this comment does not pertain to the appropriateness or completeness of the Draft IS/Proposed ND, and no further response is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-46
DON WARD

Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Don <don@studiobuilt.com>
To: Billy.Ho@lacity.org
Cc: karo.torossian@lacity.org, jackie.keene@lacity.org, ciclavalley@gmail.com

Mon, Sep 17, 2018 at 10:23 AM

STOP WIDENING STREETS and START WIDENING SIDEWALKS.
You are wasting taxpayer money and taking out TREES.

STOP spending money on widening streets and use that money to maintain what we already have and fix the damn sidewalks.

-Don Ward

Response to Comment Letter P-46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-46</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinions about the appropriateness of the project and the use of available funds are acknowledged. No further response is required with respect to the accuracy or completeness of Draft IS/Proposed ND.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Letter No. P-47
BARBARA YATES

9/24/2018 City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

Comment Letter No. P-47
BARBARA YATES

9/24/2018 City of Los Angeles Mail - Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments

**Response to Comment Letter P-47**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-47-1</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the appropriateness of the project is acknowledged. No further response is required with respect to the accuracy or completeness of Draft IS/Proposed ND.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-47-2</td>
<td>The Draft IS/Proposed ND indicates on p. 7 that vehicular safety would be increased by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane. As indicated in Item #16(f) in Appendix A of Draft IS/Proposed ND, <em>Environmental Screening Checklist</em>, the City has determined that the project would have no adverse effects on pedestrian or bicyclist safety. The comment offers no substantive evidence that would alter that determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-47-3</td>
<td>The City appreciates the commenter’s observations about conditions on the south side of Magnolia Boulevard and at the Magnolia Blvd/Lankershim Blvd. intersection. These areas are outside of the project footprint and would not be affected by the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-47-4</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinions about current trends in the project area and about how the City should prioritize projects are acknowledged. No further response is required with respect to the accuracy or completeness of Draft IS/Proposed ND.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-47-5</td>
<td>The commenter’s opinion about the tradeoffs between life and health and other societal benefits is acknowledged. The Vision Zero program has identified specific projects to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety in the City, and the project would not conflict with those safety initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A brief explanation is provided for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources cited following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. AESTHETICS – Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.A of this Initial Study (IS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Sections A.1 and A.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.A in this IS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.A in this IS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Sections A.1 and A.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.A in this IS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section A.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.B in this IS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Conservation Element; Zone Information &amp; Map Access System (ZIMAS).</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.B in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.B in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: City of Los Angeles ZIMAS; California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Biogeographic Information &amp; Observation Database (BIOS) (<a href="http://bios.dfg.ca.gov/">http://bios.dfg.ca.gov/</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.B in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: City of Los Angeles General Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.B in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References: CDC Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program website (<a href="http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/FMMP/Pages/Index.aspx">http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/FMMP/Pages/Index.aspx</a>); City of Los Angeles General Plan Conservation Element; ZIMAS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:

<p>| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | | | | X |
| Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.C in this IS. | | | | |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | | X | | |
| Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.C in this IS. | | | | |
| References: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Sections B.1, B.2, and B.3; California Air Resources Board (CARB), 2017, Ambient Air Quality Standards (<a href="http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs.htm">www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs.htm</a>) | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.C in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.C in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: <em>LA CEQA Thresholds Guide</em> Sections B.1, B.2, and B.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.C in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: <em>LA CEQA Thresholds Guide</em> Sections B.1 and B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | ☐                      | ☐                     | ☑                     | ☑         |
| Comment: See discussion in Section IV.D in this IS.                  |                        |                       |                       |           |
| References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Section C; CDFW California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) (available online at www.dfg.ca.gov/whdab/cnddb.htm); U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), *Information for Planning and Consultation (IPAC)* (www.ecos.fws.gov/ipac). |                        |                       |                       |           |

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | ☐                      | ☐                     | ☑                     | ☑         |
| Comment: See discussion in Section IV.D in this IS.                  |                        |                       |                       |           |
| References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Section C; CDFW CNDDB (www.dfg.ca.gov/whdab/cnddb.htm); USFWS IPAC (www.ecos.fws.gov/ipac); CDFW BIOS (http://bios.dfg.ca.gov/); USFWS National Wetlands Inventory (www.fws.gov/wetlands); U.S. Dept. Interior Geological Survey 7.5-minute Quad, Burbank. |                        |                       |                       |           |

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | ☐                      | ☐                     | ☑                     | ☑         |
| Comment: See discussion in Section IV.D in this IS.                  |                        |                       |                       |           |
| References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Section C; USFWS, National Wetlands Inventory (www.fws.gov/wetlands). |                        |                       |                       |           |
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.D in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References:** LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section C; CDFW BIOS Database (http://bios.dfg.ca.gov/).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.D in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References:** LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section C; Los Angeles City Council, Protected Tree Ordinance (http://www.amlegal.com/los_angeles_ca/), Los Angeles, Dept. of Public Works, Tree Removal Mitigation Agreement [BOE/BSS Tree Policy].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.D in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References:** LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section C; CDFW CNDDB (www.dfg.ca.gov/whdab/cnddb.htm).

### 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.E in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References:** LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section D.3; California State Parks Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.E in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References:** LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section D.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.E in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References:** LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section D.1; Dibblee, Thomas W. Jr., *Geologic Map of the Hollywood & Burbank Quadrangle.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See the discussion in Section IV.E in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### References:
*LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section D.2.*

### 6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.F in this IS.

References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section E.1; CDC Div. of Mines and Geology (DMG), Special Publication 42, Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California.*

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.F in this IS.

References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section E.1; CDC DMG Official Map of Seismic Hazard Zones, Seismic Hazard Map, Burbank Quad. ([http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov](http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov)).*

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.F in this IS.

References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section E.1; CDC DMG Official Map of Seismic Hazard Zones, Seismic Hazard Map, Burbank Quad. ([http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov](http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov)).*

iv) Landslides?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.F in this IS.

References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section E.1; CDC DMG Official Map of Seismic Hazard Zones, Seismic Hazard Map, Burbank Quad. ([http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov](http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov)).*

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.F in this IS.

References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section E.2*

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.F in this IS.

References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section E.2; CDC DMG Official Map of Seismic Hazard Zones, Seismic Hazard Map, Burbank Quad. ([http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov](http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov)).*

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.F in this IS.
## Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.F in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.G in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC], 2007, Fourth Assessment Report: Climate Change; California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA), 2017, CalEEMod; SCAQMD, 2008b, Interim CEQA GHG Significance Thresholds for Stationary Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.G in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: SCAQMD, 2008b, Interim CEQA GHG Significance Thresholds for Stationary Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.H in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Sections F.1 and F.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.H in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
<td>Less Than Significant</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.H in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Sections F.1 and F.2; SWRCB Geotracker Database</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.H in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.H in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.H in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section F.1 and K.2; DPW BOE NavigateLA (<a href="http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us">http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us</a>.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.H in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Sections F.1 and K.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.H in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section K.2; DPW BOE NavigateLA Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (<a href="http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us">http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us</a>.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** – Would the project:

| | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | | | |
| Comment: See discussion in Section IV.I in this IS. | |
| Reference: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section G.2 | |
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.I in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: <em>LA CEQA Thresholds Guide</em> Section G.2 and G.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.I in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: <em>LA CEQA Thresholds Guide</em> Sections G.1 and G.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.I in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: <em>LA CEQA Thresholds Guide</em> Section G.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.I in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: <em>LA CEQA Thresholds Guide</em> Section G.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.I in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: <em>LA CEQA Thresholds Guide</em> Section G.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.I in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: <em>LA CEQA Thresholds Guide</em> Sections G.1 to G.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.I in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References: <em>LA CEQA Thresholds Guide</em> Section G.4; Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), Panel 06037C; DPW BOE NavigateLA Flood Plains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(<a href="http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us">http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us</a>.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**i)** Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.I in this IS.

References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Sections E.1 and G.3; DPW BOE NavigateLA Inundation Areas (http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us.)

**j)** Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.I in this IS.

References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Section E.1; DPW BOE NavigateLA Tsunami Area and landslides (http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us.)

10. **LAND USE AND PLANNING** – Would the project:

**a)** Physically divide an established community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.J in this IS.

References: City of Los Angeles General Plan; North Hollywood-Valley Village Community Plan; *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Section H.2.

**b)** Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.J in this IS.

References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Sections H.1 and H.2; City of Los Angeles General Plan; North Hollywood-Valley Village Community Plan; ZIMAS; Los Angeles River Revitalization Plan.

**c)** Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.J in this IS.


11. **MINERAL RESOURCES** – Would the project:

**a)** Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.K in this IS.

References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Section E.4; City of Los Angeles General Plan

**b)** Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.K in this IS.

References: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section E.4; City of Los Angeles General Plan

12. NOISE – Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.L in this IS.

References: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section I; City of Los Angeles General Plan Noise Element

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.L in this IS.

References: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section I; City of Los Angeles General Plan Noise Element

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.L in this IS.

References: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section I; City of Los Angeles General Plan Noise Element

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.L in this IS.

References: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section I; City of Los Angeles General Plan Noise Element

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.L in this IS.

References: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section I; DPW BOE NavigateLA (http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us.)

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.L in this IS.

References: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section I; DPW BOE NavigateLA (http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us.)

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure?**
  - Comment: See discussion in Section IV.L in this IS.
  - Reference: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Section J.1

- **b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**
  - Comment: See discussion in Section IV.L in this IS.
  - Reference: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Sections J.1 and J.2

- **c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**
  - Comment: See discussion in Section IV.L in this IS.
  - Reference: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Section J.2

#### 14. PUBLIC SERVICES –

- **a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:**

  - **i) Fire protection?**
    - Comment: See discussion in Section IV.N in this IS.

  - **ii) Police protection?**
    - Comment: See discussion in Section IV.N in this IS.
    - References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Section K.1

  - **iii) Schools?**
    - Comment: See discussion in Section IV.N in this IS.
    - References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Section K.3

  - **iv) Parks?**
    - Comment: See discussion in Section IV.N in this IS.
    - References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Section K.4

  - **v) Other public facilities?**
    - Comment: See discussion in Section IV.N in this IS.
# Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## 15. Recreation

### a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.O in this IS.

References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Section K.4


### b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.O in this IS.

References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Section K.4

## 16. Transportation/Traffic – Would the project:

### a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersection, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.P in this IS.

References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Sections L.1 to L.4, L.8

### b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.P in this IS.

References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Sections L.1 to L3

### c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.P in this IS.

References: none

### d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.P in this IS.

References: *LA CEQA Thresholds Guide* Section L.5

### e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Issues

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.P in this IS.

References: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section L.5, L.8, and J2

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.P in this IS.

References: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section L.6

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.Q in this IS.

Reference: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section M.2

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.Q in this IS.

Reference: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Sections G.1, M.1, and M.2

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.Q in this IS.

Reference: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Sections G.1 and M.2

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.Q in this IS.

Reference: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section M.1

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.Q in this IS.

Reference: LA CEQA Thresholds Guide Section M.1

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

Comment: See discussion in Section IV.Q in this IS.
### Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>References</strong>: <em>LA CEQA Thresholds Guide</em> Section M.3; County of Los Angeles, 2016b, Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, Annual Report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.Q in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References</strong>: <em>LA CEQA Thresholds Guide</em> Section M.3; County of Los Angeles, 2016b, Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, Annual Report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.R in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References</strong>: <em>LA CEQA Thresholds Guide</em> Sections C, D1, D2, and D3; Section IV.D, Biological Resources and Section IV.E, Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.R in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong>: <em>LA CEQA Thresholds Guide</em>, all sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.R in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong>: <em>LA CEQA Thresholds Guide</em>, all sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See discussion in Section IV.R in this IS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference</strong>: <em>LA CEQA Thresholds Guide</em>, all sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Notice of Availability
Legal Advertisement
Notice of Community Meeting
August 23, 2018

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

To: Responsible Agencies, Trustee Agencies, Stakeholders, and Interested Parties

From: City of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works
Bureau of Engineering
1149 South Broadway Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90015-2213

Subject: Notice of Availability of a Draft Initial Study / Proposed Negative Declaration for the Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) – Cahuenga Boulevard to Vineland Avenue Project

The City of Los Angeles (City) Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering (BPE) has released a Draft Initial Study (IS) / Proposed Negative Declaration (ND) for the Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) – Cahuenga Boulevard to Vineland Avenue project. The City is requesting input from responsible agencies, trustee agencies, stakeholders, and other interested parties about the content of the environmental analysis and information included in the Draft IS/ND. The Draft IS/ND will be available for review for 30 days ending on September 24, 2018.

Project Title: Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) – Cahuenga Boulevard to Vineland Avenue

Project Applicant: City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering

Project Description: The City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering proposes to widen a 2,600-foot stretch of the northern side of Magnolia Boulevard between Cahuenga Boulevard and Vineland Avenue to improve traffic flow and reduce traffic congestion along this segment of the street. The proposed project would increase vehicular traffic safely by adding an east-bound through lane while maintaining a center turn lane.

The proposed project would reconfigure Magnolia Boulevard between Cahuenga Boulevard and Vineland Avenue to accommodate street parking on both sides, two travel lanes in each direction, and a center turn lane median. These changes would require widening the northern side of the street from Cahuenga Boulevard to Vineland Avenue by 7 feet to a width of 32 feet, within an existing 40-foot-wide alignment, and narrowing the existing sidewalks on the northern side to 7-8 feet wide. Proposed project improvements would include: concrete curbs, gutters, and sidewalks; asphalt-concrete pavement; storm drains and sanitary sewers; street trees and lighting; and traffic signals. Additionally, the road would be striped between Cahuenga Boulevard and Vineland Avenue and the reconfigured and upgraded project alignment would meet Avenue II Street standards.

Project Location: The project would be located on the northern side of Magnolia Boulevard between Cahuenga Boulevard and Vineland Avenue in Council District 2 and in the North Hollywood – Valley Village community of the City of Los Angeles. The proposed project is on the Burbank 7.5-minute U.S. Geological Survey quadrangle (California-Los Angeles County 7.5-minute topographic map series).
Anticipated Significant Environmental Effects: Based on the analyses provided in the Draft IS/ND, the Project would result in no potentially significant impacts. Project construction would have less than significant impacts on air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gases, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, transportation and traffic, and utilities and public services. Implementation of construction best management practices and standards will result in less than significant impacts on noise, biological resources, and hazards. Project operations would have less than significant impacts on air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, and noise. For all other environmental resources and issues, the proposed project would have no impacts during construction or operation.

Public Review Period: The Draft IS/ND is being made available for public review for 30 days, commencing on August 23, 2018, and concluding on September 24, 2018. Public comments on the Draft IS/ND will be received during this period. The Draft IS/ND is available for review at the following locations:

Council District 2 – North Hollywood District Office
5240 N. Lankershim Boulevard, Ste 200
North Hollywood, CA 91601
Phone: (818) 755-7676

Los Angeles Public Library - North Hollywood Branch
5211 Tujunga Avenue
North Hollywood, CA 91601
Phone: (818) 766-7185

Los Angeles Public Library - Studio City Branch
12511 Moorpark Street
Studio City, CA 91604
Phone: (818) 766-7873

Los Angeles Public Library – Valley Plaza Branch
12311 Vanowen Street
North Hollywood, CA 91605
(818) 766-9251

A copy of the Draft IS/ND may also be obtained by contacting Mr. Billy Ho of the Bureau of Engineering at (213) 486-5745, and can also be accessed online at: http://eng.lacity.org/techdocs/emg/projects.htm

Comments will be accepted from August 23, 2018 to September 24, 2018. Please submit comments in writing to the address below no later than 5:00 p.m. on September 18, 2018.

Mr. Billy Ho, Environmental Specialist II
City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Bureau of Engineering, EMG
1149 S. Broadway, Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Comments may also be submitted by e-mail to Billy.Ho@lacity.org (please include “Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments” in the subject line) or by fax to (213) 847-0656.

If you require a sign language interpreter or other reasonable accommodation to conduct business with City staff for a disability, as defined by the Federal Americans with Disabilities Act and California Fair Employment and Housing Act, please contact the City staff person listed in this notice to arrange for such accommodation.
23 de Agosto de 2018

AVISO DE DISPONIBILIDAD

Para: Agencias responsables, agencias fiduciarias, y todas las partes interesadas

De: Ciudad de Los Ángeles, Departamento de Obras Públicas
    Oficina de Ingeniería
    1149 South Broadway Suite 600
    Los Angeles, CA 90015-2213

Asunto: Aviso de disponibilidad de un Borrador de Estudio Inicial / Propuesta de
         Declaración Negativa para el proyecto de ensanchamiento del bulevar Magnolia (N) –
         bulevar Cahuenga a la avenida Vineland

La Oficina de Ingeniería (BOE por sus siglas en inglés) del Departamento de Obras Públicas de la
Ciudad de Los Ángeles (Ciudad), ha publicado un Borrador de Estudio Inicial (IS) / Propuesta de
Declaración Negativa (ND) para el proyecto de ensanchamiento del bulevar Magnolia (N) – bulevar
Cahuenga a la avenida Vineland. La Ciudad está solicitando comentarlos de agencias responsables,
agencias fiduciarias, y todas las partes interesadas sobre el contenido del análisis ambiental e
información incluida en el Borrador IS / ND. El borrador IS / ND estará disponible para revisión durante
30 días hasta el 24 de septiembre de 2018.

Nombre del proyecto: Ensanchamiento del bulevar Magnolia (N) – bulevar Cahuenga a la avenida
Vineland

Solicitante del proyecto: Oficina de Ingeniería de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles

Descripción del Proyecto: La Oficina de Ingeniería de la Ciudad de Los Ángeles propone ampliar un
tramo de 2,600 pies del lado norte del bulevar Magnolia entre el bulevar Cahuenga y la avenida Vineland
para mejorar el flujo de tráfico y reducir la congestión de tránsito a lo largo de este segmento de la calle.
El proyecto propuesto aumentaría la seguridad del tráfico vehicular mediante la adición de un carril con
dirección hacia el este a la vez que mantendría un carril central para girar.

El proyecto propuesto reconfiguraría el bulevar Magnolia entre el bulevar Cahuenga y la avenida
Vineland para acomodar estacionamiento en ambos lados de la calle, dos carriles de viaje en cada
dirección, y una carril central en la mediana para girar. Estos cambios requerirían ampliar el lado norte de
la calle desde el bulevar Cahuenga a la avenida Vineland por 7 pies a un ancho de 32 pies, dentro de
una alinearación existente de 40 pies de ancho, y reducir las aceras existentes en el lado norte a 7-8 pies
de anchura. Las mejoras propuestas del proyecto incluirían: bordillos de cemento, cunetas y aceras;
pavimento de asfalto-concreto; desagués pluviales y alcantarillas sanitarias; árboles en la calle e
iluminación; y señales de tráfico. Además, la carretera se volvería a delimitar entre el bulevar Cahuenga
y la avenida Vineland y la alinearación del proyecto reconfigurado y actualizada cumpliría con los
estándares de Avenue II Street.

Ubicación del proyecto: El proyecto se ubicaría en el lado norte del bulevar Magnolia entre el bulevar
Cahuenga y la avenida Vineland en el Consejo del Distrito 2 y en la comunidad de North Hollywood -
Valley Village de la ciudad de Los Ángeles. El proyecto propuesto se encuentra en el cuadrángulo

AN EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

Recycled and made from recycled waste
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Efecctos ambientales significativos anticipados: con base en los análisis proporcionados en el Borrador IS / ND, el Proyecto no tendría impactos potencialmente significativos. La construcción del proyecto tendría impactos menos que significativos en la calidad del aire, recursos culturales, geología y suelos, gases de efecto invernadero, hidrología y calidad del agua, uso y planificación del suelo, transporte y tráfico, y utilidades y servicios públicos. La implementación de las mejores prácticas y estándares en el manejo de la construcción tendrá como resultado impactos menos que significativos en el ruido, los recursos biológicos y peligros. Las operaciones del proyecto tendrían impactos menos que significativos en la calidad del aire, los recursos biológicos, los recursos culturales, la geología y los suelos, la hidrología y la calidad del agua, el uso y la planificación del suelo y el ruido. Para todos los demás recursos y cuestiones ambientales, el proyecto propuesto no tendría impactos durante la construcción o la operación.

Período de revisión pública: el Borrador IS / ND se pondrá a disposición del público para su revisión durante 30 días, comenzando el 23 de agosto de 2018 y concluyendo el 24 de septiembre de 2018. Se recibirán comentarios públicos sobre el Borrador IS / ND durante este período. El borrador de IS / ND está disponible para su revisión en las siguientes ubicaciones:

Consejo del Distrito 2 - Oficina del Distrito de North Hollywood
5240 N. Lankershim Boulevard, Ste 200
North Hollywood, CA 91601
Teléfono: (818) 755-7676

Biblioteca Pública de Los Ángeles - Sucursal de North Hollywood
5211 Avenida Tujunga
North Hollywood, CA 91601
Teléfono: (818) 766-7185

Biblioteca Pública de Los Ángeles - Sucursal de Studio City
12511 Moorpark Street
Studio City, CA 91604
Teléfono: (818) 755-7873

Biblioteca Pública de Los Ángeles - Sucursal de Valley Plaza
12311 Vanowen Street
North Hollywood, CA 91605
Teléfono: (818) 765-9251

Puede también obtener una copia del Borrador IS / ND contactando al Sr. Billy Ho de la Oficina de Ingeniería al (213) 485-5745, y también se puede acceder en línea en: http://eng.lacity.org/techdocs /eng/projects.htm

Los comentarios se aceptarán del 23 de agosto de 2018 al 24 de septiembre de 2018. Por favor envíe los comentarios por escrito a la dirección de abajo a más tardar a las 5:00 p.m. del 24 de septiembre de 2018.

Mr. Billy Ho, Environmental Specialist II
City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
Bureau of Engineering, EMG
1149 S. Broadway, Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Los comentarios también pueden enviarse por correo electrónico a Billy.Ho@lacity.org (incluyendo "Magnolia Boulevard Widening (N) Comments" en el asunto) o por fax al (213) 847-0656.

Si necesita un intérprete de lenguaje de señas u otra adaptación razonable para comunicarse con el personal de la ciudad por una discapacidad, según lo define la Ley Federal de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades y la Ley de Empleo y Vivienda Equitativa de California, por favor comuníquese con el personal de la ciudad que se incluye en este aviso para hacer arreglos para tal adaptación.
PROOF OF PUBLICATION
(2015.5 C.C.P.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS
County of Cook

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the action for which the attached notice was published.

I am a principal clerk of the Los Angeles Times, which was adjudged a newspaper of general circulation on May 21, 1952, Cases 598599 for the City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, and State of California. Attached to this Affidavit is a true and complete copy as was printed and published on the following date(s):

Aug 23, 2018

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated at Chicago, Illinois
on this 22 day of 3, 20 18.

[signature]

160 N Stetson Avenue
Chicago, IL 60601
**MAGNOLIA BLVD (NORTH) – CAHUENGA BLVD TO VINELAND AVE PROJECT**

**NOTICE TO COMMUNITY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Business Meeting</strong></th>
<th><strong>NoHo Neighborhood Council</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, November 19 at 2:30 pm</td>
<td>Monday, November 19 at 6:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poquito Mas</td>
<td>North Hollywood Senior Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10651 W Magnolia Blvd</td>
<td>5301 Tujunga Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA 91601</td>
<td>North Hollywood, CA 91601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What is the purpose?</strong></th>
<th>The purpose of this project is to increase vehicular capacity by adding one traffic lane eastbound and to get ready for possible pedestrian and cyclist safety improvements in the future.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **What is the scope of work?** | - Widen roadway by 7 feet to add one traffic lane eastbound  
- Add new curb and gutter, 8 feet sidewalk, curb ramp, paving, & storm drain  
- Relocation of utilities, street lighting, & traffic signals  
- Remove 17 street trees and add 34 new street trees. |
| **Who is funding it?** | Federal HBP (Metro) $5,564,975 (65%)  
Local Share $2,996,525 (35%) |
| **Where is the work occurring?** | North side of Magnolia Blvd, from Cahuenga Blvd to Vineland Ave. |
| **When will work begin and end?** | Work is anticipated to start in Winter of 2020 and complete in Winter of 2021. |
| **What time will crews be working?** | 7 a.m. to 4 p.m. from Monday to Friday, excluding holidays. |
| **What can I expect?** | Minor delays going through the construction area due to Magnolia Blvd will be reduced to a single lane each direction. |
| **Will local access be impacted?** | Drivers:  
- Yes, expect minor delays going through Magnolia Blvd.  
- Temporary loss of street parking.  
- All commercial business driveways will be open at all times.  
Pedestrian:  
- Protected 5 feet walkway will be provided at all times. |
| **Safety Measures** | There will be K-Rails, signs and barricades to help redirect and protect the traveling public motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists. |
| **Who can I call regarding this notice?** | City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works  
Public Affairs Office (213) 978-0333. |

As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability and upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to its programs, services and activities. 11/16/2018
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ATTACHMENTS

Technical Studies Prepared As Part of this Initial Study
(Provided under Separate Cover)

- Traffic Study, Parsons, 2018
- Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, Sapphos Environmental, Inc., 2018
- Natural Environment Study (Minimum Impact), Parsons, 2018
- Air Quality Report, Parsons, 2019
- Health Risk Assessment Screening, Parsons, 2019
- Noise Study Report, Parsons, 2018
- Historic Property Survey Report, Sapphos, 2019