

**APPENDIX A: DRAFT EIR COMMENT LETTERS
AND RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENTS**

APPENDIX A: DRAFT EIR COMMENT LETTERS AND RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

The Draft EIR for the proposed Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment was distributed for public review between November 19, 2002 and January 3, 2003. Based upon comments received at the public hearing on the Draft EIR held by the Lead Agency Board of Commissioners on December 19, 2002, the comment period was extended and comments on the Draft EIR were taken by the Lead Agency until January 21, 2003. A total of 18 comment letters pertaining to the Draft EIR were received by the Lead Agency during the public comment period. These letters included submissions from state, regional, county and city agencies, as well as from other private organizations and individuals. Copies of each of the letters received by the Lead Agency during the noticed and Lead Agency-extended comment periods, and responses to the environmental issues contained in the comments raised in these letters are included in this section of the Final EIR. In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21092.5, written proposed responses to comments provided in these letters were provided to public agencies at least 10 days prior to certifying the Final EIR. Letters were received during the noticed and Lead Agency-extended comment periods from the following agencies/organizations/individuals:

State Agencies

1. Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse, November 25, 2002.
2. Terry Roberts, Director, State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, January 3, 2003.
3. Stephen Buswell, IGR/CEQA Branch Chief, Caltrans District 7, January 2, 2002.

Regional Agencies

4. Jeffrey M. Smith, Senior Regional Planner, Intergovernmental Review, Southern California Association of Governments, January 9, 2003.

County/City Agencies

5. David R. Leininger, Chief, Forestry Division, Prevention Bureau, Los Angeles County Fire Department, December 31, 2002.
6. James A. Noyes, Director of Public Works, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, January 14, 2003.
7. Mary Richardson, Department of City Planning, City of Los Angeles, January 7, 2003.
8. Allyn D. Rifkin, Principal Transportation Engineer, Department of Transportation, City of Los Angeles, January 6, 2003.

9. Raymond E. Dippel, Assistant Environmental Planning Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District, January 3, 2003.

Organizations

10. David Gajda & Jose Malagon, Cahuenga Corridor Coalition, December 19, 2002.
11. David Morgan, Hollywood Better Government Association, January 18, 2003.
12. Leron Gubler, President & CEO, Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, December 18, 2002.
13. Robert Nudelman, Board Member and Director of Preservation Issues, Hollywood Heritage, January 3, 2003.
14. M. Paul Ramsey, Board Member, Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood Council and Hollywood Knolls Community Club, January 21, 2003.
15. John Walsh, Hollywood Project Area Committee, December 19, 2002.

Individuals

16. Edward C. Dygert, Cox, Castle Nicholson, January 2, 2003.
17. Ryan S. Harter, CIM Group, January 20, 2003.
18. Don Lippman, December 31, 2002.

<p style="text-align: center;">SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment Project</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Environmental Review Process</p>											Letter Number	Land Use	Aesthetics/Urban Design/Light & Glare	Cultural Resources	Population, Housing, and Employment	Transportation/Circulation	Air Quality	Noise	Public Services	Utilities	Geotechnical/Seismic	Hazardous Materials	Other	Notes
STATE AGENCIES																								
<p>Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse 1400 Tenth Street P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044 Letter Dated: November 25, 2002</p>											1													<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set review period as November 19, 2002 through January 2, 2003
<p>Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse Terry Roberts Director 1400 Tenth Street P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044 Letter Dated: January 3, 2003</p>											2													<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents compliance with State Clearinghouse review requirements for Draft EIRs

<p style="text-align: center;">SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment Project</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Environmental Review Process</p>	Letter Number	Land Use	Aesthetics/Urban Design/Light & Glare	Cultural Resources	Population, Housing, and Employment	Transportation/Circulation	Air Quality	Noise	Public Services	Utilities	Geotechnical/Seismic	Hazardous Materials	Other	Notes
<p>Department of Transportation, District 7 Stephen J. Buswell IGR/CEQA Branch Chief State of California 120 South Spring Street Los Angeles, California 90012 Letter Dated: January 2, 2003</p>	3				•									
Regional Agencies														
<p>Southern California Association of Governments Jeffrey M. Smith Senior Planner Intergovernmental Review 818 W. 7th St. 12th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017-3435 Letter Dated: January 9, 2003</p>	4											•		Project is not regionally significant per SCAG Intergovernmental Review criteria

<p style="text-align: center;">SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment Project</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Environmental Review Process</p>	Letter Number	Land Use	Aesthetics/Urban Design/Light & Glare	Cultural Resources	Population, Housing, and Employment	Transportation/Circulation	Air Quality	Noise	Public Services	Utilities	Geotechnical/Seismic	Hazardous Materials	Other	Notes
City and County Agencies														
<p>Los Angeles County Fire Department David R. Leininger Chief, Forestry Division, Prevention Bureau 1320 North Eastern Avenue Los Angeles, California 90063-3294 Letter Dated: December 31, 2002</p>	5								•					
<p>Los Angeles County Department of Public Works James A. Noyes Director of Public Works 900 South Fremont Avenue Alhambra, California 91803-1331 Letter Dated: January 14, 2003</p>	6									•		•		
<p>City of Los Angeles Department of Planning Mary Richardson Letter Dated: January 7, 2003</p>	7	•												

<p style="text-align: center;">SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment Project</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Environmental Review Process</p>	Letter Number	Land Use	Aesthetics/Urban Design/Light & Glare	Cultural Resources	Population, Housing, and Employment	Transportation/Circulation	Air Quality	Noise	Public Services	Utilities	Geotechnical/Seismic	Hazardous Materials	Other	Notes
<p>City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation Allyn Rifkin Principal Transportation Engineer Letter Dated: January 6, 2003</p>	8					•								
<p>Los Angeles Unified School District Raymond E. Dippel Assistant Environmental Planning Specialist Office of Environmental Health and Safety 355 South Grand Avenue, 6th Floor Los Angeles, California 90071 Letter Dated: January 3, 2003</p>	9						•	•	•					

<p style="text-align: center;">SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment Project</p>													<p style="text-align: center;">Notes</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Environmental Review Process</p>													
Letter Number	Land Use	Aesthetics/Urban Design/Light & Glare	Cultural Resources	Population, Housing, and Employment	Transportation/Circulation	Air Quality	Noise	Public Services	Utilities	Geotechnical/Seismic	Hazardous Materials	Other	
Organizations													
<p>Cahuenga Corridor Coalition David Gadja & Jose Malagon Letter Dated: December 19, 2002</p>													<p>Supports project</p>
<p>Hollywood Better Government Association David Morgan 6262 Sunset Boulevard Hollywood, California 90028 Letter Dated: January 18, 2003</p>													<p>Health effects of displacement, financial impacts, availability of plan amendment text, adequate notice</p>
<p>Hollywood Chamber of Commerce Leron Gubler President & CEO 7018 Hollywood Boulevard Hollywood, California 90028 Letter Dated: December 18, 2002</p>													<p>Supports project</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment Project</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Environmental Review Process</p>	Letter Number	Land Use	Aesthetics/Urban Design/Light & Glare	Cultural Resources	Population, Housing, and Employment	Transportation/Circulation	Air Quality	Noise	Public Services	Utilities	Geotechnical/Seismic	Hazardous Materials	Other	Notes
<p>Hollywood Heritage Robert W. Nudelman Board Member and Director of Preservation Issues P.O. Box 2586 Hollywood, California 90078 Letter Dated: January 3, 2003</p>	13			•		•				•				
<p>Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood Council and Hollywood Knolls Community Club M. Paul Ramsey Board Member Letter Dated: January 21, 2003</p>	14		•			•							•	Project description, adequate notice
<p>Hollywood Project Area Committee John Walsh Letter Dated: December 19, 2002</p>	15												•	Oppose project

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment Project											Notes		
Environmental Review Process													
Letter Number	Land Use	Aesthetics/Urban Design/Light & Glare	Cultural Resources	Population, Housing, and Employment	Transportation/Circulation	Air Quality	Noise	Public Services	Utilities	Geotechnical/Seismic	Hazardous Materials	Other	
Individuals													
Cox Castle Nicholson													
Edward C. Dygert 19800 MacArthur Boulevard, Suite 600 Irvine, California 92612-2435 Letter Dated: January 2, 2003											16	•	Inconsistent with Health and Safety Code
CIM Group													
Ryan S. Harter 6922 Hollywood Boulevard, Ninth Floor Hollywood, California 90028 Letter Dated: December 20, 2003											17	•	Supports project
Don Lippman 8660 Hollywood Boulevard Los Angeles, California 90069-1416 Letter Dated: December 31, 2002											18	•	Health effects of displacement, Eminent domain language

Letter No. 1

November 25, 2002

Governor's Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street, P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

Response No. 1-1:

The comment indicates that the State Clearinghouse forwarded the Draft EIR to selected state agencies and that the review period assigned by the State Clearinghouse would be November 19, 2002 to January 3, 2003. No response to this letter is necessary.

Letter No. 2

January 3, 2003

Terry Roberts
Director, State Clearinghouse
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street, P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

Response No. 2-1:

The comment indicates that the State Clearinghouse submitted the Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. The comment indicates that the review period closed on January 2, 2003, and that no state agencies submitted comments by that date. The comment acknowledges that the Lead Agency has complied with State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents pursuant to CEQA. No response to this letter is necessary.

Letter No. 3

January 2, 2003

Stephen J. Buswell
IGR/CEQA Branch Chief
Department of Transportation, District 7
State of California
120 South Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Response No. 3-1:

The comment indicates that traffic associated with the proposed project would impact the Hollywood Freeway (US-101) and that the need for mitigation measures such as capacity enhancement of the Hollywood Freeway would need to be addressed. The Draft EIR analysis of freeway impacts utilized criteria under the state-mandated Congestion Management Program (CMP) to determine the level of impact resulting from each of the three development scenarios. The Draft EIR indicates (page III.F-26) that: (1) under the Maximum Possible development scenario, three segments of the U.S. 101 freeway would be significantly impacted under CMP criteria.; (2) under the Moderate Development scenario, one segment of the U.S. 101 freeway would be significantly impacted under CMP criteria; and (3) under the Minimum development scenario, no freeway segments would be significantly impacted under CMP criteria. The Draft EIR further indicates (page III.F-30) that mitigation of impacts to freeways is beyond the scope of the EIR because implementation is outside the authority of the Lead Agency. Such mitigation is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Caltrans and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA). These agencies are currently undertaking a comprehensive study, scheduled to be completed in June 2004, of the U.S. 101 Freeway corridor to identify future conditions and needed improvements related to the U.S. 101 Freeway. Future development within the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area would be subject to mitigation requirements established by one or both of these agencies to address future conditions associated with the U.S. 101 Freeway.

Response No. 3-2:

The comment requests that the local agency implement a fair-share funding program for needed traffic improvements resulting from future development. The :Lead Agency, in conjunction with LADOT, will have the opportunity to consider implementation of such a program to address conditions related to

local streets, as part of the comprehensive Transportation Plan for the Project Area required under the Redevelopment Plan and set forth in the Draft EIR (page III.F-28). As noted in Response 3-1 above, implementation of a fair share mitigation funding program to address impacts to freeways and other regional transportation facilities would be outside the responsibility and jurisdiction of the Lead Agency and would be within the responsibility and jurisdiction of Caltrans and/or LACMTA.

Response No. 3-3:

The comment requests that the local agency initiate relinquishment proceeding for State Route 170 (Highland Avenue) and State Route 2 (Santa Monica Boulevard) in order to transfer control of these roadways to the local agency. This comment is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the Lead Agency and City decision makers for consideration. However, this action would be within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), and outside the responsibility and jurisdiction of the Lead Agency and the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan. This action would be separate from the proposed project evaluated in the Draft EIR.

Letter No. 4

January 9, 2003

Jeffrey M. Smith
Senior Planner, Intergovernmental Review
Southern California Association of Governments
818 West Seventh Street, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017-3435

Response No. 4-1:

The comment indicates that SCAG has reviewed the proposed Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment and determined that the project is not regionally significant per SCAG Intergovernmental Review Criteria and CEQA Guidelines. No response is necessary.

Letter No. 5

December 31, 2002

David R. Leininger
Chief, Forestry Division, Prevention Bureau
Los Angeles County Fire Department
1320 North Eastern Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90063-3294

Response No. 5-1

The comment indicates that the proposed project is within the jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles and would not likely impact the County of Los Angeles Fire Department. No response is necessary.

Response No. 5-2:

The comment indicates that areas germane to the statutory responsibilities of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Forestry Division, have been addressed in the EIR. No response is necessary.

Letter No. 6

January 14, 2003

James A. Noyes
Director of Public Works
Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
900 South Fremont Avenue
Alhambra, CA 91803-1331

Response No. 6-1:

The comment provides updated information regarding remaining capacity and average daily intake at the Bradley and Sunshine Canyon landfills. This information has been included in the Final EIR in revisions contained in Section III.J.3, Solid Waste, of the Final EIR. The updated information does not change the conclusions presented in the Draft EIR. The comment also expresses the concern of the County Board of Supervisors regarding stated positions of City of Los Angeles officials regarding closure of landfills within the City limits of the City of Los Angeles and attaches a letter to the Mayor of Los Angeles from the County Board of Supervisors to this effect. This comment is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the Lead Agency and City decision makers for consideration. The analysis of solid waste impacts included in the DEIR considered capacity available at the Bradley and Sunshine Canyon landfills located within the City of Los Angeles. These facilities are currently permitted and the analysis demonstrates that they have capacity to handle solid waste generated under the potential development scenarios. The Draft EIR analysis accurately reflects the current conditions associated with these facilities and correctly bases its conclusions on these conditions. The updated information would not change the conclusions presented in the Draft EIR. Possible de-permitting of these facilities, to which the comment refers, would represent a separate discretionary action on the part of the City of Los Angeles that is unrelated to the proposed Plan Amendment. This action would be required to be evaluated under CEQA as a separate project. Generally speaking, it is beyond the scope of any one development or redevelopment project to address the cumulative solid waste disposal needs of the region. As stated in the Board of Supervisors letter, disposal of solid waste is a regional issue. Therefore, solutions to accommodate the increasing disposal needs generated by growth in the region, including the City of Los Angeles, would need to be sought at a regional level.

Response No. 6-2:

The comment suggests that the Draft EIR should include standards for the provision of areas for collection and storage of recyclables and green waste within individual development projects that would occur under the proposed Plan Amendment. Although impacts of the proposed project related to solid waste would be less than significant, this mitigation measure has been included in the Final EIR in Section III.J.3, Solid Waste.

Response No. 6-3:

The comment indicated that current hazardous waste management facilities in the County are inadequate to handle existing generation of household hazardous waste and requests this issue be addressed in the Final EIR. State and Federal laws require all businesses that generate or accumulate hazardous waste to comply with regulations for proper disposal of these wastes. Generators of small quantities of hazardous waste may be conditionally exempt from many of the regulations if they deliver the waste to permitted collection sites. The City of Los Angeles has existing programs to provide small quantity generators with a legal and affordable solution to hazardous waste disposal. Beyond these currently allowed means of proper disposal and handling of hazardous materials, it is neither within the scope nor permitted under laws governing the handling of hazardous waste, that the proposed project address regional hazardous waste disposal facilities needs.

Response No. 6-4:

The comment indicates that food service establishments may be required to provide grease treatment devices and will be subject to review and approval by the County Environmental Programs division. This comment is acknowledged and will be forwarded to Lead Agency and City decision makers for consideration. Because this is a statutory requirement and is presently handled through an existing permitting process, no change to the Draft EIR would be necessary as a result of this comment.

Response No. 6-5:

The comment indicates that the Draft EIR was reviewed by the Land Development (Transportation Planning) division and no comments were provided. No response is necessary.

Response No. 6-6:

The comment indicates that the proposed project would not have any significant impacts to County roadways and lighting facilities in the area. No response is necessary.

Response No. 6-7:

The comment indicates that the project should consider watershed opportunities to maximize capture of local rainfall, minimize increased flow to the storm drain system and filter flows to capture contaminants from projects within the Project Area. Future development projects would be subject to existing runoff control requirements during construction and operations established under the Countywide construction storm water runoff permit and the Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan, both of which are presently applicable to all development projects in the County. Adherence to the standards set forth in these regulations would assure that all applicable Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be employed to minimize impacts from storm water runoff resulting from construction and operations.

Letter No. 7

January 7, 2003

Mary Richardson
City of Los Angeles
Department of City Planning

Response No. 7-1

The comment indicates that the three development scenarios evaluated in the Draft EIR would conform to the land use policies of the Hollywood Community Plan. No response is necessary.

Letter No. 8

January 6, 2003

Allyn Rifkin, Principal Transportation Engineer
City of Los Angeles
Department of Transportation

Response No. 8-1

The comment requested additional time to evaluate Level of Service calculations and mitigation measures included in the Draft EIR traffic analysis. As noted above, the comment period for the Draft EIR was extended from January 3, 2003 to January 21, 2003.

Response No. 8-2

The comment indicates that a majority of the proposed mitigation measures in the Draft EIR are not acceptable to LADOT and that the preparer of the traffic analysis did not discuss with LADOT the acceptability and feasibility of mitigation measures. As indicated in the comment, the preparer of the traffic analysis did consult with LADOT regarding project scope and methodology. Chapter VIII of the EIR has been updated to reflect this coordination. The Lead Agency concurs with the assessment of LADOT that further coordination is necessary to identify comprehensive solutions to future transportation conditions in Hollywood. The mitigation measures proposed in the Draft EIR were intended to provide a list of potential measures to be incorporated in a comprehensive transportation plan for the Project Area. It was the Lead Agency's intention that the consultation called for in the comment be undertaken as part of the development of this plan (see Response No. 8-3).

Response No. 8-3

The comment indicates that the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area Transportation Plan is outdated and should be updated. The Lead Agency concurs with this assessment. As indicated in the Draft EIR (page III.F-28), the Lead Agency shall, in coordination with LADOT, develop a Transportation Plan to provide comprehensive solutions to the management of traffic within the Project Area. The measures listed in the Draft EIR were not intended to constitute the substance of this Transportation Plan, but rather to suggest potential measures for consideration by the Lead Agency and LADOT as part of this planning process. The Lead Agency intends to develop this Plan in close coordination with LADOT to ensure that the most effective transportation management strategy is developed.

Letter No. 9

January 3, 2003

Raymond E. Dippel, Assistant Environmental Planning Specialist
Los Angeles Unified School District
Office of Environmental Health & Safety
355 S Grand Ave, 6th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071

Response No. 9-1:

The comment provides a listing of seven elementary schools, two middle schools and one high school that could potentially be affected by future development associated with the proposed Plan Amendment. The comment indicates that construction activities associated with the proposed project could result in short term impacts on one or more of these schools and requests that air pollution impacts be quantified and reduced to a level of insignificance. The Draft EIR includes an analysis of potential construction impacts (pages III.G-20 through III.G-23) that quantifies, in accordance with SCAQMD methodologies, the expected emissions from the typical construction activities expected to occur under the Maximum Possible, Moderate and Minimum development scenarios. The estimated emissions resulting from typical construction activity are provided in Table III.G-6 on page III.G-22 of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR does not evaluate specific projects because the exact location of future individual projects is unknown. However, the Draft EIR concludes that these typical levels of emissions could affect sensitive receptors within the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area, including schools. Schools that are located within the Project Area and on the edge of the Project (which would include Hollywood High School, Selma Avenue Elementary, Cheremoya Avenue Elementary, Grant Elementary, Le Conte Middle School, and Santa Monica Boulevard Elementary) are the schools most likely to be affected by construction activity occurring in conjunction with the proposed Plan Amendment. Schools located outside the boundary of the Project Area (Gardner Street Elementary, Ramona Elementary, Vine Street Elementary and Bancroft Middle School) are less likely to be affected by construction activity occurring in conjunction with the proposed Plan Amendment. As indicated in the Draft EIR, even with implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, NO_x emissions during construction would exceed SCAQMD thresholds under all development scenarios and would be significant and unavoidable. In addition, PM₁₀ emissions under the Maximum Possible and Moderate development scenarios would exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds and would be significant and unavoidable. All other construction emissions would be below SCAQMD significance thresholds under all scenarios.

Response No. 9-2:

The comment indicates that construction noise could affect schools located adjacent to projects within the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area. The Draft EIR provides an analysis of construction noise impacts at pages III.H-8 through III.H-12, which concludes that construction activities associated with the proposed project could result in impacts to sensitive receptors under all development scenarios. Even with implementation of mitigation measures, construction noise impacts would be significant and unavoidable under all development scenarios (page III.H-21). The comment requests that an additional mitigation measure be included in the Final EIR with respect to construction noise effects on schools. This measure would provide for additional coordination with the affected school(s) to identify additional mitigation measures to be employed to mitigate construction related noise at affected schools. The portion of the proposed mitigation measure that requires additional coordination between project applicants and schools to identify the potential to implement additional school-specific mitigation measures to address construction noise impacts has been included in the Final EIR in Section III.H, Noise. However, because it may be technically infeasible to mitigate such impacts below the significance threshold, depending upon the specific characteristics of the proposed construction activity, the location of the activity and the location and configuration of the school, it would be infeasible to require that construction noise impacts be “effectively mitigated” as requested in the comment. Therefore this requirement has not been included in the Final EIR.

Response No. 9-3:

The comment identifies mitigation measures to address possible effects on school traffic and pedestrian routes as a result of construction activity associated with the proposed project. The requested mitigation measures have been included in the Final EIR in Section III.I.3, Schools.

Letter No. 10

December 19, 2002

David Gadjia & Jose Malagon
Cahuenga Corridor Coalition

Response No. 10-1:

The comment indicates that the Cahuenga Corridor Coalition has reviewed the Draft EIR for the proposed Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment and agrees with the proposed extension establishment of the Lead Agency's power of eminent domain to acquire property on which no persons lawfully reside and support for continued funding of certain programs within the Project Area. The comment requests the Lead Agency consider providing gateway improvements at major entry ways into Hollywood. While no environmental issues are contained in this comment, the comment is acknowledged and will be forwarded to Lead Agency and City decision makers for consideration.

Letter No. 11

January 18, 2003

David Morgan
Hollywood Better Government Association
6262 Sunset Boulevard
Hollywood, CA 90028

Response No. 11-1:

The comment indicates that three issues identified by the commentor in a response to the Notice of Preparation issued on December 4, 2001 were not evaluated in the Draft EIR. These issues included: (1) dangerous health effects of displacement; (2) fiscal impacts to public services; and (3) transfer of the project from California Redevelopment Law to the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC). The commentor provided comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) in a letter dated January 4, 2002. This letter was included in Technical Appendix B (Responses to the Notice of Preparation) of the Draft EIR. The Lead Agency considered all comments in the January 4, 2002 letter during preparation of the Draft EIR. However, none of the issues raised in the commentor's January 4, 2002 letter were appropriate for inclusion in the Draft EIR under CEQA and CEQA Guidelines. The specific reasons for the Lead Agency's determination not to include these issues in the Draft EIR are provided below. With respect to health effects of displacement, see Response No. 11-3. With respect to fiscal impacts on public services, see Response No. 11-51. With respect to transfer of the project to the LAMC, see Response No. 11-22.

Response No. 11-2:

The comment suggests that adequate notice was not given on the Draft EIR hearing and comment period. As part of the EIR process, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Draft EIR was sent to public agencies and to those persons and organizations that, as defined in the Lead Agency's CEQA Guidelines, may be concerned with the environmental effects of the proposed Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment. The Notice was also sent to property owners, tenants and affected taxing entities, and in response to that, the commentor sent a letter to the Lead Agency in January of 2002. The Lead Agency also provided notice of the availability of the Draft EIR and provided opportunities to comment on the Draft EIR in accordance with legal requirements. The recipients and respondents of the Notice of Preparation were sent copies of the Draft EIR, which was made available for public review on November 20, 2002. A Notice stating that the Draft EIR was available for public

review and announcing the date and time of the public hearing was sent to all interested parties, and was published in the Los Angeles Times on the week of November 20, 2002, and thereafter in the Hollywood Independent and the Los Angeles Downtown News. The Notice also stated that members of the public could review and/or obtain copies of the Draft EIR at the Lead Agency's Records Center and could review the Draft EIR at the Hollywood Library, the Hollywood site office, and the Lead Agency's web site. In addition, interested parties may also borrow a copy in accordance with the Lead Agency procedure at the Records Center of the Lead Agency's Central Office (See Appendix B of the Draft EIR). The Draft EIR was circulated for a 45-day review period as required by CEQA. The CRA Board of Commissioners held a public hearing on December 19, 2002 to take comments on the Draft EIR. It is noted that the commentor gave testimony during the public hearing for the Draft EIR (see comment PH1). In response to oral comments provided by one commentor representing the Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood Council at this hearing, the public review period was extended an additional 18 days, to January 21, 2003, in order to provide additional opportunities to comment on the Draft EIR. The resulting 63-day comment period for the Draft EIR exceeded the EIR public noticing requirements for CEQA compliance.

Response No. 11-3:

The comment indicates that the Draft EIR did not consider the human health effects of displacement and suggests that this occurred because the environmental checklist provided in CEQA Guidelines was not completed. This suggestion is incorrect. As permitted under CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(a), if the lead agency can determine that an EIR would clearly be required, an initial study is not required. Since the Lead Agency determined that an EIR would be required for the proposed Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment, no initial study was prepared (see Notice of Preparation, Technical Appendix A to the Draft EIR).

Even though an Initial Study was not prepared, the Lead Agency was aware of the commentor's contention that human health effects associated with displacement should be addressed in the Draft EIR. The Lead Agency disagrees with this contention, as no substantial evidence has been presented to the Lead Agency that such effects could occur. The commentor included, as an attachment to the response to the Notice of Preparation, 41 pages of material purporting to establish the human health effects associated with displacement. The major portion of the pertinent material relating to human health effects is contained in a 12-page paper entitled "The Fundamental Right to Life and Health – Relocation and Eminent Domain Have Adverse Health Effects". Upon examination of this material, the Lead Agency concluded that it did not support the commentor's claims regarding the health effects associated with relocation and displacement and did not constitute substantial evidence under CEQA. The paper relies heavily on dated sources from the 1960s and 1970s, testimony of social scientists and economists,

legal declarations and testimony before public bodies and anecdotal evidence. Not a single authoritative, scientifically valid study is cited which establishes a causal relationship between displacement and relocation and human health consequences. The studies cited provide some evidence for correlations between sources of stress and medical consequences, but none of them control for the source of the stress experienced by their subjects, and therefore do not establish any direct connection between relocation activities and human health consequences. Under Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21082.2, significant effect is “based on substantial evidence, not public controversy or speculation”. Substantial evidence shall include “facts, reasonable assumptions based on facts and expert opinion supported by facts. (PRC Section 21082.2(c).” None of the information provided by the commentor rises to this level. In addition, the proposed Plan Amendment would not result in the large scale displacement and relocation which occurred under urban renewal programs in the 1960s and 1970s. These early programs often resulted in large areas of inner cities being cleared for “urban renewal”. No such large scale displacement has occurred under the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan since its adoption in 1986, and no such activity is anticipated in the future. Thus this effect would not be appropriate for inclusion in the Draft EIR.

Moreover, most of the material presented in this paper is not relevant to the proposed Plan Amendment, as it attempts to establish connections between involuntary displacement and relocation of residents and the elderly and human health effects. As indicated in the Draft EIR (page II-7), the proposed Plan Amendment would not include authority for the Lead Agency to acquire property on which persons lawfully reside. Therefore the Draft EIR concludes (pages III.E-2, III.E-4 and III.E-5) that no involuntary residential displacement would occur under any of the development scenarios. Potential displacement associated with the acquisition of non-residential property is acknowledged in the Draft EIR to be a significant impact, which would be mitigated through compensation and relocation assistance programs established under federal, state and local law.

The evidence presented by the commentor did not warrant inclusion of analysis related to human health effects in the EIR. No scientifically valid studies are available upon which to base such analysis. Therefore the Lead Agency concluded that this issue need not be addressed in the Draft EIR. This conclusion would have been the same, based upon the evidence presented to the Lead Agency, even if an Initial Study had been prepared for the proposed Plan Amendment.

Response No. 11-4:

The comment indicates that the Lead Agency did not provide a draft of the proposed plan amendment and other information related to blight determinations related to the “213 parcels slated for redevelopment”. With respect to the provision of a draft of the proposed plan amendment, this

document is not required to be provided under CEQA. Rather, sufficient information needs to be provided in the project description which allows for evaluation and review of the environmental impacts of the project. This information is provided in the Draft EIR (pages II-7 and II-8), which list the components of the proposed Plan Amendment that have the potential to result in physical changes to the environment. The proposed Plan Amendment will be made available for public inspection pursuant to the requirements of, and in accordance with, Community Redevelopment Law. Regardless of the specific language included in the proposed Plan Amendment, the environmental effects evaluated in the EIR would not be expected to change. Also, see Response No. 11-38, below. With respect to the “213 parcels slated for development”, see Response No. 11-5 below.

Response No. 11-5:

The comment suggests that the Draft EIR does not specify sites and medical dangers in a quantitative manner. With respect to “medical dangers”, see Response No. 11-3. With respect to specific sites proposed for development, the commentor misunderstands the process by which the development scenarios representing the potential physical change in the environment resulting from the proposed Plan Amendment were determined. As indicated in the Draft EIR (page II-8), the candidate parcels were identified solely for the purpose of providing a basis for calculating the estimated amount of growth that could occur within the Redevelopment Project Area under the three development scenarios. These parcels represented approximately 213 acres (not 213 parcels) of the approximately 1,100 acres that comprise the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area. The development that could be associated with the proposed Plan Amendment would not be limited to the candidate parcels but could occur anywhere within the Redevelopment Project Area. The candidate parcels themselves may or may not be developed as a result of the proposed Plan Amendment. The effects, which the Draft EIR evaluated would not be limited to the candidate parcels, but could occur throughout the Project Area. The commercial displacement effect to which the comment specifically refers would not be limited to the candidate parcels. Therefore the locations of these candidate parcels were not pertinent to the analysis provided in the Draft EIR.

Response No. 11-6:

The comment claims that the Draft EIR falsely labels CRA development as “No Project” when “Existing Conditions” is the actual no project and that the No Project alternative means that CRA is no longer active within the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area. This claim is incorrect. As indicated in the Draft EIR (Page II-9), the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan is an adopted plan and remains effective until May, 2026. Even if the proposed Plan Amendment were not adopted, redevelopment activities in Hollywood would continue until May of 2026. The No Project scenario reflects the

development expected to occur within the Project Area through 2026 if no change to the existing Redevelopment Plan were to occur.

Response No. 11-7:

The comment states that the CRA has set a precedent to provide site specific detail on displacements and cites an October 1997 EIR Addendum issued by CRA as precedent. The commentor misunderstands the purpose of the October 1997 document as compared to the Draft EIR on the proposed Plan Amendment. The October 1997 Addendum was intended to address the potential effects associated with a specific project, for which the potential to use eminent domain to acquire property at specific locations was known. The Addendum provided the appropriate level of analysis that addresses the environmental effects for those specific possible acquisitions. The Draft EIR for the proposed Plan Amendment cannot include any site specific instances where eminent domain would be used, as those locations are not known at this time. The Draft EIR is a Project EIR per Public Resources Code Section 21090 and therefore addresses all public and private activities or undertakings pursuant to or in furtherance of the Redevelopment Plan. These activities or undertakings could include the exercise of eminent domain to acquire property on which no persons lawfully reside, as permitted under the proposed Plan Amendment. Therefore, the environmental effects of such activity, even though specific locations for the exercise of eminent domain authority are not known at this time, are addressed in the Draft EIR.

Response No. 11-8:

The comment indicates that the Draft EIR fails to address past use and threats of eminent domain within the Project Area. Use of eminent domain authority in the past is not relevant to the proposed Plan Amendment. Under the proposed Plan Amendment, the Lead Agency would be provided with the authority to acquire property, through eminent domain, on which no persons lawfully reside. The potential environmental effects of this provision of the proposed Plan Amendment are addressed in the Draft EIR as required by law.

Response No. 11-9:

The comment provides the commentor's opinion that the CRA Board should terminate the EIR process, based on the alleged deficiencies described in the preceding comments. The commentor's opinion is noted and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration.

Response No. 11-10:

The comment reiterates the comments provided earlier regarding the commentors response to the Notice of Preparation, with respect to purported medical effects of relocation. See Response No. 11-3.

Response No. 11-11:

The comment questions the past use of tax increment funds generated by the Hollywood Redevelopment Project. This comment does not pertain to the proposed Plan Amendment that is evaluated in the Draft EIR and is therefore not required to be included in the Draft EIR analysis under CEQA.

Response No. 11-12:

The comment references a report on business assessment districts and business improvement districts and the cumulative impacts of them along with “all other taxes and government interferences”. This comment does not pertain to the proposed Plan Amendment that is evaluated in the Draft EIR and is therefore not required to be included in the Draft EIR analysis under CEQA.

Response No. 11-13:

The comment references the use of eminent domain on a project in the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area in the late 1980s. This comment does not pertain to the proposed Plan Amendment that is evaluated in the Draft EIR and is therefore not required to be included in the Draft EIR analysis under CEQA. The comment further states, incorrectly, that CRA did not have eminent domain power until June 1992. Eminent domain authority was, in fact, established with the adoption of the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan in 1986.

Response No. 11-14:

The comment suggests that the Draft EIR did not consider potential displacement associated with the demolition of Hollywood High School. There is no project under consideration under the proposed Plan Amendment that would result in the acquisition and demolition of Hollywood High School. As indicated in the Draft EIR (page III.I-15), the capacity provided at Hollywood High School is necessary to accommodate the projected enrollment growth that would occur under the development scenarios.

Response No. 11-15:

The comment suggests that the Draft EIR should have considered the effects of school displacements that previously occurred at Selma School, Grant School, Le Conte School and Hollywood Elementary No. 2, in addition to Hollywood High School. The Lead Agency is not proposing to acquire any property presently associated with schools. Therefore, any acquisition of property that may have been associated with these school projects would not be associated with the proposed Plan Amendment and need not be considered in the Draft EIR. Acquisition of property in association with school projects is not within the authority of the Lead Agency and would be subject to CEQA review by the lead agency responsible for the school projects.

Response No. 11-16:

The comment states that eminent domain threats have been used extensively in the past and that 2,900 parcels have been condemned by eminent domain. Past use of eminent domain authority is not relevant to the proposed Plan Amendment and therefore need not be considered in the EIR. The commentor incorrectly states there is a Project Area Committee (PAC) in the Hollywood Redevelopment Project. While a PAC was created at the time the Redevelopment Project was created, none currently exists. See also Response Nos. 11-3, 11-7 and 11-8.

Response No. 11-17:

The comment suggests that redevelopment agency activities have caused massive displacements in Hollywood. Regarding duplicate reviews and approvals between CRA and the City, it should be noted that a redevelopment agency is a separate legal entity from the legislative body of the community, and that the CRA is a local state agency, not a department of the City of Los Angeles. It has been well accepted, since at least 1959, that a city is acting as “an administrative arm of the State” when it adopts a redevelopment plan and that a redevelopment agency is fulfilling state legislative policies in the implementation of such plans. The comment also encompasses the commentor’s opinion regarding the effects of past redevelopment activities in Hollywood, and is not directed at the adequacy or conclusions in the EIR. The comment is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration.

Response No. 11-18:

The comment suggests that displacement due to rail construction in Hollywood should have been considered in the Draft EIR. Displacements associated with Metro Rail construction activities occurred

during past rail system construction activity and are not relevant to the proposed Plan Amendment. They were also the responsibility of another lead agency and were subject to CEQA review in conjunction with the Metro Rail project.

Response No. 11-19:

The comment suggests that the effects of displacement differ between small property owners and large property owners. The Lead Agency is not aware of any evidence which would support this suggestion and therefore it was not included in the EIR. The potential effects of commercial displacement are addressed in the Draft EIR and mitigated in accordance with federal, state and local laws and regulations.

Response No. 11-20:

The comment provides the commentator's opinion that there is class discrimination in the pattern of CRA condemnations. No evidence is provided by the commentator to support this claim. The Lead Agency is not aware of any evidence which would support this suggestion and therefore it was not included in the EIR.

Response No. 11-21:

The commentator suggests that a reasonable alternative would be to conduct the project with no further borrowing. The reasonable range of alternatives considered in the Draft EIR was established to address the potential for alternatives to avoid the significant environmental effects of the proposed project. The suggested alternative would not have any effect on the significant environmental effects of the project and therefore was not considered. In addition this alternative would not achieve the objectives of the proposed Plan Amendment as set forth in the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan (see Draft EIR, pages II-12 through II-14).

The range of alternatives evaluated by the Lead Agency was structured to evaluate alternatives which would meet the project objectives of promoting redevelopment and eliminating blight within the Project Area. Three alternative future development scenarios were developed as described in Section II.D of the EIR, and evaluated for each environmental issue in Sections III.A through III.L of the EIR. An alternate site for the Proposed Project was rejected because the Project Area already exists and the physical conditions that the redevelopment tools authorized under the existing Redevelopment Plan and the proposed amendment are intended to address are concentrated within the existing Project Area boundaries.

Response No. 11-22:

The comment indicates that the Draft EIR fails to evaluate the benefits that would accrue from transfer of the project from California Redevelopment Law to the Los Angeles Municipal Code. The comment refers to a report that provides information concerning financial aspects of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project. These financial issues are not environmental issues under CEQA and therefore are not required to be included in the EIR. In addition, the proposed transfer of responsibilities would not be consistent with the objectives of the proposed project to promote redevelopment in Hollywood.

Response No. 11-23:

The comment suggests that the EIR should evaluate the fact that large corporations and investors have profited from taxpayer welfare. This is not an environmental issue under CEQA and therefore is not required to be addressed in the EIR. The Draft EIR considers the effects of the proposed project on the provision of public services in Section III.I.

Response No. 11-24:

The comment provides the commentator's opinion that the restoration of eminent domain authority to the Lead Agency is analogous to dispossession of Indians in past U.S. history. This comment is neither directed at the adequacy of the EIR nor the environmental impacts of the proposed project and so no response is required. However, the commentator's opinion is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration. See also Response No. 11-21.

Response No. 11-25:

The comment provides the commentator's opinion that money was wasted in the past on specific projects and that the EIR should evaluate the benefits that would occur if waste were cut in the future. The commentator's opinion is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration. The financial performance of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project is not an environmental issue under CEQA and is therefore not required to be included in the EIR.

Response No. 11-26:

The comment reiterates the objection provided previously that the text of the proposed Plan Amendment was not provided. See Response No. 11-4 above and Response no. 11-38 below.

Response No. 11-27:

The comment suggests that the restriction on use of eminent domain on residential property contains a loophole that would allow a resident to be evicted to permit the property to be acquired by eminent domain. It is not the Lead Agency's intent to acquire any property on which persons lawfully reside. Residential displacement would therefore, not occur under the proposed Plan Amendment. See also Response No. 11-3.

Response No. 11-28:

The comment suggests that the EIR did not consider cumulative effects of displacement in the Project Area combined with those in the rest of the City and County and other CRA project areas. The effects of potential commercial displacement within the Project Area are considered in Section III.E of the Draft EIR. This analysis included the potential effects of cumulative growth within the Project Area because the analysis of potential impacts is based on the total projected growth within the Project Area, including growth projected to occur under the No Project scenario. Potential commercial displacement associated with growth occurring outside the Project Area would not be likely to cause a cumulative impact in conjunction with the proposed Plan Amendment, as this activity, to the extent that it occurs, would affect different populations. Because no residential displacement would occur within the Project Area, no potential for cumulative residential displacement would exist. The EIR has been prepared in full compliance with the provisions and requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Response No. 11-29:

The comment suggests the cumulative impacts of the project on traffic are not considered in the EIR. The traffic analysis prepared for the three potential development scenarios accounts for potential cumulative growth in traffic passing through the Project Area, as well as project-related traffic. Cumulative traffic growth was estimated based upon SCAG forecasts (Draft EIR, Page III.F-10) and is reflected in the future traffic conditions with the project shown in Section III.F of the Draft EIR. All impacts that could potentially result from implementation of the proposed project have been addressed in the Draft EIR including traffic and hazards.

Response No. 11-30:

The comment suggests that the EIR does not consider cumulative impacts from fiscal detriments. This is not an environmental issue under CEQA and is therefore not included in the EIR. Growth-inducing

impacts associated with project implementation have been addressed in full compliance with the requirements of CEQA (see Section VI of the Draft EIR).

Response No. 11-31:

The comment suggests that the EIR did not review the projects and businesses that went bankrupt or had properties foreclosed. This is not an environmental issue under CEQA and is therefore not included in the EIR. Moreover, past activities related to bankruptcy and foreclosure within the Project Area are not relevant to the proposed Plan Amendment and are therefore not included in the EIR.

Response No. 11-32:

The comment suggests that “the EIR fails to disclose any nexus for the taking of eminent domain powers and the effects of taking such powers without a nexus.” Community Redevelopment Law provides the authority for redevelopment agencies to exercise the power of eminent domain, if authorized under a redevelopment plan. The authority to acquire property by eminent domain was contained in the Redevelopment Plan when the Redevelopment Plan was adopted in 1986. Re-establishing the Lead Agency’s authority to acquire property by eminent domain is required, in order to continue to achieve the goals and objectives set forth in the adopted Redevelopment Plan.

Response No. 11-33:

The comment reiterates the commentor’s opinion regarding health effects of displacement and eminent domain. See Response No. 11-3.

Response No. 11-34:

The comment suggests that equal protection is denied since there is no system whereby each property receives equal benefit annually. This is not an environmental issue required under CEQA and is therefore not included in the EIR.

Response No. 11-35:

The comment suggests that the EIR does not include an adequate discussion of no project. The EIR describes the No Project alternative on page II-9 of the Draft EIR and evaluates the impacts of the No Project alternative on pages IV-4 through IV-18 of the Draft EIR as required by CEQA. The commentor does not specify how the information provided in the Draft EIR is inadequate.

Response No. 11-36:

The comment suggests that the EIR does not have an adequate discussion of alternatives and reasonable alternatives. The method and assumptions under which the alternative development scenarios were calculated is described in the Draft EIR on pages II-8 through II-11. The discussion of the alternatives analysis process and description of the environmentally superior alternative required by CEQA is provided in the Draft EIR at pages IV-1, IV-18 and IV-19. The commentor does not specify how the information provided in the Draft EIR is inadequate.

Response No. 11-37:

The comment suggests that the EIR does not contain an adequate discussion of existing conditions. A discussion of existing conditions is provided for each technical area of the EIR (Sections III.B through III.L) under the heading "Environmental Setting". These sections provide all relevant information on existing conditions for the issue discussed in each respective section. The commentor does not specify how the information provided in the Draft EIR is inadequate.

Response No. 11-38:

The comment reiterates the objection provided previously that the text of the proposed Plan Amendment was not provided. See Response No. 11-4. The proposed project is an amendment to the existing Hollywood Redevelopment Plan. The text of the proposed amendment will be included in the report to the City Council as provided by state law, and will be available for public inspection in the offices of the Lead Agency at 354 S. Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90013, prior to the joint public hearing by the Lead Agency and the City Council. The text of the adopted Redevelopment Plan has been available since 1986.

Response No. 11-39:

The comment suggests that the CRA is attempting to divide the project by not providing all documents ahead of time. See Response No. 11-4 and Response No. 11-38 above.

Response No. 11-40:

The comment suggests that CRA failed to give timely notice to Neighborhood Councils of the hearing before the CRA Board. See Response No. 11-2.

Response No. 11-41:

The comment indicates the commentor's disagreement with statements made at the public hearing by one individual, and is not directed at the adequacy or the conclusions contained in the EIR. While no response is required, the commentor's opinion is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration.

Response No. 11-42:

The comment indicates the commentor's disagreement with statements made at the public hearing by one individual and is not directed at the adequacy or the conclusions contained in the EIR. While no response is required While no response is required, the commentor's opinion is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration.

Response No. 11-43:

The comment indicates the commentor's disagreement with statements made at the public hearing by one individual and is not directed at the adequacy or the conclusions contained in the EIR. While no response is required, while no response is required, the commentor's opinion is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration.

Response No. 11-44:

The comment indicates the commentor's disagreement with statements made at the public hearing by one individual and is not directed at the adequacy or the conclusions contained in the EIR. While no response is required, the commentor's opinion is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration.

Response No. 11-45:

The comment suggests that the EIR failed to evaluate "giving away of sales tax revenue" to a specific project in the past. This comment does not pertain to the proposed Plan Amendment that is evaluated in the Draft EIR and is therefore not required to be included in the Draft EIR analysis under CEQA.

Response No. 11-46:

The comment indicates the commentor's disagreement with statements made at the public hearing by one individual and is not directed at the adequacy or the conclusions contained in the EIR. While no response is required, the commentor's opinion is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration.

Response No. 11-47:

The comment reiterates the objection provided previously that relevant documents were not provided prior to the December 19, 2002 public hearing. See Response No. 11-4 and Response no. 11-38 above.

Response No. 11-48:

The comment indicates that the commentor incorporates by reference all files of CRA, City, County, LAUSD, MTA and any other affected entities. Incorporation by reference is an authority granted to the Lead Agency under CEQA whereby, if another document is incorporated by reference, the incorporated language shall be considered to be set forth in full as part of the text of the EIR. Such authority is not provided to commentors under CEQA or CEQA Guidelines. Moreover, when an agency incorporates another document by reference, it must provide a copy of the document for public inspection before it can be considered part of the administrative record for the project. The commentor would be required to provide this information in order for it to be included in the administrative record for the EIR on the proposed Plan Amendment. In addition, to incorporate a document by reference, it must be described sufficiently to adequately provide notice of which document is being incorporated. Since this did not occur, this comment has no effect, and therefore no response is required. Nonetheless, this comment is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration.

Response No. 11-49:

The comment suggests that prior filings of the BGA and redevelopment judicial records are incorporated by reference. To the extent that these materials are included in the commentor's response to the Notice of Preparation, oral testimony before the CRA Board and this comment letter, such information would be included in the administrative record for the EIR on the proposed Plan Amendment. To the extent that this material was not submitted in conjunction with one of the three actions cited above, see Response No. 11-48.

Response No. 11-50:

The comment refers to the reaction of “immigrants to Hollywood” regarding eminent domain powers of the Lead Agency and is not directed at the adequacy or the conclusions contained in the EIR. While no response is required, this comment is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration. See also Response No. 11-3.

Response No. 11-51:

The comment suggests that the EIR fails to describe impacts on public services in light of state, county and city funding shortfalls. The Draft EIR describes the potential impacts of the proposed Plan Amendment on Public Services in Sections III.I-1 through III.I-5. Fiscal impacts and financing of public service activities is not an environmental issue required under CEQA and is therefore, not considered in the EIR.

Response No. 11-52:

The comment suggests that the EIR does not describe potential changes in landscapes, streets and skylines associated with the proposed Plan Amendment. These effects are considered in Section III.C (Aesthetics) of the Draft EIR as well as under Section IV. (Alternatives) of the EIR. Section III.C also includes mitigation measures to be implemented to reduce these impacts. The Draft EIR indicates that the proposed Plan Amendment could have significant and unavoidable effects with respect to view blockage, development density in residential areas and shadow impacts.

Response No. 11-53:

The comment suggests that the EIR does not designate the actual improvement or activities that will take place. As indicated in the Draft EIR (page II-8), the EIR assesses the potential environmental consequences of performing redevelopment activities after adopting the proposed Plan Amendment under three alternative land use and development scenarios. These development scenarios represent the potential physical changes to the environment that could result from the continuing application of the redevelopment tools that are available to the Lead Agency. These land use and development scenarios would result from future public and private sector activities and projects that are unknown at this time. Therefore the EIR evaluates the impacts of cumulative growth within the Project Area at a level of detail commensurate with the information available to the Lead Agency with respect to the nature of that growth.

Response No. 11-54:

The comment suggests that the EIR does not designate the proposed improvements to be implemented and their sites. No specific improvements are associated with the proposed Plan Amendment. Therefore, no project specific analysis could be provided in the Draft EIR. See Response No. 11-53.

Response No. 11-55:

The comment suggests that the EIR does not designate the time frame in which proposed improvements would take place. The EIR assumes that the time frame for the proposed Plan Amendment would be the same as for the adopted Hollywood Redevelopment Plan, which is effective until May, 2026. Therefore the Draft EIR analyses assume a year 2026 time horizon.

Response No. 11-56:

The comment suggests that there is no analysis of City added fluorine to the water supply. Flouridation of the water supplied by the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) is outside the authority of the Lead Agency and is not part of the proposed Plan Amendment. To the extent that this constitutes an environmental impact under CEQA, such review would be the responsibility of the LADWP.

Response No. 11-57:

The comment suggests that no mitigation is proposed for higher noise levels from the project. As indicated in the Draft EIR (page III.H-13) traffic noise impacts under the Maximum Possible development scenario would exceed the threshold of significance. Traffic noise impacts under the Moderate and Minimum development scenarios would be less than significant. As indicated on page III.H-21 of the Draft EIR, due to the nature of the source, no feasible mitigation measures are available to address the traffic noise impacts of the Maximum Possible development scenario. Mitigation measures that could be feasibly implemented to reduce short-term construction noise impacts for projects within the Redevelopment Plan area were identified on page III.H-21 of the EIR.

Response No. 11-58:

The comment suggests that the EIR is a speculative description of the proposed redevelopment plan. The EIR properly addresses the impacts associated with potential physical changes that could result

from the proposed Plan Amendment, using reasonable assumptions that are fully explained in the Draft EIR (pages II-8 through II-11). See also Response No. 11-7.

Response No. 11-59:

The comment suggests that in other project areas the Lead Agency has provided site specific project information. Where the Lead Agency has site specific information that is appropriately included in an EIR for a Redevelopment Plan or Redevelopment Plan Amendment, such information is included in the EIR project description and evaluated in accordance with CEQA requirements. However, in the case of the proposed Plan Amendment, such site specific project information is not available and therefore could not be included in the EIR project description. The potential physical change to the environment that could result from the proposed Plan Amendment was estimated as described in Response No. 11-58. See also Response No. 11-7.

Response No. 11-60:

The comment suggests that the EIR does not include an appropriate project description and does not address specific environmental impacts. See Response Nos. 11-7, 11-58 and 11-59.

Response No. 11-61:

The comment suggests that the EIR does not meet the standards for a Program EIR. The EIR is a Project EIR as provided under Public Resources Code Section 21090 and provides the prescribed level of analysis for the proposed Plan Amendment, which does not have specific projects or improvements associated with it. See Response Nos. 11-7, 11-58 and 11-59.

Response No. 11-62:

The comment suggests that the EIR has site specific projects in mind but does not disclose them. The analysis contained in the EIR is in full compliance with the requirements of CEQA, based on reasoned analysis and on a good faith effort at full disclosure. Therefore, this assertion is incorrect. Also, see Response Nos. 11-7, 11-58 and 11-59.

Response No. 11-63:

The comment suggests that the project and alternatives are insufficiently analyzed with respect to medical effects, relocation effects and all other areas examined in the Draft EIR. As previously

indicated, the EIR fully analyzes all potential impacts associated with the proposed project and is in full compliance with the requirements of CEQA. This comment represents the opinion of the commenting party. The commentor's opinion is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration. The commentor does not specify how the analyses presented in the Draft EIR are deficient. See also Response Nos. 11-3, 11-7, 11-58 and 11-59.

Response No. 11-64:

The comment suggests that the EIR does not consider the cumulative effects of the project with respect to other CRA projects in the City and County. The Draft EIR appropriately examines the cumulative effects of the proposed Plan Amendment in conjunction with other growth in the surrounding areas in each technical section of the EIR (III.A through III.L). Growth in other CRA areas was reflected in SCAG projections of regional population, housing and employment growth that were used to assess potential cumulative effects in the areas of transportation, air quality and population/housing/employment in the Draft EIR. The remaining environmental effects consist of localized effects, for which cumulative effects would only occur if other CRA projects were located in close proximity to the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area. Since no other CRA projects are located in the immediate vicinity of the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area, no additional cumulative impacts beyond those addressed within the EIR would occur.

Response No. 11-65:

The comment suggests that the EIR fails to propose adequate mitigation measures for growth inducing impacts because of the inadequacy of the project description. The Draft EIR considers the growth inducing effects of the proposed Plan Amendment as required by CEQA on page VI-1, and concludes that growth inducement would be consistent with the objectives of the Redevelopment Plan and that the proposed Plan Amendment would not induce growth in an area that is not already developed with infrastructure to accommodate such growth. Impacts would not be significant and no mitigation measures would be required. In addition, Section 15126.2 (d) of the CEQA Guidelines states that "It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment". Mitigation for growth inducement is therefore, not a requirement under CEQA. With respect to the adequacy of the project description used in the Draft EIR, see Response No. 11-60.

Response No. 11-66:

The comment suggests that the EIR is merely a post hoc rationalization of the redevelopment plan. The conclusions contained in the Draft EIR are based on a thorough, in-depth and reasoned analysis, and the EIR appropriately examined the potential physical changes and environmental consequences that could be associated with the proposed Plan Amendment. The commentator's opinion is noted and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration.

Response No. 11-67:

The comment suggests that the EIR is merely a set of conclusions unsupported by specific evidence. The commentator's opinion is noted and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration. The comment does not indicate where the Draft EIR analysis lacks evidence to support its conclusions. Also, see Response no. 11-66 above.

Response No. 11-68:

The comment suggests that the EIR does not give the addresses of parcels slated for development so analysis of historic value can be made. The Draft EIR does not assume that potential development under the analyzed development scenarios would occur at any specific location within the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area (see Response No. 11-5). The Draft EIR identifies the addresses of historic resources that presently exist within the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area (Draft EIR, Appendix G) and provides an analysis and mitigation measures to address potential impacts associated with projects that could affect these resources as a result of the implementation of the proposed project (Draft EIR, pages III.D-8 and III.D-9).

Response No. 11-69:

The comment indicates that the EIR does not provide a finalized plan to address transportation impacts. The Draft EIR identifies the requirement to prepare a Comprehensive Transportation Plan in accordance with the provisions of the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan. This Plan would be developed in conjunction with LADOT to provide comprehensive transportation solutions within the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area to address effects associated with traffic, parking, street relocation, widening and vacation and transportation, as suggested in the comment (see Response No. 8-3). The Draft EIR does not rely upon this Plan as a mitigation measure, and, as a result, identifies impacts to a number of roadway segments during the AM and PM peak hours under the Maximum Possible,

Moderate and Minimum development scenarios. Impacts and mitigation measures associated with freeways are not within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the Lead Agency (see Response No. 3-1).

Response No. 11-70:

The comment suggests that the EIR has no analysis of impacts to surrounding areas. The commentator's opinion is noted and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration. The comment does not specify what impacts to surrounding areas the Draft EIR fails to analyze. The Draft EIR presents an analysis of the potential physical changes and environmental consequences associated with the proposed Plan Amendment, including analysis of effects on surrounding areas where appropriate. See also Response Nos. 11-29 and 11-64.

Response No. 11-71:

The comment suggests that the EIR fails to analyze the impact on police services. The Draft EIR provides an analysis of impacts to police services in Section III.I.1 (pages III.I-1 through III.I-6). This analysis identifies impacts and mitigation measures for addressing impacts to police services. The comment does not specify which part of this analysis is insufficient.

Response No. 11-72:

The comment suggests that the EIR fails to use actual growth rates and realistic growth rates. The commentator's opinion is noted and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration. The development scenarios analyzed in the Draft EIR were developed using appropriate assumptions and were based on a planning analysis that projected different land use and development scenarios that could reasonably result from the proposed Plan Amendment. The methodology used in identifying the development scenarios is described in the Draft EIR (pages II-8 and II-9).

Response No. 11-73:

The comment suggests that the EIR has internal contradictions. The commentator's opinion is noted and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration. The comment does not specify where such internal contradictions may exist. The comment further suggests that the EIR is partially unintelligible, specifically noting that the computer printouts in the appendix lack assessor parcel numbers and addresses. As noted earlier, the locations of the candidate parcels is not pertinent to the analysis provided in the Draft EIR (see Response 11-5). Therefore inclusion of locational information is not

relevant to the analysis and could be misleading in that it might suggest that impacts would be limited to these locations under the proposed Plan Amendment, which is not the case.

Response No. 11-74:

The comment suggests that the technical appendices were only circulated to selected parties preventing full public comment. The separate technical appendices volume of the Draft EIR was provided to agencies which would require the specific technical data contained therein and was made available to all other persons at local libraries in the Hollywood community (Frances Howard Goldwyn Hollywood Regional Branch, Will and Ariel Durant Branch), along with the Records Review Branch of the Lead Agency. The Notice of Completion and Availability for Public Review, and the Notice of Public Hearing that were filed and published for the Draft EIR all included information showing where the Draft EIR and its Technical Appendices were available for review. The commentor, upon telephone request to the Lead Agency on November 21st 2002, was provided with a copy of the technical appendices volume and the Lead Agency has received no comments from any other commentor or agency indicating that their ability to comment on the Draft EIR was impeded due to the lack of availability of the technical appendices volume.

Response No. 11-75:

The comment suggests that the cumulative impacts of the project with projects in the surrounding area were not analyzed. See Response Nos. 11-29, 11-64 and 11-70.

Response No. 11-76:

The comment suggests that the EIR did not analyze the effect of the project on small businesses and small property owners. See Response No. 11-19.

Response No. 11-77:

The comment suggests that the effect of a proliferation of social service agencies in the project area is not analyzed. This comment is not related to the proposed Plan Amendment, which does not include any social service agencies. Moreover, this is not an environmental issue under CEQA and therefore was not addressed in the Draft EIR.

Response No. 11-78:

The comment suggests that the failure to consult the Project Area Committee was not analyzed. This comment is not directed at the adequacy or the environmental impacts addressed in the EIR and so no response is required. The comment is however, acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers. However, no PAC presently exists within the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area. See also Response No. 11-16.

Response No. 11-79:

The comment suggests that there is no reason to amend the Hollywood Redevelopment Plan to provide for eminent domain authority. The commentator's opinion is noted and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration. Also see Response No. 11-49.

Response No. 11-80:

The comment requests answers to questions raised in previous reports provided by the commentator. See Responses 11-10 through 11.18.

Response No. 11-81:

The comment requests that the CRA Board and City Council reject the EIR and order it redone, adopt existing conditions as the project and close down the redevelopment project. The commentator's opinion is noted and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration.

Letter No. 12

December 18, 2002

Leron Gubler, President & CEO
Hollywood Chamber of Commerce
7018 Hollywood Boulevard
Hollywood, CA 90028

Response No. 12-1:

The comment indicates that the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce supports extension of the Lead Agency's authority to acquire property on which no persons lawfully reside by eminent domain and the proposed revisions to the text of the Redevelopment Plan. The comment indicates that the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce supports the Minimum development scenario and the creation of a vibrant, livable community within the heart of Hollywood and suggests several policies for achieving this aim. The comment is acknowledged and will be forwarded to Lead Agency and City decision makers for consideration. Since the comments pertain to implementation of the proposed Plan Amendment rather than any environmental issues in the Draft EIR, no further response to this comment is required.

Letter No. 13

January 3, 2003

Robert W. Nudelman
Board Member and Director of Preservation Issues
Hollywood Heritage
P.O. Box 2586
Hollywood, CA 90078

Response No. 13-1:

The comment requests that the locations of the 448 structures listed in the Draft EIR as buildings of historic significance be provided in order to judge the effectiveness of the Redevelopment Plan in promoting historic preservation within the Project Area. This information was contained in a separate technical report contained in Technical Appendix G to the Draft EIR. This technical report was provided to the commentor as part of a separate action by the Lead Agency. The technical report contains a series of tables with property addresses which are organized according to their eligibility or ineligibility for the National Register of Historic Places and for the California Register of Historical Resources. Tables 1 and 2 provide the address listings for those properties which are listed in or previously determined eligible for listing in the National Register, and are, therefore, automatically listed in the California Register, and there is no change in their status. Tables 3 and 4 of that technical report, provide a list of property addresses that provide a comparison between the previous and newly evaluated status codes, according to California Register eligibility (Table 3) or ineligibility (Table 4). Table 5 of that technical report contains a list of addresses of properties newly identified as being eligible for the California Register. Table 6 of that technical report includes a list of buildings which no longer appear eligible for the National or California Register, including those that have been demolished. These Tables provide the information and comparisons requested in the comment.

Response No. 13-2:

The comment indicates that the DEIR fails to address the preparation of certain plans identified in the adopted Redevelopment Plan, including circulation and design plans. This comment is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the Lead Agency and City decision makers for consideration. The Lead Agency did prepare, as required under the adopted Redevelopment Plan, a draft urban design plan for the Hollywood Boulevard District. This plan was prepared in coordination with a community task force, but was not adopted by the City Council. The proposed Plan Amendment would modify

schedules for the preparation of studies and plans required under the Redevelopment Plan, including the referenced transportation and urban design plans. The Lead Agency has included funding for preparation of this Plan in its work program for the current fiscal year and the following fiscal year. These plans are expected to be completed within this time frame.

Response No. 13-3:

The comment indicates that the Maximum Possible, Moderate and Minimum development scenarios could pose problems related to the provision of public services, including parks, police services and roadway infrastructure. The Draft EIR acknowledges (page III.I-18) the shortage of park space in the Project Area, based on the guidelines utilized by the City Department of Recreation and Parks. Although mitigation measures commit the Lead Agency and future project applicants to explore creative ways to alleviate this shortage, it is doubtful that the Project Area, which is a fully developed, dense urban regional center, would be able to feasibly meet the Citywide parkland guidelines (page III.I-22). Thus this impact is identified as significant and unavoidable. Of note, this impact would also occur in the absence of the proposed Plan Amendment (Draft EIR, page III.I-18). With respect to police services, the mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR (Draft EIR, page III.I-5) would require project applicants to coordinate with the LAPD to minimize increased demand for services and would require the Lead Agency to work with the LAPD to meet new facility needs within the Project Area. These measures would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. LAPD did not submit comments regarding the analysis presented in the Draft EIR. With respect to transportation infrastructure, the analyses presented in the Draft EIR reflect the increased mobility and accessibility provided by the Metro Rail system and the location of concentrated activity in the immediate vicinity of the transit system, as promoted in regional and local land use plans (Draft EIR, Sections III.E and III.F). In addition, the Lead Agency, in coordination with LADOT, will be preparing a comprehensive transportation management strategy for the management of transportation demand and infrastructure within the Project Area (see also Response No. 8-1).

Response No. 13-4:

The comment suggests that preservation of historic resources is part of the quality of life in Hollywood, and such resources need to be treated as such and not as “roadblocks to progress”. The comment is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration. Preservation of historic resources is an important priority under the adopted Redevelopment Plan and is addressed in the Draft EIR in Section III.D.

Letter No. 14

January 21, 2003

M. Paul Ramsey, Board Member
Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood Council and
Hollywood Knolls Community Club

Response No. 14-1:

The comment suggests that extension of eminent domain powers to the Lead Agency should not be permitted when the Urban Design Plan required by the Redevelopment Plan adopted in 1986 has not been completed. The comment is noted and will be forwarded to the Lead Agency and City decision makers for consideration. The Lead Agency prepared, in coordination with a community task force, a draft Hollywood Boulevard District Urban Design Plan in accordance with the requirements of the Redevelopment Plan. However, the City Council did not adopt this Urban Design Plan. Among other amendments, the proposed Plan Amendment would modify schedules for the preparation of studies and plans required under the Redevelopment Plan, including the referenced Urban Design Plan for Hollywood Boulevard. The Lead Agency has included funding for preparation of this plan in its work program for the current fiscal year and the following fiscal year. The plan is expected to be completed within this time frame.

Response No. 14-2:

The comment questions how impacts are addressed when there is no plan to analyze. As indicated in Chapter II, Project Description of the Draft EIR, the Lead Agency developed a range of development scenarios that could result under implementation of the proposed Plan Amendment to represent the physical change in the environment that could result from the proposed Plan Amendment. These development scenarios, which represent different assumptions with respect to the pattern of land uses and intensity of development that could occur under the proposed Plan Amendment, form the basis for the environmental analyses provided within the Draft EIR. In addition, under CEQA Guidelines Section 15146, the degree of specificity in an EIR will correspond to the degree of specificity involved in the underlying activity which is described in the EIR. The development scenarios evaluated in the Draft EIR represent the appropriate degree of specificity for evaluation of a redevelopment plan amendment.

Response No. 14-3:

The comment suggests that traffic impacts on the area of Hollywood surrounding the Redevelopment Project Area should have been considered. Other areas of Hollywood surrounding the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area were addressed in the traffic analysis prepared for the Draft EIR. The methodology used in the study employed street segment level analysis to study traffic as it enters and exists the Project Area (i.e., regional traffic that travels through the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area) as well as traffic within the Project Area. The 75 roadway segments analyzed in the Draft EIR traffic analysis were prescribed by LADOT as fairly representing a study of travel demand into, out of and within Hollywood.

Response No. 14-4:

The comment questions why the environmental, traffic and economic impacts of the planned Hollywood Freeway expansion were not addressed. The environmental impacts of activities associated with the expansion of the Hollywood Freeway are a separate project from the proposed Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment. This project is being undertaken by a different agency (Caltrans) and would be proceeding independently of any actions taken by the Lead Agency with respect to the proposed Plan Amendment.

Response No. 14-5:

The comment questions why the Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood Council was not given adequate time to respond to the Draft EIR. In response to comments provided by the commentor during the public hearing on the Draft EIR held by the Board of Commissioners, the Lead Agency extended the comment period on the Draft EIR from January 3, 2003 to January 21, 2003. This extension was agreed to and announced by the governing body of the Lead Agency at the December 19 hearing attended by the commentor. The resulting 63-day comment period for the Draft EIR is beyond that required under CEQA.

Response No. 14-6:

The comment questions how the proposed plan amendment will revitalize the economically depressed area on Hollywood Boulevard between Highland and Vine. As indicated in the Draft EIR (pages II-4 and II-7), the adopted Redevelopment Plan provides the Lead Agency with a broad range of tools for promoting redevelopment and eliminating blight in Hollywood. The proposed Plan Amendment would extend the Lead Agency's authority to acquire, through eminent domain, property on which no persons

lawfully reside to further promote redevelopment throughout the Project Area, including the portion of Hollywood Boulevard between Highland Avenue and Vine Street.

Letter No. 15

December 19, 2002

John Walsh
Hollywood Project Area Committee

Response No. 15-1:

The comment expresses the commentor's opinion that the Hollywood Redevelopment Project be discontinued. This comment will be forwarded to the Lead Agency and City decision makers for consideration. The comment does not contain any environmental issues. No further response to this comment is required.

Response No. 15-2:

The comment expresses the commentor's opinion that the Hollywood Redevelopment Project has been a "fiscal disaster". The commentor's opinion will be forwarded to the Lead Agency and City decision makers for consideration. The comment does not contain any environmental issues. No further response to this comment is required.

The comment letter included an attachment providing an agenda for the Hollywood PAC meeting of December 2, 2002. This agenda contained two items (D and E) that pertain to the proposed Plan Amendment evaluated in the Draft EIR. Item D was a motion to invite the CRA Project Manager for Hollywood to answer questions about the Draft EIR. This comment does not raise any environmental questions or issues regarding the Draft EIR; therefore no response is necessary. Item E is a motion to support the portion of the proposed Plan Amendment that removes the Lead Agency's power of eminent domain over property where persons reside and supports extension of the removal of the power of eminent domain to include commercial property. The commentor misunderstands the proposed Plan Amendment. As indicated in the Draft EIR (page II-7), the Lead Agency's power to acquire property (residential and commercial) by eminent domain expired in 1998. The proposed Plan Amendment would extend the Lead Agency's ability to acquire property by eminent domain, but would limit that authority to only property on which no persons lawfully reside. The commentor's statement related to the potential use of eminent domain on commercial property is noted and will be forwarded to the Lead Agency and City decisionmakers for consideration. The comment does not contain any environmental issues. No further response to this comment is required.

Letter No. 16

January 2, 2003

Edward C. Dygert
Cox Castle Nicholson
19800 MacArthur Boulevard, Suite 600
Irvine, CA 92612-2435

Response No. 16-1:

The comment suggests that the limitation of the Lead Agency's eminent domain authority under the proposed Plan Amendment to property on which no persons lawfully reside does not appear consistent with Health and Safety Code Section 33385(a)(1). Health and Safety Code Section 33385.3(a)(1) provides that a redevelopment agency shall establish a project area committee if a project area committee does not exist and the agency proposes to amend a redevelopment plan to grant the authority to the agency to acquire by eminent domain property on which persons reside in a project area in which a substantial number of low- and moderate-income persons reside. The proposed Plan Amendment would extend the Lead Agency's authority to acquire property by eminent domain in the Project Area, but prohibit its use on any parcel of real property in the Project Area on which any persons lawfully reside. The word "reside" as used in Health and Safety Code Section 33385.3(a)(1) contemplates that a person must be in lawful possession of a dwelling unit in order to "reside" in the Project Area. Lawful possession of a dwelling unit is implied by law. Therefore, the proposed text of the Plan Amendment is simply declaratory of existing law and has been included for clarification purposes.

Letter No. 17

January 20, 2003

Ryan S. Harter
CIM Group
6922 Hollywood Boulevard, Ninth Floor
Hollywood, CA 90028

Response No. 17-1:

The comment indicates support for extension of the Lead Agency's eminent domain authority and concurrent with the findings of the Draft EIR. The comment contains no environmental issues. No response is necessary.

Letter No. 18

December 31, 2002

Don Lippman
8660 Hollywood Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90069-1416

Response No. 18-1:

The comment provides anecdotal evidence regarding effects associated with a past real estate project within the Hollywood Redevelopment Project area. This comment is acknowledged and will be forwarded to Lead Agency and City decision makers for consideration. Under the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15384(b), substantial evidence includes facts, reasonable assumptions predicated on facts and expert opinion supported by facts. Under State CEQA Guidelines Section 15384(a), substantial evidence does not include argument, speculation, unsubstantiated opinion or narrative, evidence which is clearly erroneous or inaccurate, or evidence of social or economic impacts which do not contribute to or are not caused by physical impacts on the environment. The anecdotal evidence offered by the commentor does not constitute substantial evidence under CEQA.

Response No. 18-2:

The comment questions the potential impacts on property owners and tenants that could result from CRA having the authority to acquire property. The Lead Agency is unaware of any impacts that could result merely because the Lead Agency has the authority, through eminent domain, to acquire property on which no persons lawfully reside. Under Public Resources Code Section 21082.2, "the lead agency shall determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment based on substantial evidence in light of the whole record." No substantial evidence has been presented to the Lead Agency which would indicate that such effects would occur and CEQA requires a Lead Agency to address only impacts of a particular project to the environment, not emotional or social impacts.

Response No. 18-3:

The comment questions the potential impacts on property owners and tenants that could result from CRA's use of eminent domain in acquiring property. As indicated in the Draft EIR (page II-7), the proposed Plan Amendment would include extending the Lead Agency's ability to acquire property, through eminent domain, on which no persons lawfully reside. As such, the effects associated with use

of that authority were evaluated in the Draft EIR. These potential effects are evaluated in Chapter III.E, Population, Housing and Employment, of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR indicates (pages III.E-2, III.E-4 and III.E-5) that no involuntary residential displacement would result from the proposed Plan Amendment, as the Lead Agency would not be authorized to acquire, through eminent domain, property upon which persons lawfully reside. The Lead Agency would be authorized to acquire, through eminent domain, property upon which no persons lawfully reside, thus the Draft EIR identifies commercial displacement as a potential impact of the proposed project. This impact would be mitigated through assistance provided by the Lead Agency under established state and local relocation assistance programs. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts associated with potential commercial displacement would be less than significant (page III.E-7).

Response No. 18-4:

The comment questions potential impacts on persons who reside on property so acquired. As indicated in Response No. 18-3 above, the Lead Agency would not have authority to acquire property, through eminent domain, on which persons lawfully reside. Therefore, no persons would be involuntarily displaced as a result of property acquisition under the proposed Plan Amendment.

Response No. 18-5:

The comment questions whether the proposed Plan Amendment means that the Lead Agency shall have no authority or ability to acquire, by eminent domain, property on which persons reside. As indicated in the Draft EIR (page II-7), the Lead Agency's authority to acquire property through eminent domain expired in 1998. The Lead Agency presently has no authority to acquire any property within the Hollywood Redevelopment Project Area. The proposed Plan Amendment would only extend the Lead Agency's authority to acquire, through eminent domain, property upon which no persons reside. Under the proposed Plan Amendment, the Lead Agency would not have the authority or ability to acquire, through eminent domain, property upon which persons lawfully reside.

Response No. 18-6:

The comment questions whether the proposed Plan Amendment means that the Lead Agency shall have the authority or ability to acquire property on which persons reside in some instances. As indicated in Response No. 18-5, the proposed Plan Amendment would not include authority for the Lead Agency to acquire, through eminent domain, property upon which any person lawfully resides, under any circumstances.

Response No. 18-7:

The comment requests that the instances under which property the Lead Agency would have the authority or ability to acquire, through eminent domain, property upon which persons reside, be listed. As indicated in Response Nos. 18-5 and 18-6, under the proposed Plan Amendment, the Lead Agency would not be provided the authority to acquire property upon which persons lawfully reside under any circumstances.

Response No. 18-8:

The comment questions whether there is any difference between the words ability and authority when applied to the Lead Agency's use of eminent domain. There is no difference between these words as used in the EIR. The legal authority is a prerequisite to the ability of the Lead Agency to acquire property. Under the proposed Plan Amendment, the Lead Agency would have neither the ability nor the authority to acquire, through eminent domain, property upon which persons lawfully reside. The Lead Agency's authority (or ability) to acquire property would be limited only to non-residential properties.

Response No. 18-9:

The comment questions whether the wording of the proposed Plan Amendment is intended to provide the Lead Agency with the ability to acquire, by eminent domain, property on which persons reside under any circumstances. As indicated in Responses 18-5 and 18-6, under the proposed Plan Amendment, the Lead Agency would not be provided the authority or ability to acquire property upon which persons lawfully reside under any circumstances.

Response No. 18-10:

The comment requests that the instances under which property the Lead Agency would have the authority or ability to acquire, through eminent domain, property upon which persons reside, be listed. See Response No. 18-7.

**APPENDIX B: RESPONSES TO PUBLIC HEARING
COMMENTS AND PUBLIC HEARING
TRANSCRIPT**

APPENDIX B: RESPONSES TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS AND PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPT

On December 19, 2002, a public hearing was held before the Board of Commissioners of the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles (Agency Board) for the purpose of providing additional opportunity for the public to comment on the environmental issues and the Draft EIR for the proposed Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment. The hearing was held in the Agency Board Room, 354 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90013. A total of 9 persons testified before the Agency Board during this hearing. The comments of these individuals and responses to those comments are contained in the section of the Final EIR. The complete transcript of the public hearing is attached to this section following the responses to comments.

The Agency Commissioners present for the public hearing included:

- David Farrar, Chair
- Shu K. Woo
- Madeline Janis-Aparicio
- Douglas R. Ring
- John Schafer
- Marva Smith Battle-Bey
- Dov Lesel

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS Hollywood Redevelopment Plan Amendment Project		Comment Number	Land Use	Aesthetics/Urban Design/Light & Glare	Cultural Resources	Population, Housing, and Employment	Transportation/Circulation	Air Quality	Noise	Public Services	Utilities	Geotechnical/Seismic	Hazardous Materials	Other	Notes
Environmental Review Process															
David Morgan	PH1					•									• Notification, Env. Checklist, Health effects of displacement, text of plan amendment, No Project Alternative, past use of eminent domain
Marty Collins	PH2														• Supports project
Paul Ramsey	PH3														• Notification
Brian Folb	PH4														• Supports project
Don Lippman	PH5														• Eminent domain language
Leron Gubler	PH6														• Supports project
John Walsh	PH7														• Opposes project
Tarik Nuhodzic	PH8														• Supports project
Josh Kamensky	PH9														• Supports project

Comment PH1: David Morgan

Response No. PH1-1:

The comment suggests that notification was not provided to all property owners subject to eminent domain. See Response No. 11-2.

Response No. PH1-2:

The comment suggests that the EIR is incomplete since it omits the environmental checklist. See Response No. 11-3.

Response No. PH1-3:

The comment suggests that a draft of the proposed redevelopment plan (sic) and other supporting material has been requested from the Lead Agency and not provided. See Response No. 11-4.

Response No. PH1-4:

The comment suggests that the EIR did not specify locations of potential commercial displacement and medical effects of displacement. See Response Nos. 11-3 and 11-5.

Response No. PH1-5:

The comment suggests that the EIR incorrectly identifies CRA development as no project whereas existing conditions are actually the no project condition. See Response No. 11-6.

Response No. PH1-6:

The comment suggests that the EIR does not list past uses of eminent domain. See Response No. 11-8.

Response No. PH1-7:

The comment suggests that the Board terminate the EIR process and correct deficiencies before continuing. The commentor's opinion is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration.

Comment PH2: Marty Collins

Response No. PH2-1:

The comment indicates the commentator's support for the proposed Plan Amendment. The comment is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration. No response is necessary.

Comment PH3: Paul Ramsey

Response No. PH3-1:

The comment indicates that the commentator's organization was not provided sufficient notice and sufficient time to provide comments on the Draft EIR. See Response No. 14-5.

Comment PH4: Brian Folb

Response No. PH4-1:

The comment indicates the commentator's support for the proposed Plan Amendment. The comment is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration. No response is necessary.

Comment PH5: Don Lippman

Response No. PH5-1:

The comment indicates that the commentator requested the text of the proposed Plan Amendment, which was not provided. See Response No. 11-4.

Response No. PH5-2:

The comment questions differences between the "ability" and "authority" of the Lead Agency to undertake acquisition of property through eminent domain. See Response Nos. 18-5 and 18-6.

Comment PH6: Leron Gubler

Response No. PH6-1:

The comment indicates the commentor's support for the proposed Plan Amendment and the Minimum development scenario on behalf of the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce. The comment further requests additional planning activities be undertaken in conjunction with the proposed Plan Amendment. The comment is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration. See also Response No. 12-1.

Comment PH7: John Walsh

Response No. PH7-1:

The comment suggests that the Lead Agency consult with the Hollywood Project Area Committee (PAC). See Response Nos. 11-16 and 11-78.

Response No. PH7-2:

The comment suggests that the Lead Agency does not require eminent domain authority. The commentor's opinion is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration.

Response No. PH7-3:

The comment provides the commentor's opinion that the Hollywood Redevelopment Project has been a failure and should be audited. The commentor's opinion is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration.

Response No. PH7-4:

The comment suggests that the Lead Agency provide a list of money spent on different projects. The comment refers to matters which are not environmental issues under CEQA and therefore were not appropriate for inclusion in the Draft EIR.

Comment PH8: Tarik Nuhodzic

Response No. PH8-1:

The comment indicates the commentor's support for the proposed Plan Amendment on behalf of the Hollywood Community Housing Corporation. The comment is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration. No response is necessary.

Comment PH9: Josh Kamensky

Response No. PH9-1:

The comment indicates the commentor's support for the proposed Plan Amendment on behalf of Council Member Eric Garcetti, Council District 13. The comment is acknowledged and will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration. No response is necessary.